



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 223

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 21, 1995

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 21, 1995

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

HIRE A STUDENT WEEK

Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada employment centre for students is celebrating its annual hire a student week across Canada, June 19 to 23.

The goal of hire a student week is to gain support from potential employers and to heighten awareness of the services available through the Canada employment centre for students in Saskatoon as well as in other parts of the country.

People will notice the hire a student buttons being worn by students at the events planned to celebrate this week. In Saskatoon we had button day on Monday, flag raising day was yesterday, today is a hot dog sale, fitting for students, tomorrow is job shadowing day and on Friday, most important, is employment appreciation day.

I extend a big thank you to the hard working young people in the Canada employment centre for students office in Saskatoon, in particular Thomasina Burke, for all the hard work they do in helping students find much needed summer employment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have to deplore the government's inaction regarding the mining industry. In spite of several initiatives on the part of parliamentarians and the natural resources committee, this government never agreed to provide assistance to this major industry which employs tens of thousands of Canadians and Quebecers.

On June 5, I supported the motion put forward by the hon. member for Timiskaming—French River to implement a mining incentives program. Instead of taking steps to ensure this

industry's viability, the government chose to let the investment climate deteriorate.

We must make sure that our mining sector will be able to develop in the future and continue to create thousands of jobs in Quebec and Canada instead of abroad.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. George S. Rideout (Moncton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the committee on natural resources requested during the examination of the Department of National Resources Act, the Minister of Natural Resources tabled this morning the fifth annual report to Parliament, "The State of Canada's Forests, 1994".

Canada's forests continue to be a major engine of economic growth for Canada, particularly in certain regions of the country such as my home province of New Brunswick, but they are also essential to our environment.

The theme of this year's report, "A Balancing Act", describes the challenges of maintaining timber for our industry while conserving habitat for wildlife.

As the world's largest exporter of forest products, the eyes of the world continue to watch how well Canada is able to balance its economic and environmental needs.

[*Translation*]

I would like to take this opportunity to urge all my hon. colleagues to read the fifth annual report tabled in Parliament and to participate in the public debate on the future of the most precious of our natural resources: our forests.

* * *

[*English*]

CHILD POVERTY

Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled to address the issue of child poverty, a phenomenon generally attributed to the third world.

Canada is not a third world nation and yet there are nearly 1.3 million Canadian children living in poverty, enough to form the fifth largest province. Think about it: shocking, incredible, terrifying, intolerable; yes, all of these.

S. O. 31

Five years ago the Government of Canada in the House resolved to achieve the goal of eliminating poverty among our children by the year 2000. Resolutions and objectives are not enough. Effective anti-poverty initiatives and immediate action are warranted, indeed demanded.

None will deny the necessity to eliminate the deficit as expeditiously as possible but let us strive to bring this deficit to zero in a compassionate and reasonable way. Let us not forget the children in poverty during this era of fiscal restraint. Our country's future depends on solving both problems quickly and fairly.

* * *

G-7 SUMMIT

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I offer an alternative version of the interpretation being put on the G-7 summit by the Prime Minister.

The G-7 summit did not deal in any significant way with a lot of the serious problems facing the international economy. The G-7 summit did not deal with growing polarization between rich and poor within industrialized countries and between industrialized countries and the third world. It did not deal with the international debt problem of third worlds.

Finally and most significantly, because this is what the Prime Minister likes to talk about, it did not deal with the whole question of money speculators.

All it did was provide that the IMF might have more money in the end to bail out economies damaged by speculators. When we bail out those economies in the current context we bail out the speculators themselves.

What we have increased here is the global welfare state for money speculators rather than dealing with the root of the problem which is curbing speculation—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary North.

* * *

CALGARY STAMPEDE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on July 7 a western tradition continues and that wild west show, the Calgary Stampede, kicks off its 10-day extravaganza.

I invite all members and Canadians across the country to come and experience all the parades, pancake breakfasts and the rodeos. Try horseback riding, line dancing and all the other fun that marks this favourite time of year for Calgaryans and thousands of visitors.

If a Canadian vacation is what you need, come to Calgary this July for the greatest outdoor show on earth. We will be glad to show you our western hospitality.

Two final notes. Liberals who have been disciplined for voting against the party line should pay close attention to the calf roping event. Any MP who is not opting out of the MP pension plan should avoid the greased pig wrestling contest.

* * *

SAFE GRAD

Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, high school graduation time is again upon us. I take this opportunity along with my colleague from St. Boniface to commend the laudable actions of many students across Canada for their participation in the safe grad program.

This year's students from across the country including Manitoba will again take part in the safe grad program. This combines student graduation celebrations with realistic measures to prevent accidents and other problems which could be associated with drinking and driving.

Safe grad is a student run program with input from parents, teachers and police. Safe grad is geared toward the needs and wishes of individual schools and their students.

I am most impressed with the students of our country and their support of safe grad. Along with the member for St. Boniface, I commend them on their actions. On behalf of the House and my colleagues, I wish all students a safe and happy graduation.

* * *

(1405)

[Translation]

BURMA

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that today is the 50th birthday of an outstanding woman, Aung San Suu Kyi, the 1991 Nobel Peace Prize winner who is fighting for democracy in her country, Burma.

After winning the 1990 elections with an 82 per cent majority, Mrs. Suu Kyi was imprisoned by the Burmese military authorities and has been under house arrest for nearly six years.

The Canadian government must take positive action in support of those values set out in its foreign policy statement, should there be any left, and bring pressure to bear on Burmese authorities for her release.

The Bloc Québécois salutes the courage of this woman and thanks her for fighting for democracy, liberty and human rights under extremely difficult conditions.

S. O. 31

[English]

ROGERS SURREY

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Rogers Surrey community channel has served New Westminster with excellence for many years and now local producers are reaping the rewards of their hard work.

On May 30 in Halifax, Nova Scotia executive producer Catherin Ackroyd and co-producers Jim Reis and Archie Miller were recognized for their documentary “Lest We Forget: Canadians in Normandy”.

The Canadian Cable Television Association awarded the hour long program as the best documentary in Canada in 1994. The program also won best documentary of the Pacific programmers region for provincial awards of excellence.

From a Canadian perspective “Lest We Forget” shows the dramatic events of the D-Day landing with interviews of veterans from the Canadian Scottish regiment and the 1st Canadian parachute battalion.

In the year of the 50th anniversary of the second world war it is important for all Canadians to appreciate what our veterans did on our behalf. I thank Rogers Surrey for its service to my community and its longstanding commitment to excellence in community programming.

* * *

ABORIGINAL SOLIDARITY DAY

Mr. Elijah Harper (Churchill, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is aboriginal solidarity day and I call on my colleagues in the Chamber to show their solidarity with Canada’s aboriginal people.

I also bring greetings from the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs. Last week I attended its assembly in Winnipeg. I can attest to its solidarity as it prepares for the dismantling of the Department of Indian Affairs and for self-government in that province.

Today on this day of solidarity I call on members of the House to work together with the First Nations to implement self-government in Manitoba and across Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to salute, personally and on behalf of the government, the recent appointment of Louise Fréchette as Deputy Minister of National Defence. Mrs. Fréchette’s appointment to that important position in the Department of National Defence

shows once again the government’s true commitment to promote greater participation of women in all lines of activity.

[English]

Louise Fréchette began her career with the Department of External Affairs and has since occupied various posts, including Ambassador of Canada to Argentina and Uruguay and most recently as Canada’s first female ambassador to the United Nations.

Prior to her appointment as deputy minister of defence she was the associate deputy minister of finance and G-7 deputy.

This appointment is a testament to Mrs. Fréchette’s hard work and perseverance. I wish her much success in her new post on behalf of all my colleagues. Félicitations et merci beaucoup.

* * *

LEADER OF THE REFORM PARTY

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks we have learned the hon. leader of the Reform Party has designs on becoming the leader of the opposition. Apparently the leader of the third party has decided he needs a car upgrade. Chevys are great cars and lately he has found his accommodation not to be to his liking.

Having made these discoveries he felt it was easier to become leader of the opposition than to get the Reform Party to increase his expense account. Therefore he has initiated a feeble attempt to get backbench Liberals to defect to the Reform Party. Such unrestrained political ambition is so blatant it is embarrassingly dangerous.

I have a message for him on behalf of my colleagues. There will not be a stampede, so do not hire the interior decorator for Stornoway just yet.

* * *

[Translation]

SOMALIA

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the commission of inquiry into the behaviour of the Canadian Forces in Somalia is about to begin its public hearings, it is increasingly obvious that the measures taken to protect potential witnesses are largely inadequate. Indeed, several members of the armed forces fear reprisals from their senior officers if they tell what they know or what they saw in Somalia.

The Minister of National Defence must immediately reassure these soldiers and encourage them to testify, by publicly promising that no retaliation measures will be taken against them.

S. O. 31

(1410)

We must shed light not only on the events which occurred in Somalia, but also on the reprehensible behaviour of several other members of the armed forces, including at the Petawawa military base. The government must restore the honour and integrity of the Canadian Forces, which were greatly tarnished following these dramatic events.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are happy to say this appears to be one time when the justice minister and Reform can agree.

The justice minister needed reminding by Reform that DNA evidence can be a useful tool in determining a suspect's guilt or innocence and that Canadians wanted action on this issue now.

Following that reminder the justice minister stated he will immediately introduce legislation allowing court ordered DNA testing of suspects charged with violent crimes providing he has the support of the House.

We assure the justice minister not only will our members support his initiatives, all Canadians will most heartily support him. As we leave the House for the summer it is encouraging to see the government can act quickly and decisively when an important issue affecting the lives and safety of Canadians is brought to the forefront by Reform.

We trust and hope this spirit of co-operation to enact important legislation wanted by Canadians will continue when the House returns in the fall to conduct the nation's business.

* * *

ETHICS COUNSELLOR

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Prime Minister to have his ethics counsellor investigate the awarding of a contract for legal services for the Saint John Port Corporation to a lawyer in a law firm in Saint John, New Brunswick, which is owned by the brother of the executive assistant to the Minister of Transport and in which a government member of the House continues to practise.

This is a straight conflict of interest. The awarding of this contract calls into question the integrity of the government. It is against the policies of the red book.

[Translation]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Quebec pequisite government did not wait for the referendum campaign to start squandering public money. The Parti Quebecois has already spent \$11.2 million on its propaganda campaign. That amount only includes activities which can be directly related to separatist propaganda.

Imagine what the total amount would be if we were to add the salaries of ministers, members of the legislative assembly and PQ government staff, who did nothing but promote their separatist obsession since the provincial election. It is time for Quebec separatists to stop wasting money on their pet project. Quebecers expect the PQ government to work with us to create jobs and stimulate the economy.

* * *

[English]

G-7 SUMMIT

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Nova Scotia is still enjoying the prestige and recognition it has received after successfully hosting the G-7 summit.

It was not only Halifax that hosted the events associated with the summit, both Lunenburg and Chester in my riding of South Shore played host to spouses and daughters of the G-7 leaders last Friday.

They were welcomed by the town crier, William Cluett, treated to a guided tour of the historic town and enjoyed lunch in the scenic village of Chester.

The type of hospitality and scenery to which the spouses and daughters were treated is typical of the entire South Shore. Whether visiting Shelburne County, Queens County or Lunenburg County you can be guaranteed a spectacular coastal view and a warm welcome from the residents of this beautiful part of Canada.

I urge all members of the House to visit the South Shore of Nova Scotia this summer and see and experience for themselves the numerous events this area has to offer.

Once again I go on record in the House thanking the many individuals who gave their time and talents, as well as the well wishers who lined the streets of Lunenburg for making the leaders' spouses and daughters' visit a success.

* * *

THOMAS SZAJKO AND JASON SHULTZ

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the constituents of Okana-

Oral Questions

gan—Similkameen—Merritt because last spring two of my constituents, Thomas Szajko and Jason Shultz, put their lives on the line to rescue six people from an intense house fire.

Both these men entered the inferno without regard to their own lives. They managed to awaken five residents of the house and rescue them. They re-entered to seek out the last victim who was crying for assistance. Without their bravery and determination, the final resident would not have survived.

On Friday, June 23 these two heroes will be awarded the medal of bravery, presented by the Governor General of Canada for acts of bravery in hazardous circumstances. Few would dare to do what they have done. I take this moment to pay tribute to these two heroes. They show the true spirit of humanity and compassion for others.

Not only is the town of Oliver proud of these two men but all of my constituents, indeed the country, should be proud of their remarkable achievement.

(1415)

I encourage all members of the House to acknowledge the fearless actions of these two great Canadians.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

FEDERALISM

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tried to justify Ottawa's new strategy on the Quebec referendum as follows, and I quote: "There has not been enough emphasis by the federalists on demonstrating that the federal system works well and works for Quebec. I think that is one of the problems". The minister's perception of the facts is selective, to say the least.

My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Can he seriously claim that the federal system works well and works for Quebec, when in one particular case, his Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has refused to compensate Quebec for what it spent on educating young Crees, a total of \$130 million?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs gave a very good explanation. If I remember correctly, there was an agreement between the federal government and the provincial government. The terms of that agreement were met, but there were some additional, unforeseen expenses that were not covered by the agreement.

That particular aspect is being discussed now, but the terms of the agreement as such were met. If there were additional expenses that were warranted, that can be discussed, but we did what is essential to good federal-provincial relations, that is, we complied with the agreement as negotiated and approved by both parties.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, how can the Prime Minister keep saying that the federal system works well and works for Quebec, when Ottawa still refuses to transfer responsibility for manpower training to Quebec and in fact plans to intervene even more in this area, thus leading to further costly and inefficient duplication?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development made offers to all the provinces, including Quebec, in which he proposed to conclude temporary agreements that would include a transfer of responsibilities, but Quebec said no. Other provinces are discussing the problem with the minister, but Quebec wants all or nothing.

I think we must maintain a federal presence in these areas, because Quebec, like other provinces where the economic situation is not as good as in the richer provinces, needs the federal government to redistribute resources from those who have jobs to those who do not. And this has no connection with federal-provincial relations.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister says that Quebec wants all or nothing. This is an outright reproach to one of his ministers, the minister responsible for the referendum in Quebec, who when she was a minister in the Johnson government, turned down the federal government's offer on manpower training.

How can the Prime Minister keep saying, like his minister, that the federal system works well and works for Quebec, when Ottawa's withdrawal from social program funding puts the provinces, including Quebec, in the very difficult position of either having to cut services or raise taxes?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even before the federal budget, the provincial government in Quebec City cut \$500 million from its budget for health care services, and that was last fall, when the PQ came to power. Look at what Minister Rochon is doing now. I read the papers like everybody else.

I think we explained our position very well. As for the reference of the Leader of the Opposition to the position taken by the Minister of Labour, as a party leader who changed parties five times, he is certainly not in a position to tell anyone to be consistent in politics.

*Oral Questions***BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN**

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Fédération nationale des associations de consommateurs du Québec and the Canadian Council, which represent over 300 organizations, have joined forces with dairy producers and processors to demand that the federal government renew the moratorium on bovine somatotropin, which will end in nine days.

(1420)

Since the ministers of agriculture and health have been waffling for months on this important issue, I would ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to follow up on the request of consumer associations, the dairy industry and even the Standing Committee on Health to impose a strict moratorium for an indeterminate period on the use of somatotropin? It is up to him to set down the rules.

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just because the voluntary moratorium agreed upon by manufacturers and the Department of Agriculture ends on July 1 does not mean that the sale of BST will automatically become legal.

Health Canada continues to study the issue and will approve the product only if scientists are convinced that it is safe and effective.

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister does not even recognize the work of the health committee, which is unanimous regarding the issue. The agriculture committee has declared war and is demanding that Health Canada make its studies public and the minister is taking no action.

Will the Prime Minister acknowledge that people have the right to drink the most natural milk possible, and that by refusing to extend the moratorium, he is exposing consumers to the risk of unknowingly drinking milk tainted with hormones, without knowing the real impact that this will have on the health of humans and animals?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Minister of Health explained the situation clearly. There was a voluntary moratorium and the Minister of Health did not give permission for this product to be used for the Canadian market. And we will not give permission until we have very clear advice that there is no danger.

At the moment, we are fully aware of the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, and I would like to remind you that almost weekly, a member of my caucus raises the issue. We are very much aware of the problem and, contrary to what some people are implying, the product will not be authorized for use after July 1 of this year.

*[English]***GOVERNMENT OF CANADA**

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as this session comes to an end the great imperative for the Prime Minister is to re-establish the ethical standards of his government.

When the government came to power it promised to make government integrity its number one priority but 20 months later that red book promise is in tatters with ministers flouting the federal code of ethics, the ethics counsellor reduced to impotence, and the Prime Minister defending party loyalty and discipline over the principles of democracy and ethics.

Will the Prime Minister send a clear signal to Canadians today that unethical behaviour in government will not be tolerated? Will he can tainted ministers, starting with the Minister of Canadian heritage?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after many days of arguing the case we stated that everything had been done according to the laws of Canada. The record of the government over the last 20 months has been the best we have seen in a long time. I am applying myself to making sure that all ethical and normal rules that should apply to members of Parliament and to cabinet are followed by all cabinet ministers. That has been debated.

After 20 months and on the last day before we adjourn they repeat the same question they have used for the last three weeks. We must be doing quite well if they have nothing else to talk about.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government also promised to put an end to the politics of patronage and backroom deals.

But over the last 20 months what have we witnessed: \$26 million diverted in Nova Scotia from highway 104 to a road in the riding of the minister of public works, campaign workers lined up in Victoria for patronage plums from the justice department, and the Liberal family contact rewarded again and again with government contracts and favourable cabinet decisions. This is like a rerun of an old movie: Brian Mulroney Part II.

(1425)

Will the Prime Minister make a new commitment today to purge political patronage from his administration by restoring funding to highway 104 and by disciplining members tainted by patronage, starting with the minister of public works?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the list of things. I will explain every element of it to the House of Commons.

Oral Questions

The Minister of Transport said many times that the change in the situation in Nova Scotia was requested by the elected provincial authorities in Nova Scotia. The member refuses to recognize that.

He made another so-called attack talking about family contacts, knowing very well who he is trying to attack, and he cannot prove anything. I will not go to his level to try to defend myself; I have a record of 32 years in public service.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): Not one contract or not one favour has been given to anybody close to me and my family. I do not have to insist. Every member in good faith knows it.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government also promised freer voting in the House of Commons and a meaningful voice for backbenchers.

In the past few weeks, however, we have seen nothing from the government but a growing disregard for the democratic process: time allocation and closure, Liberal backbenchers being punished for voting the wishes of their constituents, and cabinet ministers who break conflict of interest guidelines being defended by the Prime Minister himself.

Will the Prime Minister reaffirm his red book promises of freer voting and greater MP power in the House by lifting the heavy hand of discipline from those MPs whose only crime was to respect their constituents' wishes?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have done it since I have been prime minister.

In some opinions expressed not long ago, it seems a few years ago, this institution was considered not very acceptable in performing well. It was 9 per cent. The last time there was the same poll it was published not long ago that collectively we have managed to lift respect for this institution from 9 per cent to virtually 30 per cent.

There was an international poll which said there was more respect for the Parliament of Canada in Canada than there was in England, the United States, France, Italy, Germany and so on.

I am not afraid to reply to the person who fired his own justice critic. I have some rules in my party which people know about, but we have more democracy in our party than in any other.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of Parliament for quite some time and it is the first time in the history of this Parliament when members of Parliament of the government side presented dozens of amendments to the House of Commons, as we saw last week, and we let them vote on them.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): Yes, we did. It is the first time there was so much freedom in the House of Commons. We have never seen that before. The vote has passed and I think members on this side of the House of Commons are going home happy, feeling they have done a good job.

* * *

[Translation]

DEFENCE INDUSTRY

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

A study done by the defence industry research group reveals that Quebec would be particularly affected by cuts to the defence industry production program, DIPP. This study concluded that 60 per cent of DIPP's funding in Quebec would be cut, that is, \$50 million, and so research and development would drop by \$150 million.

(1430)

Will the minister admit that he is on the wrong track in cutting funds to DIPP, when he knows very well that, for every dollar the government puts into this program, the industry puts in three, and jobs in high tech industries like aerospace are directly related to contributions to the program?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we discussed this issue last week. As I indicated then to the member, I acknowledge that DIPP is very important, but the government has decided to reduce grants to Canadian private enterprise and to review DIPP.

We think that it has long been an important program in Canada, but this does not mean that this sort of program should not be reviewed. Perhaps the member has some ideas that could be adopted.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister should not concern himself with my ideas. I am more worried about his.

After attacking at the Quebec pharmaceutical industry, the minister is now going after the aerospace industry by cutting DIPP. Is this the sort of federalism being offered to Quebec, where Ottawa continually threatens high tech industry in Quebec, offering only unemployment and technological delay in exchange?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the Bloc supports high tech companies like Monsanto and Eli-Lilly.

I would remind him that Quebec is not the only province with a high tech sector, particularly in aerospace. There are companies all over Canada, such as Pratt & Whitney, which is located not only in Montreal but also in Lethbridge and Halifax, and is very concerned about international competition for grants from the government. We are very much aware of this competition and have some ideas to propose for this sector.

*Oral Questions**[English]***HIGHWAYS**

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it just does not fit, really. The Prime Minister just said that the highway 104 scandal is the responsibility of the province of Nova Scotia.

I recognize that the Minister of Public Works and Government Services refuses to answer for the misappropriation of funds—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: As I mentioned during the last question period, whenever a question is put it is put to the government. The government may choose to answer in whatever fashion it wishes.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, now I find that the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester is telling people that the federal government has found a solution.

Before the session closes I would like to try to get the minister of public works up on his feet and be blessed with an answer. Will the Liberal government be returning the \$26 million to highway 104 as suggested by the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester is very interested in this matter and I understand her concerns. We have listened to people who have made representations with respect to highways in Nova Scotia on a number of occasions.

Although the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester is a very hard working member of Parliament, it does not change the reality that decisions for highway construction, the allocation of funds and the routing of highways is a provincial matter.

I know it is extremely difficult for the hon. member who has asked the question to understand that, but I intend to be patient and to continue to explain to him that whether it is in Manitoba, British Columbia or Nova Scotia, the decision for the construction of highways and how the funds are allocated is the primary responsibility and falls within the constitutional jurisdiction of the provinces in question.

(1435)

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder who is going to get the babysitting fees for the minister of public works, the minister of transport or me?

The government has refused to give documents to the Citizens for Fairness Coalition in Wentworth Valley, Nova Scotia, but I delivered them myself at a rally in the valley.

I would like the Prime Minister to answer this question. Why does the government have to be threatened with lawsuits by outraged citizens before it acts to rein in cabinet ministers who are clearly out of control? What assurances do we have that the minister of public works, in particular, will be given a wake-up call by the Prime Minister?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we continue with the programs already in place to deal with highway construction in a number of provinces, no doubt citizens in every part of the country are seeking as much as they can get to build highways. That is the case in Nova Scotia.

We fully understand the concerns, especially in my case being a New Brunswicker. We recognize that highways in Atlantic Canada need a lot of funding.

Rather than railing at the rally in the valley about the 104, I look forward to the hon. member and his party telling us where they would get more money and what they would propose for highway construction in the country. Since this is not federal jurisdiction, they might want to tell us how they propose to fund highway construction in Nova Scotia and elsewhere where it is required.

* * *

*[Translation]***FRENCH-LANGUAGERESEARCH JOURNALS**

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after providing financial assistance to Canadian research journals for years, in January, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council announced a new policy based on the number of subscribers rather than on the quality of the publications. As a result, funding for French-language journals is being reduced by half.

My question is for the Minister of Industry. Will the minister confirm that the cuts under the new Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council's policy will be borne almost exclusively by French-language journals, while English-language ones will be generally unaffected?

[English]

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while it is true the Social Science and Humanities Research Council will have less funds three years from now than at present, those cutbacks were less proportionately than in many other areas of the government, less proportionately than the Department of Industry.

The Social Science and Humanities Research Council has worked very hard in making adjustments and to make them in the best possible way for the whole research community.

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the council's new criteria do not take into account the relative size of the francophone and anglophone markets in Canada. To give out grants on the sole basis of the number of subscribers amounts to a death sentence for francophone journals.

In that context, does the minister recognize that the real impact of this new policy of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, which gives an outrageous advantage to anglophone journals, is tantamount to eliminating funding for French-language research journals?

[English]

Hon. Jon Gerrard (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council represents all the researchers in the social sciences and humanities in Canada, both anglophone and francophone, and has on its council both anglophone and francophone members. It treats and funds researchers equally all across the country.

* * *

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the American government is poised today to punish Canadian industries for the Liberal policies of cultural protectionism.

Mickey Kantor will issue his retaliation hit list today. Because the Liberals are closing our borders and choking off competition, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of Canadian business stands to suffer.

Why will the Minister of Canadian Heritage not live up to the pro-competition rhetoric of the industry minister and avoid this trade battle with the U.S. which damages Canadians business and allows CMT into the market?

(1440)

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague does not seem to realize that Canada is one of the most open markets to cultural products in the world, for the benefit of Canadians. However, when a Canadian producer does a good job, creates employment and Canadian content he should be supported.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, despite the woolly answer from the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Mickey Kantor will issue a hit list today, regardless of whether the CMT deal with NCN goes through during the current negotiations.

Oral Questions

The Minister of Canadian Heritage is letting CRTC run amok. The CRTC was directly responsible for the negative options billing fiasco. It is responsible for the satellite policy debacle and now it has forced the government to sacrifice Canadian industries and jobs in a high stakes poker game within the U.S.

The CRTC's time is—

The Speaker: The question, please.

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast): The government has repeatedly stated that it has raised competition but the CRTC disagrees.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

* * *

[Translation]

TRADE

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

On January 1, the United States took advantage of the establishment of the World Trade Organization to impose on Canada new restrictions on imports of sugar and products containing sugar, thus jeopardizing over 2,400 jobs. Also, a bill sponsored by Senator Jesse Helms is currently before the U.S. Congress and seeks to prohibit access to the American market to any business having commercial ties with Cuba.

Meanwhile, American sugar is flooding our market to the point that the revenue department felt the need to initiate an antidumping investigation. Can the minister tell us what concrete action he will take to prevent the Helms bill from being passed?

[English]

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been vigorous in our protests about the Helms bill. They have taken a variety of forms. We followed the traditional one of protesting to the United States state department. The Prime Minister had occasion to raise the matter during heads of government meetings. For my part, I have on a number of occasions pressed the matter with the United States trade representative.

The result of our protests and those of European countries, Japan and other major trading partners of the United States has been to encourage the administration to seek a revision of the bill in such a way as to meet our trading concerns.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister has been aware of the problem for several months. In spite of his often repeated assurances, nothing has changed and the situation still represents a threat to our companies.

Oral Questions

Will the minister intervene with American officials regarding the so-called black list presumably made by the U.S. Treasury and said to include the names of Canadian companies doing business in Cuba, including sugar refineries?

[English]

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to what the hon. member refers. In the case of the so-called black list, there have been press reports of the United States treasury issuing a "black list", if he wishes to call it that, against four subsidiary companies in Cuba, in which a Canadian company has an equity position.

The United States treasury has not issued such a list. Therefore I must take the member's question as hypothetical.

* * *

RAILWAYS

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

In the 1800s railroads were given the power of expropriation as they expanded across Canada. Today, as railroads abandon lines everywhere, I would like to know why the new Canadian transportation act contains a similar or parallel power of expropriation?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member is interested in this matter. If he takes a close look at the proposed legislation he will find, and I am sure he agrees, that it is no longer appropriate for railroads in Canada to have the direct expropriation powers they enjoyed over many years.

(1445)

We have suggested in the new legislation that in the event where negotiations do not lead to a satisfactory settlement, railroads will no longer have the direct power of expropriation. They will only be able to move in that direction with the consent of the government and cabinet.

I agree with the hon. member that it is a situation that should only be allowed to exist in extraordinary circumstances. Certainly the new legislation will not allow railroads to become involved in any direct expropriation on their own.

* * *

LITERACY

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government's literacy program has funded a booklet entitled: "Making Scenes Between the Lines", scripts written by street kids for use in our students' classrooms. In it a

principal says: "F— you. Empty your pockets", and the student responds: "F— you, I will. You can take your attitude and shove it up your f—ing a—".

Why is the government allowing the literacy program to fund \$200,000 for such a project and what in the world is this supposed to accomplish in our schools?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not avail myself of the same reading literature that the hon. member obviously does.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

An hon. member: You should read it. You might learn something.

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre): Calm yourself.

One reason for supporting literacy programs is to bring important opportunities to large numbers of Canadians, particularly those who have not had an opportunity for education. It brings them into the system to learn the basic functions of reading and writing. We supply those grants to a wide variety of organizations, mainly the ABC Canada organization, a group of corporate sponsors which provides that kind of funding. They make the decisions based on those peer groups.

If the hon. member wants to send me a copy of the publication, I would be glad to look at it and respond. The hon. member should recognize the ultimate and important value of helping street kids to learn to read.

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is going to every school in the country, not just to street kids and government money is being spent on it.

My party believes in literacy and keeping kids off our streets, but handing out scripts like this to every high school in the country is hardly the way to do it. Learning how to spell obscenities is not literacy and the real language the government talks about can be learned by reading washroom walls, not through government programs.

Can the Prime Minister assure the House and Canadian parents whose kids are going to be getting this stuff on their desks in September that it will not happen and this project will not go ahead?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, like other members of her party, seems to forget that the decisions on these matters as to what appears in the classroom are not made by the federal government but are decisions of the local school boards. If the school boards do not want to make access of that kind of literature to their children, it is their choice.

Oral Questions

I have already indicated that if the hon. member would be good enough to send me a copy of the publication, I will take it up with the secretary of state for literacy to determine what the sponsorship is and what the use is. We would then get a response back to the hon. member.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

The many cuts imposed by the federal government on the National Film Board since 1984 have literally disrupted their services. In Quebec, seven municipal libraries are affiliated with the NFB and carry NFB films and documentaries. However, citizens who do not reside in these municipalities must pay up to \$100 per year, for example in Abitibi-Témiscamingue, to avail themselves of the services of an NFB library.

Is the minister aware that the repercussion of this NFB policy is that access to the NFB collection has become considerably more restricted for residents of remote regions?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the NFB is making budgetary adjustments, there is nothing surprising about that. In addition, we are reviewing its mandate, and during this process we will study the NFB's distribution policy. Lastly, the future lies in distribution via the information highway, and, in this area, the NFB is on the cutting edge.

(1450)

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the minister not feel that the NFB should be strongly encouraged to come up with ways of making this collection more accessible, for example through video rental stores?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our colleague is a little behind the times technologically. The NFB is in the process of setting up a robotics centre in Montreal which will provide a direct link between its collection and the entire country, once the centre is linked to the information highway. It will serve all parts of the country, including out of the way areas like the one mentioned by our colleague.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, medicare waiting lists are now so long that an American firm is selling insurance here. This is a disgrace. Health care delayed is health

care denied. Can the health minister explain why medicare waiting lists are so long?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons for waiting lists. Sometimes they are long because emergency cases go ahead of others.

One of the good things about our country and medicare is the fact that people do not need a large wallet and there is no need to spend excessive dollars on insurance administration. The dollars we spend go directly to patient care. We are going to continue to ensure that happens. That is the best way to treat the people of Canada: based on need, not based on whether they can afford to pay.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this plan is actually called waiting list insurance. If a person has to wait more than six weeks for surgery, the company will pay to take them to the U.S. to have it done.

Instead of handing us rationing and rhetoric will the minister admit that reasonable access is a thing of the past in Canada?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every country has a form of rationing of medical care. I happen to like the way ours is which is based on the degree of need. In other countries it may be based on how much money the person has, where they live or whether they have insurance. When a person goes to a hospital in Canada they are treated because they are sick, not because of the kind of insurance they have.

* * *

[Translation]

INCOME SECURITY

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

On Monday in Quebec, Minister Blackburn announced a thorough reform of the income security system.

Within the context of flexible federalism and consultation with the provinces, how does the Minister of Human Resources Development, who is about to table components of the federal reform plan, intend to work together with his counterparts in Quebec?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Brome—Missisquoi for his question.

I was very interested in the proposals from the Quebec government, especially since the approach suggested by Minister Blackburn reflects the approach taken by our own government as year ago, particularly the proactive measures for steady employment and plans for decentralizing authority, for local centres and community centres.

Oral Questions

I am prepared to co-operate with Mrs. Blackburn, and I hope she will co-operate with our government, in the best interests of all Quebecers.

* * *

MINIMUM WAGE

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour.

One of the main demands made by womens' groups, especially those that organized the bread and roses march, is for governments to raise the minimum wage.

(1455)

Since the federal minimum wage has not been increased since 1986, does the minister intend to correct this situation and announce an increase this year?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are looking into this right now, and we intend to make a decision very shortly.

I might add that after checking with federally regulated employers, we found that most businesses operate on the basis of the minimum wage in each province. Right now, we can assume that a very small majority of workers are paid the federal minimum wage.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this may be a good opportunity to look at federal encroachment on provincial jurisdictions in all areas connected with manpower.

Since the average provincial minimum wage is around \$5.60—even if only a small majority of people are concerned, these are always too many, and we should find out how many people are earning such a low wage—would the minister agree that a federal minimum wage of \$4.00 is clearly inadequate and should be increased as soon as possible?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, the minimum wage varies widely in this country, depending on the province. It varies from \$4.75 to \$7.00 in certain provinces. Most employers adjust to the minimum wage in the province where they live, and meanwhile, we are looking into adjusting the federal minimum wage accordingly.

* * *

[English]

SOMALIA

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the defence minister promised the Somalia inquiry would be free and open. He said that anyone having pertinent testimony had the responsibility to appear. However earlier this week Justice Letourneau suggested serving soldiers might need to be protected and offered that some could testify in camera.

Does the minister accept that military witnesses may need protection? Will he ensure that soldiers can testify, perhaps even against the department and their seniors without fear of reprisal?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that Justice Gilles Letourneau, the chairman of the commission, was quoted in press reports as stating that some soldiers may fear reprisals or being prejudiced in their military career. He did insist however that there is no evidence to that. Perhaps he was taking precautionary steps. He is considering a promise of confidentiality of information, a pledge that the inquiry will investigate any allegation of ongoing reprisals and an offer to allow vulnerable people, if it is shown that this is the case, to give testimony in private.

It would be improper for me or the minister to comment on any other aspects of the commission until the commission has finished its work.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let us look at a specific example.

Justice demands that Mark Boland testify, but he has made allegations about the conduct of military police and even now is in their custody. He may have the right to appear, but I question his freedom to do so as long as his treatment and even well-being are under the control of the very people against whom he may testify.

What will the minister do to ensure that a soldier like Mark Boland can without fear of retribution testify freely before the commission?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just suggested and mentioned some of the areas that were being considered by the chairman of the commission. I believe it is the commission's responsibility to decide on this aspect of witnesses and their protection if necessary. I would like to leave it at that.

* * *

DRUG ENFORCEMENT

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

It is clear that current drug enforcement policies need to be reviewed in this country. The B.C. coroner last week raised the issue again, as law enforcement officials and many other people have done recently, suggesting that a radically different legislative approach needs to be taken for the possession and use of hard and soft drugs.

In Canada the last comprehensive public review was in 1970 with the Le Dain commission. Has the minister's department taken any steps to initiate a comprehensive review of Canada's drug enforcement policy?

(1500)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the Department of Justice we are always looking for controversial new topics to undertake. Perhaps the hon. member has given us something to do for the summer.

I should say that at the moment, as the hon. member may know, the Standing Committee on Health has Bill C-7 before it, which was introduced by the government to deal with a variety of matters in relation to non-medical drugs, their use, and prosecution and enforcement of laws in relation to their illegal use.

It may be that after that bill has been dealt with the Minister of Health may wish to speak more broadly to the question of the drug enforcement strategy. I am sure she will take into account the points made by the hon. member in formulating that suggestion.

* * *

BOSNIA

Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and it relates to the situation in Bosnia.

As the House will be rising for the summer, the Prime Minister and the government will know Canadians are extremely concerned about what is happening to our soldiers in that part of the world. Given the fact that the House is rising, I would like to ask the government whether it would make a commitment to voluntarily brief members of the House of Commons on a regular basis, in particular members of the Standing Committee on National Defence, so we can be kept abreast of what is happening in this ongoing situation.

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to indicate to members of the House who are interested in the safety of our soldiers in Visoko that a liaison officer from the Bosnian government is now in the camp in Visoko to make appropriate arrangements to restore freedom of movement to the troops, including the resupply of our soldiers there.

In regard to the suggestion just made by the hon. member, indeed we have offered periodically to brief political parties, the official opposition and the Reform Party. Certainly if the caucus of the Conservative Party could get together we would be delighted to brief them.

As the member knows, we are the servant of parliamentary committees. If the chair of the standing committee wants to have briefings, I am sure the defence department or my department will respond quickly and expeditiously.

Privilege

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Dr. Victor Quintana, member of the Mexican Chamber of Deputies.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[Translation]

PRIVILEGE

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as the member for Témiscamingue, proud to live in the Abitibi—Témiscamingue region, and on behalf of my colleague for Abitibi and of members from all regions of Quebec and elsewhere, I draw your attention to the remarks made by the Minister of Canadian Heritage in response to a question from my colleague for Québec.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage showed a flagrant lack of respect and a disdain for the people of remote regions like mine. In his response to my colleague for Québec, he referred to new technologies, using qualifiers. He then used the expression “reculées” (out of the way, backward) to describe the regions, probably in reference to all sorts of things going on in his head as his department is making decisions regarding major cultural sectors in the regions—such as the National Film Board or the Festival du cinéma international.

(1505)

As the member for Témiscamingue, I cannot accept such remarks. Through you, I ask the Minister of Cultural Heritage to apologize to all of the people of Abitibi—Témiscamingue and everyone living in the regions, who are not necessarily the people who live in large urban centres.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at issue is not the respect I have as a Quebecer for all parts of Quebec, but a knowledge of how to speak the French language. I refer you to page 1632 of the *Petit Robert*, where “reculé” is defined as “lointain, difficile d'accès, isolé” (distant, hard to reach, isolated). I see nothing to offend people in this.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: This is unacceptable.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): I would like to go back, Mr. Speaker, to the words that the minister just said. The minister just demonstrated that he has an extremely poor image of those Quebecers who do not live in cities when he said that he finds it utterly normal, parliamentary, respectable and acceptable to say that these people live in isolated, hard to get to and distant regions. There are no distant regions in the province of Quebec. In fact, the minister was talking about people who live in vibrant and constructive communities which contribute to our society.

Routine Proceedings

I would like to ask this minister, who has a very good knowledge of the French language, having used it on many different levels, to, very modestly, very simply, withdraw his unfortunate comments, and then we can put this whole incident behind us.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I do not believe that this is a matter of privilege. This is a debate and, in this House, we have a lot of time for debates, therefore, I will let this issue rest here. There is no matter of privilege.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to raise another point of order?

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I will not be able to intervene; you have already settled the matter. However, talking about shrinking a country's boundaries, just look at the position of the Bloc Québécois.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I had hoped that you had forgotten that today is "wonderful Wednesday". Let us move on to Routine Proceedings.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

(1510)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 48 petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mr. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the third report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage, on the future of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the multi-channel universe.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response thereto within 150 days.

[Translation]

I also have the privilege to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage on the government's proposed orders issuing directions to the CRTC respecting direct-to-home satellite distribution and pay-per-view programming undertakings.

[English]

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF DISABLED PERSONS

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 108(3), I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons entitled "Employment Equity: A Commitment to Merit".

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to make a brief comment on the Reform Party's minority report, which is attached to the employment equity report from the government.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-338, an act to amend the Income Tax Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill to amend the Income Tax Act with respect to the political activities of charities receiving public funds.

I would like to thank the hon. member for Hamilton—Wentworth for seconding the bill.

The bill would allow the revenue minister to disqualify from charitable status corporations, trusts, and organizations that receive discretionary grants from the public money of Canada if they engage in public activity that goes beyond the direction of their charitable object.

I call upon members on all sides of the House to support the bill. I would remind them that our federal debt is now over \$550 billion.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

INTERVENOR FUNDING ACT

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-339, an act to provide for the funding for intervenors in hearings before certain boards and agencies.

(1515)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to present a private member's bill entitled an act to provide for funding for interveners in hearings before certain boards and agencies, which responds to concerns from constituents in my riding.

The bill establishes the principle that a proponent of a project that requires review and approval and that affects the public interest or the environment should assist with funding for interveners.

The bill will assist interveners with a record of responsible representation of a facet of the public interest to put their arguments respecting the project before the approving authority.

I look forward to the support of my colleagues when the bill comes forward.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

BROADCASTING ACT

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-340, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (termination of CBC's television operations).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to introduce these three private members' bills. The bills are part of our package to privatize the CBC.

One of the bills amends the Access to Information Act and would make the CBC more accessible to Canadians. Presently it is exempt from the Access to Information Act and the bill would end that exemption.

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to continue. The explanations as you read them are self-explanatory.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): moved for leave to introduce Bill C-341, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act (Canada Council, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Canadian Film Development Corporation, National Arts Centre Corporation).

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-342, an act to amend the Access to Informa-

Routine Proceedings

tion Act and the Privacy Act (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Arts Centre Corporation).

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

(1520)

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-343, an act to amend the Criminal Code (arrest without warrant).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce this private member's bill which I feel will have no difficulty finding support throughout the House.

The purpose of the bill is to give a peace officer the power to arrest without warrant a person who is in breach of a probation order binding the person.

We are thinking particularly of the number of reports that have come through the police commissions to my office of stalkers and other individuals who are out on parole, probation or found in areas where they have been told not to be. The police have no authority to do anything other than report. We feel they should have, for the safety of all Canadians, the power to arrest. We would seek support for the bill.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC HARBOURS AND PORT FACILITIES ACT

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-344, an act to amend the Public harbours and Port Facilities Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to change a time-honoured practice under the Public harbours and Port Facilities Act by which harbour masters and wharfingers are appointed at the discretion of the minister, often as a political favour.

The purpose of the bill is to ensure that appointments are made on the basis of individual qualifications. The decision will still be up to the minister, but he will have to designate appointees who have shown they are capable of performing the duties involved, all of which would be part of the current review of Canada's marine policy. I think the House would have no trouble passing this bill.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

Routine Proceedings

[English]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

REFERENDUM ACT

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs be designated as the committee of the House of Commons to which any matters shall stand referred pursuant to the Referendum Act.

The Speaker: Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when Government Orders are reached later this day I think you would find unanimous consent that notice of ways and means motion No. 28, standing in the name of the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions, will be deemed carried on division when it is put to the House.

Notice of ways and means motion No. 29, standing in the name of the Minister of National Revenue, will be put to the House, a division will have been deemed to have been demanded, and the same will be deferred until 11.30 tonight.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

(1525)

PETITIONS

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I wish to present a petition that has been circulating across Canada. The particular petition comes from Leamington, Ontario.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

They also state that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families that make the choice to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate tax discrimination against families who decide to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill or the aged.

[Translation]

ELIGIBILITY TO UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Gérard Asselin (Charlevoix, BQ): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my privilege to table in the House a petition signed by more than 850 residents of the riding of Charlevoix.

Your petitioners call on the government to make zone 16 in the central northern region part of zone 25 in Northern Quebec, in the case of municipalities included in the MRCs of Charlevoix-est and Charlevoix-ouest, for the purposes of eligibility for unemployment insurance.

Since most of the jobs available in zone 16 are seasonal, your petitioners want to be part of zone 25, which better reflects the kind of jobs they have.

[English]

TAXPAYER PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present several petitions today.

The first is from 120 constituents of my riding as well as other parts of British Columbia. They call upon the government to reduce its spending and instead implement a taxpayer protection act to limit federal spending.

I am pleased to present the petition today.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as well there is a petition that once again reflects the concerns of Canadians about the Young Offenders Act.

The petition has almost 200 signatures from all parts of British Columbia including my riding. They call upon Parliament to review the Young Offenders Act in an open and accountable process which addresses the following principles: deterrence of the offender, accountability of the offender, and the rights of the victim.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): As well, Mr. Speaker, I have one small petition with which I disagree relating to the Canadian Human Rights Act.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners call upon Parliament to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation.

JUSTICE

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as well, I have a petition that calls for stiffer treatment of criminals and to return rights to law-abiding citizens. It is from approximately 150 petitioners, 25 from British Columbia and others from across Canada.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to return rights to the citizens of Canada from the criminals and request that Parliament honour these requests.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions asking Parliament to lobby on behalf of Leonard Peltier.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions urging Parliament to amend the human rights act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation.

I have two other petitions asking Parliament not to amend the human rights act in any way that would indicate approval of same sex relationships.

VIOLENT OFFENDERS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition calling for stiffer sentences and mandatory treatment for all child abusers.

BREAST CANCER

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my last petition today is on the matter of breast cancer in Canada.

The petitioners call for Parliament to support centres of excellence for breast cancer research, a national toll free information and support system for breast cancer research, and core funding for that research. They call upon Parliament to spearhead federal and provincial action on breast cancer.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to present a petition on behalf of approximately 300 constituents of my riding of Edmonton—Strathcona.

The constituents request that the human rights act not be amended to include the term sexual orientation in order that no Canadian receives special rights or privileges based solely on sexual behaviour.

It is my pleasure to submit the petition and to inform my constituents that I concur.

(1530)

The Speaker: Colleagues, it is not necessary to agree or disagree with petitions. We ask you not to.

I will get you all in. How many of you have to catch a plane? I will get you in, I promise.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition from my riding and parts of the city of London, Ontario which contains four pages of signatures.

This is a petition calling on Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

It notes acts of discrimination against lesbian, gay and bisexual Canadians are an every day reality in all regions of Canada and that this type of discrimination is unacceptable in a country known for its commitment to human rights, equality and dignity for all citizens.

EUTHANASIA AND ASSISTED SUICIDE

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions from Lac-la-Biche, Alberta in the constituency of Beaver River.

Pursuant to Standing Order 36, they are saying whereas the majority of Canadians are law-abiding citizens and respect the law, whereas the majority of Canadians respect the sanctity of human life, and whereas the majority of Canadians believe physicians in Canada should be working to save lives, not to end them, they are praying that Parliament ensures present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously.

They pray that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

Also pursuant to Standing Order 36, I present a petition on behalf of constituents from Bonnyville, again in Beaver River. Whereas decriminalizing assisted suicide or legalizing euthanasia could lead to a reduction in patient-physician trust and respect, the degrading of the value of human life and the erosion of moral and ethical values, and whereas palliative care is active and compassionate care which can relieve the pain and suffering of terminally ill persons and families without the dangers of suicide, these petitioners pray that Parliament continue to reject euthanasia and physician assisted suicide.

They also request present provisions of section 241 of the Criminal Code of Canada which forbids the counselling, procuring, aiding or abetting of a person to commit suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament consider expanding palliative care that would be accessible to all dying persons in Canada.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this petition may be one of the most important petitions tabled in the House of Commons. It was signed by students at Lavallée, Windsor Park Collegiate and Nelson McIntyre, all schools in my riding, and concerns national unity.

These petitioners point out that:

[English]

Quebec has been a founding partner of Canada and its richness and uniqueness in terms of language and culture, its population, its size and its position have enriched the entire nation.

In spite of differences we have had over time, we have been able to reach accommodation to the benefit of all parties and certainly to the benefit of the entire nation. These students believe separation would jeopardize the quality of life of all Canadians, particularly young people. They insist we all work very diligently and responsibly as adults toward national unity; a stronger country for ourselves but let us not forget them.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have five petitions to present. The first deals with our financial condition. The petitioners pray and request that Parliament reduce government spending instead of increasing taxes and implement a taxpayer protection act to limit federal funding.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition unfortunately arrives too late because Parliament rushed through Bill C-68.

I have 250 signatures from my constituents asking more attention be paid to people who are breaking the laws with respect to guns as opposed to law-abiding citizens who came under the gun as a result of that act.

The third petition with 151 signatures draws to the attention of the House that public safety is the number one priority of the criminal justice system.

The petitioners want Parliament to support laws that will severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in the commission of crime and support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions which recognize and protect law-abiding citizens to own and use recreational firearms.

(1535)

JUSTICE

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for the interest of the House, the last two petitions have had the greatest

number of petitioners coming to my office. The first one specifically refers the bill of my colleague from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Bill C-240. The petitioners call on Parliament to enact legislation against serious personal injury crimes being committed by high risk offenders by permitting the use of post-sentence detention orders and specifically passing Bill C-240.

A related petition with 686 signatures calls for keeping dangerous offenders and paedophiles locked up for life, eliminating statutory release and posing stiffer sentences for violent offenders. There is a whole list here.

This issue has prompted the greatest number of signatures in my constituency. Although I do not have any obligation to comment on it, I will say that I do concur.

The Speaker: I prefer you did not.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions signed by many residents across my constituency which deal directly with national unity in Canada.

They state that whereas the hon. Leader of the Opposition has travelled to other parts of the world to promote the separation of Quebec from Canada, and whereas the majority of residents of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke wish to promote Quebec's continued participation in the Confederation of Canada, therefore the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call on Parliament to inform the Leader of the Opposition he is not supporting the majority view of the residents of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke when he is travelling to promote the separation of Quebec from Canada.

They want national unity in Canada.

PHONE SEX SERVICES

Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition signed by my constituents.

The petitioners, most of whom are concerned parents, have expressed grave concerns of the arrival in Canada of new phone sex services that originate from foreign countries. These services are classified as standard overseas calls and their advertising and access are not regulated, as are domestic services of the same nature.

Unlike -900 and -976 calls which parents can block, these -011 numbers cannot be blocked. The petitioners believe children's access to these services should be curtailed and they request Parliament to enact a publication ban on foreign sex line numbers and to regulate foreign sex lines and restrict publication of the numbers to adult subscriptions to be accompanied by a warning as to their graphic nature.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my duty and honour to present a petition on behalf of 100 constituents of Saanich—Gulf Islands and surrounding area.

The petitioners humbly pray and call on Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people, binding on Parliament, to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

JUSTICE

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition with the signatures of 7,582 residents of southeastern and central Ontario. This was presented to me by Tracey Bridgeman of the Durham region.

It calls on Parliament to recognize that crimes and violence against persons are serious and abhorrent to society. It also requests we amend the Criminal Code, the Bail Reform Act of 1972 and the Parole Act accordingly.

JUNK MAIL

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 1,950 residents mainly of the Victoria, British Columbia region, asking that Canada Post cease to deliver junk mail.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and pleasure to present a number of petitions which I have grouped into six topics in order to facilitate their presentation.

The first is signed by 83 responsible firearms owners from Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan who use firearms for their livelihood, sport and industry. They call on Parliament to recognize Canada already has the toughest gun control in North America with strong regulations regarding usage and storage, and to further recognize there is no relationship between responsible gun ownership and the use of firearms in crime.

(1540)

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next group of petitions is signed by 47 constituents of Saskatchewan, not in my riding, who call on Parliament to preserve Canadian unity, parliamentary tradition and to protect the rights of all the people of Canada by prevailing on the Speaker of the House of Commons to recognize the Reform

Routine Proceedings

Party of Canada as the official opposition during the remainder of the 35th Parliament.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to present a petition signed by 195 school teachers from my riding regarding the status of the Young Offenders Act.

The petitioners call on Parliament to change the legislation to make young offenders more responsible for their actions, to make the names of young offenders public and to increase the severity of consequences for repeat offenders.

RAIL TRANSPORT

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next group is petitions is with respect to the elimination of the Crow benefit.

The petitioners call on Parliament to eliminate the debt incurred by CN Rail and get the CN empire, government owned grain hopper rail cars and the Port of Churchill to western Canadian farmers operated in conjunction with the Canadian Wheat Board, thus allowing effective competition within rail transportation.

JUSTICE

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the next petition is from 25 residents of Saskatchewan who are greatly concerned that under section 745 of the Criminal Code convicted murderers sentenced to life imprisonment without chance of parole for 25 years are able to apply for review after 15 years. The petitioners request the repeal of section 745 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the last group of petitions which I have the honour and privilege to present today is signed by 425 concerned Canadians, primarily from Saskatchewan and British Columbia, who request that Parliament support the existing laws which severely punish all violent criminals who use weapons in crime, support new Criminal Code firearms control provisions which recognize the rights of law-abiding citizens to own and use recreational firearms, and support legislation which will repeal and modify existing gun control laws which have not improved public safety or have proven to not be cost effective or have proven to be overly complex so as to be ineffective or unenforceable.

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for me to recognize the last three members for petitions today?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to present yet another petition from citizens in my riding who are opposed to the approval of BST, the drug injected into cows to increase milk production.

Routine Proceedings

A recent Angus Reid poll suggested 74 per cent of Canadians are concerned about BST and would pay more for milk from cows not injected with it.

There is no shortage of milk in the country. If there should ever become a shortage of milk the solution would be to get more cows.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Gary Pillitteri (Niagara Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the federal representative for the riding of Welland—St. Catharines.

The petitioners oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amendments to the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

The petition contains 38 signatures.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, citizens from across British Columbia have given me several petitions which cover a variety of topics.

In the first petitioners are concerned that the definition of marriage remain the legal union of a man and a woman.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition the petitioners request that assisted suicide and euthanasia not be allowed in Canada.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the third petition the petitioners request that protection enjoyed by born human beings be extended to unborn human beings.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the fourth petition the petitioners request that firearms legislation target the criminal misuse of firearms and not law-abiding citizens.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps readying Parliament for the next federal budget, in the final petition the petitioners request that Parliament reduce government spending instead of increasing taxes.

JUSTICE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour and a privilege to rise on behalf of my constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt to present petitions. I have three petitions to present today.

The first petition was initiated in the memory of Mindy Tran, an eight-year old who was abducted and tragically murdered in her home town of Kelowna, British Columbia. The 248 signatories request that Parliament impose maximum existing legislation, deny eligibility for parole, bring in new legislation and hold a binding national referendum on the issue of capital punishment as a deterrent to these social predators victimizing our children.

(1545)

SEXUAL ASSAULT

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition also deals with the criminal justice system. Outraged citizens are concerned with sexual assaults on women.

The petitioners call on Parliament to amend section 271 of the Criminal Code to include a minimum sentence of five years where a person pleads guilty to or is found guilty of level one sexual assault.

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker the third petition, bearing 71 signatures, is in regard to the bovine growth hormone that is injected into dairy cows.

The petitioners request the Government of Canada to protect our health and food supply by disallowing the unnecessary genetic manipulation of dairy cows through the injection of bovine growth hormones.

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of a number of Canadians from Merritt, Kamloops, Oliver, Langley and Surrey, British Columbia.

The petitioners point out that Canadians, particularly women and children, are becoming increasingly fearful of walking on the streets in their communities. They ask the House of Commons and the Minister of Justice to take whatever steps are necessary to amend the Criminal Code and parole system to ensure that safety and peace return to our neighbourhoods.

SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition, signed by people primarily from Ontario. It indicates that deep cuts to Canada's social programs will hurt all Canadians and have a profoundly negative impact on the four million adults and children living below the poverty line.

The petitioners point out that 50 per cent of the debt of Canada is the result of monetary policy, 44 per cent is the result of tax policy and less than 6 per cent is a result of all government programs.

Routine Proceedings

Therefore they point out that social programs ought not to be severely limited, in that they are our right and heritage.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 183 and 196.

[Text]

Question No. 183—Mr. Comuzzi:

What portion of the announced \$300 million adjustment payment following cancellation of the WGTA will be directed toward enhancing infrastructure for the port of Churchill?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food), Lib.): No final decisions have yet been made on the precise allocation of the \$300 million multiyear WGTA adjustment fund. Discussions with private sector stakeholders, including farm organizations, and provincial governments are underway to solicit advice as to priorities. The fund first becomes available on April 1, 1996.

To date, the advice received by the government has emphasized the use of this fund to: offset some of the impact of changes in the Canadian Wheat Board's freight cost pooling system; provide transitional support for the alfalfa dehydration industry; and build or upgrade agricultural infrastructure on the prairies, and especially the road system.

Final allocation decisions will take all relevant interests into account, recognizing that a \$300 million fund cannot address every expectation. The objective is to assist the prairies agricultural sector to make the necessary transition to an economic environment without transportation subsidization.

Question No. 196—Mrs. Hayes:

With respect to the UN New York preparatory conference in March 1995, (a) what was the total amount spent by all federal departments and agencies as well as the breakdown of those costs by department and agency, (b) who were the representatives that comprised the Canadian delegation and what were the guidelines utilized in the selection of those delegates?

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.): I am informed by Status of Women Canada (SWC) as follows:

The four week New York preparatory meeting for the World Conference on Women March 15 to April 7, 1995 was held concurrently with the regular session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women.

(a) Cost to the federal government for participation at these meetings were as follows:

Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)—\$973

Status of Women Canada (three officials)—\$19,677

Foreign Affairs (one official)—\$5,000

Canadian International Development Agency (one official)—\$8,055

Non-governmental organizations (two representatives)—\$16,215*

*Funded by Status of Women Canada

Total Cost:—\$49,920

(b) Representatives on the Canadian Delegation included:

Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women); Status of Women Canada, Valérie Raymond, executive director, world conference secretariat; Status of Women Canada, Rhonda Ferderber, director, external relations and communications; Status of Women Canada, Sheila Regehr, senior policy analyst; Foreign Affairs, Adèle Dion, co-ordinator, international women's equality; Canadian International Development Agency, Diana Rivington, senior policy adviser, women in development directorate; NGOs, Madeleine Gilchrist and Gulzar Samji; and two representatives of the government of Quebec, costs covered by the government of Quebec.

The appointment of a delegation to represent Canada at world conferences and/or preparatory meetings leading to those conferences is the responsibility of the Minister of Foreign Affairs. In selecting members, the minister ensures that the expertise is well matched to the issues to be addressed and that the delegation is representative of the diversity of Canadian interests at play in the conference.

[English]

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

An hon. member: Agreed.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the second time I am asking about Question No. 117, which I placed on the Order Paper on December 1, 1994.

I understand that the government normally takes 45 days to answer these questions. It has now been seven months. I thought it was a fairly simple question, asking about the taxable liability of civil servants who have travel allowances and chauffeured limousines to move around the country.

I hope the government will see fit to answer this question forthwith, after seven months.

Government Orders

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day in responding to a similar point of order raised by the same hon. member, the question asked involves a tremendous amount of detail from all parliamentary agents, crown corporations, every department and agency of the government, all governor in council appointees, armed forces personnel and RCMP personnel. He has asked for a tremendously detailed answer. Frankly, I am not surprised that it has taken so long to answer. I am sorry it has taken so long.

I should advise the hon. member and he will be interested to know that of the 209 questions on the Order Paper to date, 166 have been answered and 43 are outstanding. That will be less the ones that have been answered this week. I think there have been four answered already this week.

In fact, 80 per cent of the questions that have been placed on the Order Paper during this session of Parliament have been answered. The government has been assiduous in attending to its duties. I know the hon. member will agree, having heard those figures.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to suggest that all notices of motions for the production of papers stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

(1550)

*[English]***WAYS AND MEANS**

CUSTOMS ACT

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): moved that a ways and means motion to amend the Customs Act and the Customs Tariff and to make related and consequential amendments to other acts be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to an order made earlier today the motion is deemed adopted on division.

(Motion agreed to.)

EXCISE TAX ACT

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of National Revenue, Lib.) moved that a ways and means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act and the Income Tax Act be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to an order made earlier today, a recorded division is deemed demanded and deemed deferred until 11.30 p.m. this evening.

* * *

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There are 33 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada.

Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33 will be grouped for debate but voted on as follows. A vote on Motion No. 1 applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33.

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 1 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 2 and 5. On the other hand, a negative vote on Motion No. 1 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 2.

A vote on Motion No. 2 applies to Motion No. 5

[Translation]

Motions Nos. 7 to 11, 14, 15 and 19 to 25 will be grouped for the purposes of debate but voted on separately.

Motions Nos. 12 and 13 will be grouped for the purposes of debate. A vote on Motion No. 12 will apply to Motion No. 13.

[English]

Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 18 will be grouped for debate but voted on as follows. A vote on Motion No. 16 applies to Motion No. 17. Motion No. 18 will be voted on separately.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I shall now propose Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33 to the House.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent on the part of the House to consider that when you call a group, all the motions in the group would be deemed put to the House without your having to read them or have them moved. I think there is a disposition throughout the House in that regard today.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is that agreed?

(1555)

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I think you might find unanimous agreement to start with Group No. 4. I understand that is the wish of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In that case I shall propose Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 18 to the House.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-91, in Clause 23, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 42, on page 10, with the following:

“shares with a par value of \$100 each, but the paid-in capital of the Bank.”

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-91, in Clause 24, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 18 and 19, on page 11, with the following:

“24. The rights conferred by shares include”; and

(b) by deleting lines 26 to 38, on page 11.

Motion No. 18

That Bill C-91, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 42, on page 12 and lines 1 to 23, on page 13, with the following:

“(a) authorizing the issue of shares in one or more series and authorizing the Board to fix, by resolution, the maximum number of shares in each series and to determine the designation, rights, privileges, restrictions and conditions attaching to the shares of each series, subject to any limitation set out in the by-law;

(b) changing authorized shares without par value, whether issued or not, into shares with a par value and changing authorized shares with a par value, whether issued or not, into shares without par value; and

(c) consolidating or subdividing shares.”

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, before I get into the debate I would like to express my appreciation for the unanimous consent given to the grouping and that all of these motions are deemed to have been put, to expeditiously advance the debate and the passage of the bill.

However, I also need to register very clearly and unequivocally that the establishment of a crown corporation like the Federal Business Development Bank or by whatever other name it might be called in the future is not consistent with Reform Party policy. We would suggest that such a crown corporation, organization or corporation not exist. Even though that is our position, we want to make the crown corporation as efficient and effective as it can be. That is the purpose of the amendments that our party is presenting to the House this afternoon.

With regard to Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 18, which refer to clauses 23, 24 and 27 of the act respectively, each of these amendments and those respective clauses refer to the capital structure of the proposed FDBD. The capital structure as covered in clause 23 suggests that it consists of a variety of instruments. The first of these are common shares with a par value of \$100 each and an unlimited number of preferred shares without par value, but the paid-in capital of the bank together with any contributed surplus related to it and any proceeds referred to in paragraph 30(2)(d).

This paragraph from 30(2)(d) really has to do with hybrid capital instruments. We will talk about that in just a moment. We also need to recognize that those things that have been described as equity have to do with contributed surplus and retained earnings.

Therefore, a couple of things need to be suggested here. First, the categorization of common shares versus preferred shares needs to be distinguished. The common shares and the preferred shares will be owned by the crown which is the Government of Canada. However, as I understand it, there is a difference in how they are treated in terms of the presentation of the budget to the House of Commons.

The preferred shares, to the best of my knowledge, will not be in the budget but off budget. In other words, they are considered as an investment of the government so the people are unaware of what the disposition or exposure is of the Government of Canada in the equity of the Federal Business Development Bank.

Motion No. 16 deletes from the capital structure of the bank the category of preferred shares. This would suggest that it is better to take them out.

When we get to clause 24, if there is going to be a share capital part of the capital structure of the bank, to make it more efficient then it ought to be possible, in fact it is necessary in our opinion, that there be a variety of classes of shares and that they be created in such a way that there is a maximum of flexibility possible.

If some future government would like to do what the current government is doing, that is privatizing crown corporations like CNR, then this capital structure would be a very convenient way to make the thing go smoothly. From that point of view, it is an improvement to go to a share capital position.

Our suggestion is that there be only one class of shares which are common shares rather than preferred shares. Motion No. 17 clarifies and makes more efficient the disposition, control and management of those shares.

I would like to focus briefly on the hybrid capital instruments. Nowhere does the act define exactly what is meant by a hybrid capital instrument. This raises a whole series of questions. The

Government Orders

first question has to do with what is the priority claim in the event of dissolution of the bank or in the event of looking at the earnings of the bank as to who gets paid and in what order they get paid. Do they take preference to the preferred shares or do they take a secondary position or do they maybe even take a tertiary position? It is not clear.

Therefore the act is deficient in not making that clear. The act is also deficient in not clarifying exactly who will own these hybrid financial instruments.

The question really arises of who will be expected to buy these things. Are they going to be individual citizens? Is it going to be the Government of Canada?

(1600)

The way the act is written, it is possible that the government could own these, that individual citizens could own these, that corporations could own these. That raises the other good question: Could some kind of persuasive power be directed towards the banks and it be requested that they supply this hybrid capital, in which case it is almost an expectation that it is just short of exercising a tax on the banks in order to supply the capital for this crown corporation? I do not think that is a desirable situation to be in.

The other situation is that if you create a hybrid capital instrument and nobody knows exactly what we are talking about, that is like creating something we are supposed to be supporting and we are not sure what it is we are supporting. One has to be very critical of that kind of provision in an act of this kind.

There is one other point that has to be raised here, and that is the actual manner in which the retained earnings and the contributed surplus is going to be handled by this bank. On one hand, the bank is told that it must manage its affairs in such a way that there is complete cost recovery in terms of the loans and the financial transactions it engages in. On the other hand, there is a provision that the capitalization of the bank contain a parliamentary appropriation.

It depends a lot now on what the mix of these equity positions is going to be. If the major portion of the capitalization of the bank is going to be a hybrid capital instrument and if that has prior claim, then indeed the bank is obligated to pay the holders of these hybrid instruments before it considers any profit to the bank or any return on investment. If the major part of that is there, that becomes a direct charge against the earnings the bank might make. Most of those earnings will come from the money it lends to various entrepreneurs.

I would respectfully suggest to the House that we adopt these three amendments to the act.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, to begin I would like to say to the industry critic for the Reform Party and the critic from the Bloc Quebecois that as we in committee designed this bill we had a very constructive debate, a very solid exchange of views. I am happy to see that this spirit is continuing today in the House, because it is important that we put this bill through the House today, with all the responsibility we have been given to make sure we do the right thing.

At the same time, members must realize that this Business Development Bank of Canada is an instrument that we need to act as a catalyst with the small and medium size business community and it must be done. This bill must be passed before this House adjourns.

I now want to deal with the Reform Party member's concerns about this area of the bill on these motions. I want to humbly differ with him. Where the member has said that we are not specific about the options the bank may choose to get into and therefore the crown's liability might be increased, I differ with that.

I want to be very specific. Under section 30 of the bill, it is entitled the debt to equity ratio. Section 30 is very specific. The aggregate of (a) the borrowings of the bank under subsection 18(1) and section 19 and (b) the contingent liabilities of the bank in the form of guarantees given by it must not at any time exceed 12 times the equity of the bank.

(1605)

We go on and we are very specific about the definition of equity:

For the purpose of subsection (1), the equity of the Bank consists of

- (a) the amounts paid for its shares, including any contributed surplus;
- (b) the retained earnings of the Bank, which may be positive or negative;
- (c) the amounts paid to the Bank as capital by Parliamentary appropriation; and
- (d) such proceeds of debt instruments, hybrid capital instruments or any other arrangements as may be prescribed as equity by the Governor in Council.

What I am suggesting by that very specific control the bank has is that the amendment the Reform Party is putting forward is not necessary because any activity in respect to the concern of the member of the Reform Party could only be undertaken if it met the bank's eligibility criteria. If the eligibility criteria were not met, then the bank could not proceed holus-bolus on its own.

I believe that the bill, as it stands, amply covers the Reform Party's concerns.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to participate in the debate on the fourth group of motions and I am pleased that we have agreed to

Government Orders

accommodate one of our Reform Party colleagues, who had to return to his riding unexpectedly early.

I should mention from the outset that the amendments before us are very technical and very specialized. We support them, because, on the whole, they strike us as not altering the spirit of the bill to any degree, a bill, I might add, that we condemn with all the strength we can muster. This is perhaps a bit of a disappointment for our Reform colleagues.

This very important bill changes the rules of the game and the way of doing things in addition to changing the name of the largest federal financial institution. The change is being made on the sly, without debate or show, make no mistake about it, even though the bill will completely change the operation and the mission of the bank in its relations with future clients.

It will have the role of agent of regional development. We will, however, come back to this point at length during the course of the day. The mission of the bank is being changed in that the nature of the role of economic developer through small business will be altered. We have questions about the way the bank will work in the future, because, in our opinion, it will have to become more commercial in nature and assume the accompanying concerns.

At this point in the debate, I would like to inform you that we will support the three motions by our colleague from the Reform Party, and particularly the amendment to prevent the issue of preferred shares. We consider it important in the context that the legislation clearly state preferred shares may not be issued.

I end my remarks here and will comment further on the bill itself in the coming hours.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 16?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

(1610)

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 17.

The next question is on Motion No. 18. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (for the Minister of Industry), Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That the title of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 3

That section 1 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 4

That section 2 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 6

That section 3(1) of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 26

That section 43 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 27

That section 44 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 28

Government Orders

That section 45 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 29

That section 47 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 30

That section 49 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 31

That section 51 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 32

That section 53 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Motion No. 33

That the Schedule to Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following for "Small Business Bank of Canada":

"Business Development Bank of Canada".

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-91 be amended by deleting Clause 1.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-91, in Clause 3, be amended by replacing lines 23 to 27, on page 2, with the following:

"3. (1) The Federal Business Development Bank is continued as a body corporate."

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to this motion put to the House by the government wherein we name the Federal Business Development Bank the Business Development Bank of Canada.

I think it is only fair to give a little background on this issue, because it was quite a contentious issue in the industry committee. It is important for Canadians to realize that the industry committee over the last year has been seized with one issue primarily. That one issue has been access to capital for small business.

Most members of the committee would agree that we did not let a day go by when we did not explore and examine opportunities and ways in which we could put the small business community on the front burner in the House of Commons. Having worked in this city for many years, I must say that I have found the industry committee to be a united force on this issue.

There were times when we felt we were not the industry committee but really the small business committee. I think it would be fair to suggest that we all wanted to put the small business stamp on every issue we touched. Lo and behold, when the reform of the Federal Business Development Bank came along we decided as a committee to rename it the Small Business Bank of Canada. We became emotionally attached to the issue of small business, to the point where we would probably have wanted to name this institution the Small Business Institution. But reason prevailed and a number of people took the committee's recommendation and did a more thorough analysis of exactly how Canadians felt about that name in all regions of the country. A number of important facts came back to us.

(1615)

By naming the Federal Business Development Bank the Small Business Bank of Canada we would be creating an expectation for that institution which in fairness it could not fulfil. We would have been suggesting that the bank had powers way beyond the powers this bill is giving it. Most Canadians probably do not even realize that the Federal Business Development Bank is not a deposit taking institution. Right off the bat that is an important thing for Canadians to realize.

Another thing we have discovered is that even though the bank is committed to the traditional sectors of our economy, we also want to give it a new type of energy and a new focus on the innovative economies, the knowledge based industries, et cetera. The small business categorization seemed to limit that group. These are new and emerging businesses but it does not take long before they become large businesses. To restrict the bank to the small business name would, in the long run, have created an adverse image and adverse impact on the bank. All committee members did not in any way, shape or form want to do anything other than make sure that this re-tooled, renewed bank with expanded powers got off on the right foot.

I realize that emotionally many of us, including myself, were attached to the name Small Business Bank of Canada. In light of the fact that all of this other information has been brought to our attention, I would ask members to support the government amendment with respect to the new name, the Business Development Bank of Canada, which better reflects the mandate of the bank.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise for the second time. Changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank is a substantial change indeed, especially when there has been no real expressed need. It would appear that the parliamentary secretary's memory of what happened in committee differs from mine.

Government Orders

I would invite you to read again the report on small and medium sized business financing, put out last year by the committee, especially recommendation 19, if my memory serves me well, which came out of left field since the committee had not debate whether the FBDB should change its name. It was our very courteous colleague from Broadview—Greenwood who, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, strong armed the committee into considering the results of the reflection which had taken place in the minister's office to the effect that the Federal Business Development Bank should change its name to the Small Business Bank of Canada. Strangely enough, there is no comment regarding this recommendation in the report. I believe that everybody understood that the parliamentary secretary had no other choice than to present certain proposals.

(1620)

However, it was not enthusiastically received, since everybody agreed that the Federal Business Development Bank had a very good reputation and that changing its name to the Small Business Bank of Canada would result in extra costs and a waste of efforts, all the more as it apparently narrowed unduly the federal bank's mandate.

It would appear that cabinet continued to reflect on the issue. We are told that, during the past year, they consulted many Canadians, from coast to coast I suppose, and concluded that the Canadian public wanted the Federal Business Development Bank to change name. Whereas, last year, they had a very narrow view of the issue, now they have a wider view, and want to call the bank the Business Development Bank of Canada. The decision has already been made; that is what the bill proposes.

The name was too restrictive before, but now it is too presumptuous. I think that the development of a country like Canada does not rest on the name of a bank. This would mean that the only possible kind of development is a financial one when, in fact, there is also a social and cultural development in Canada.

This name change will bring about all the disadvantages we had anticipated right from the start, that is unnecessary spending, the costs of changing all business cards, letterheads and signs and a waste of energy. We also learned from the bank's representatives, during the proceedings of the committee, that in these times of economic recession and budget crisis, the bank has decided to move most of its branches, economic austerity notwithstanding.

So we ask where is the coherence in this government if it cuts seven billion dollars in transfers to provinces for social programs and allows spending of that nature which seems entirely unnecessary and untimely. We know just how capable of deep

and logical thinking those people across the street, in the Langevin Building, are.

Unless the federal government sees in this Business Development Bank of Canada—and this is how we interpret the objective of the government—some special instrument for intervening in the post-referendum Canada which is coming, where the federal government, without any mandate and without consultation with anyone and especially not with provincial governments, is establishing—and we have said it many times and we hope Quebecers will understand what is involved, what is behind all this manoeuvring, truly the dark side of the moon—a whole system of instruments which will allow it to meddle more and more in the daily lives of Canadians and Quebecers. This is the new flexible federalism which, in fact, will turn provincial governments into regional governments.

What worries us is when we hear the testimony of well-known Liberals like Claude Castonguay and Jean-Claude Rivest, now a senator, and a former special adviser to Premier Bourassa, all articulate federalists. They declared publicly on the CBC that Canada is being fundamentally restructured. Quebecers should reflect on that, on what these people say.

So, when we see how far the federal government is going in terms of the new mandate of the Business Development Bank of Canada, which will be asked, among other things, to promote entrepreneurship and support all programs developing entrepreneurship in Canada, we notice that these terms are unclear and undefined in the bill and will allow the government to intervene as it sees fit in any area that it finds interesting, as it will be able to do in another context, under Bill C-88 concerning internal trade that we will also comment on later today. Again, in clause 9, the federal government is giving itself huge powers, without any mandate, without consulting the stakeholders, even if nobody asked for this. It is again doing it on the sly.

(1625)

We are also aware that there was a meeting on this issue in Calgary; no one had authorized the federal government to act as it did and the federal government did not inform its partners of its intention to pass Bill C-88 that we are going to study later on today or tomorrow.

Instead we propose that clause 1 to maintain the status quo regarding the name of the Federal Business Development Bank be dropped, for all kinds of reasons. It is a corporation which has an excellent reputation and with which Canadians and Quebecers are familiar. It has proven itself, it has played a useful role as a bank of last resort and we will come back to this concept later on.

If only to set an example and because of the costs and unnecessary efforts involved in changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank to Business Development Bank of Canada, which furthermore we find presumptuous, we

Government Orders

are going to vote against the government's amendments. We are going to propose instead to cancel clause 1 which aims at changing the name of the bank.

[English]

Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, there are a number of principles I would like to adhere to when rising to debate on this first group of motions having to do with changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank. A number of the principles I want to centre on are fiscal responsibility, democratic decision making, and some of the provisions in the bill itself.

My hon. colleague from the Bloc has illustrated so clearly and so well the additional cost that will be incurred because of these kinds of changes that I do not think are necessary. If on the one hand it would change the function of the bank by changing the name, then let us do it but it does not.

In the whole function of the bank the mandate has been expanded and the capitalization structure has changed. The capital that is available to be lent out has changed. In fact the current capital is about \$3.2 billion and under the new provisions of this bill it rises to \$18 billion. There are some points there that this bank now becomes a very major player in small business lending.

The parliamentary secretary made a big point about the fact that this is going to be the small business bank and that we all have an emotional attachment to small business. My attachment to small business is not on an emotional basis. My attachment to small business is very pragmatic and very hard headed. It is very simply that 85 per cent of the new jobs created in Canada are created by small business. That is the significant part. If we ever want to really build this economy, we have to pay attention to small business. We have to grow it and we have to develop it. It has to become larger and eventually has to graduate from a small business to a big business.

Those are all very desirable things. The big point here is that we are entering into a request to change the name of a bank. I really wonder what the result will be of changing that name.

What bothers me on the democratic part of this thing is that we entered into an arrangement in this House where we could get the bill to committee before second reading, a bill that was supposed to be discussed in the House. What happened? It meant that all the members in the House were not able to contribute to the debate on the provisions of the proposed legislation in the House.

The bill went to the committee and the committee worked on it. It worked fast. All parliamentary standing committees should take a lesson from the way the industry committee works. It gets co-operation. It works well. There is a lot of disagreement and fighting back and forth but there is no recrimination and that is very significant. We recognize a good idea. It does not matter where it comes from and that is wonderful.

(1630)

When the decisions of that kind from committee are presented to the minister and he turns right around and says he is sorry about that committee but he is on his way, it will be the Business Development Bank of Canada and he does not care what we think, that calls for real criticism and begs the questions of how important a committee is. What has happened to the procedure?

If everyone in the House agreed to name the bank the small business bank of Canada, would the minister have said sorry, Parliament of Canada, but the name will be the Business Development bank of Canada not the small business bank? The minister exercised that kind of authority in committee, which he would not dare do in the Parliament of Canada. There has been an abuse of the intent and the spirit of bringing this to committee before second reading.

I also want to come to grips with the word complementary which was touted. This new bank is now supposed to be complementary. We could not get the experts, legal or anything else, to define complementary clearly. It was ultimately brought into the bill in a new kind of way. I hope the parliamentary secretary, the minister and all of the department officials will be able to administer this act so it is complementary and not in direct competition with the existing field.

I do not think it is fiscally responsible to incur costs of making all of those changes from the Federal Business Development Bank to the Business Development Bank of Canada. It is unnecessary and will change nothing. If we are to do it that way let us not change it at all.

Democracy needs to prevail in the House. We ought to recognize how important it is the wishes of committees have meaning. I must recognize at the same time, although it is not part of these motions, that in the committee there were some significant amendments made and the minister accepted them. We need to recognize the minister went the other way around, which I think is an abuse of his privileges.

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): You cannot win them all.

Mr. Schmidt: Madam Speaker, is it interesting how the parliamentary secretary gets so excited about this issue. That is to be a fundamental question not only for the parliamentary secretary but for all members on that side of the House. How well do they recognize democracy and the wishes of the people when it comes to voting in the House?

[Translation]

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to say that I totally agree with what my friend from the Reform Party said about committee proceedings. In committee there are ideas exchanged, some serious work done. However, we get the impression that, in spite of all

the work that is done, when the government wants to impose a direction or a decision, a committee does not carry much weight.

As regards this grouping of amendments, I would like to remind members that with this bill, the government aims at streamlining and modernizing the Federal Business Development Bank. These are words that are really suited to the market situation as this century comes to an end. But they do not fool anyone about the primary intention of the federal government, which is to interfere even more in regional development. Knowing as we do that this element of regional development is extremely important to Quebec, it is obvious that the government intends increase its presence through this structure, this bank, to interfere, to play a role in the most important processes of the economic development of the state of Quebec. We can feel that very clearly.

The government is introducing totally new legislation, the Business Development Bank of Canada Act, which is the new name of the bank, and thereby revokes the Federal Business Development Bank Act. The Bloc opposes any amendment to the current act instituting the Federal Business Development Bank. The bank must continue to provide last resort bank services to small business. Why? Because this is its basic mission, which is to support small businesses having difficulty obtaining financing.

(1635)

But now, the government wants to set itself up as a banker. We all know very well that Quebec's position is very clear as regards financial support to business. The Quebec premier said clearly that Quebec does not want to act as a banker but that it is ready to implement numerous measures to support small business.

The federal government has just given itself a means to act as a banker and to compete directly with banks. This group of amendments on the new name of the Federal Business Development Bank is particularly important. The intent of the government is to turn it into a genuine bank.

If we look closely at the very centralizing bill put forward by the Liberal Party of Canada, we understand the reason for this name. It comes from a very clear federal Liberal tradition that goes back to the Trudeau era. A very centralizing tradition with tentacles everywhere.

From now on, the central government will not be involved in regional development, and even less in local development. It is developing, using a global strategy, all over the map. In other words, what is good for Canada is good for Quebec, what is good

Government Orders

for Newfoundland is good for Quebec, what is good for Ontario is good for Quebec, what is not good for Ontario is not good for Quebec. We know that Ontario has the final say, because the Minister of Industry is from Ontario.

We oppose this group of government amendments relating to the naming of the Federal Business Development Bank. I refer to the motion of my colleague for Trois-Rivières that says that the Federal Business Development Bank is to be maintained as a body corporate. We propose that the bank retain its primary mission, the current one.

The dissenting report of the Bloc Québécois members sitting on the Standing Committee on Industry concerning small and medium size enterprises says, and I quote: "That the Quebec government is in a better position to recognize the funding needs of small and medium size enterprises, to develop programs and to implement them".

I will go further into other groups of amendments later on and list the tools Quebec has in this field of activity. By moving into this field, the federal government is once again creating a lot of costly duplication.

As we have said on many occasions, Quebec does not accept that the central government can apply Canadian industrial development plans throughout Canada, with national standards and objectives established by the Department of Industry.

We have to acknowledge something that is very obvious: "Quebec's control in this field of activity must be recognized by its Canadian economic partner, that is Quebec must have sole control over access to small and medium size enterprises and regional development".

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to speak to Bill C-91 and emphasize the very positive work done by the critic of the Bloc Québécois on this matter, the member for Trois-Rivières, who, as you know, has extensive experience in financial assistance to small business.

I think it is worthwhile to repeat what others have already said, that such a bill worries the Bloc. We do not understand how the Minister of Industry could waste his time reviewing the Federal Business Development Bank, since this institution was and still is an instrument much appreciated by small business.

We are convinced that, if the Minister of Industry is really hard-pressed for work, he could have reviewed the assistance programs for the defence industries, with some help from the secretary of state for science, research and development.

Government Orders

I see that the secretary of state is eager to participate in the debate, whether directly or indirectly. Essentially, we are concerned about the fact that this bill is sanctioning a concrete and immediate interference in an area of provincial jurisdiction, that is regional development.

(1640)

Madam Speaker, you certainly know that Quebec has been demanding that regional development be recognized as a provincial jurisdiction, in accordance with the constitution, since 1974—in fact probably since 1968, but at least since 1974, when the Industrial Development Bank was established. That was the first real interference by the federal government.

I could very easily demonstrate that, certainly as far back as 1974, the federal government has used regional development as a pretext to meddle in a lot of areas that are not under its jurisdiction.

As for ERDAs, or Economic and Regional Development Agreements, why is it that we are debating in June 1995 a bill put forward by the Minister of Industry, when he did not even deign to negotiate and sign ERDAs? Why is the government making this a priority, but did not feel concerned and compelled to get involved in the renewal of these agreements? One can only wonder.

In fact, this needs to be said. Our friends opposite are consistent in their ways; they are using regional development as an excuse to move into areas over which they have no jurisdiction under the constitution. That is what this interest in regional development and ERDAs is all about. Let me back this up with a few facts and figures.

The second batch of ERDAs, those covering the 1984–94 period—I think the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry should listen, because even if he is from Toronto, he could learn a thing or two—were on cultural products, fisheries, transportation and tourism. Can you think of an area that is more obviously and explicitly a provincial responsibility than tourism? Regional development was used to step into areas of jurisdiction not assigned to the federal government.

That is the kind of trick that should make us see clearly that the federal government will never play fair and square at the game of federalism and abide by sections 91 and 92 of the British North America Act. It had been amply demonstrated that this many armed, one track and rule bending government is trying to encroach on areas of jurisdiction that are not its own.

It must be said that the Federal Business Development Bank, in the present state of affairs and because of the way it operates, is something small and medium size businesses in Quebec appreciate because it had a well-defined mandate limited to providing last resort assistance. I think that every member of this House has had the chance at one time or another to deal with officials of the Federal Business Development Bank. I know that

often, when as an MP I had occasion to refer people to the FBDB, it was because traditional institutions such as chartered banks had refused to help. As stated in its enabling legislation, the FBDB was a last resort lending institution.

Why review the mandate of the Federal Business Development Bank? At whose request? Why is this a government priority when we have so many other fish to fry, particularly I might add in the area of science and technology, about which the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology published a report? I do hope we will get to discuss it in this House, as it would provide me with an opportunity to share views with my good friend, the parliamentary secretary. Over the weekend I read the report, which was tabled recently and found it quite enlightening.

(1645)

This report of the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology talks about growth, and wisdom, and it proposes four courses of action, but it gives no real indication that this government wants to work to make science and technology a priority. It would have been much more useful for the government to work toward that goal than to review the Federal Business Development Bank Act that no one, in the end, wished to review.

Once again, we must keep in mind that the Federal Bank, established in 1974, was appreciated, and still is, by small and medium size businesses in Quebec and perhaps even in Canada, because it offered consulting services, financial services which were mostly self-financed. For no apparent reason, the Federal Business Development Bank, under a new name, is being asked, as my colleague for Trois-Rivières pointed out, to become a rather traditional lending institutional and to compete with existing institutions. I know that some witnesses raised this as a concern before the Committee on Industry. We fail to understand why the government is bent on stiffer competition in an area that did not need it.

There is cause for concern here, and I think that we will never give enough attention to the real threats for Quebec which are included in this bill, especially under clauses 20 and 21. Are you aware of the Liberals' old tactic? The bill will allow the new bank to do business with organizations or persons directly, over the head of the Quebec government. This is the same old unhealthy, obsolete tactic of divide and conquer, and it fools nobody.

They want to divide and conquer by making funds available. The government whip is a well informed man generally, but obviously, his somewhat Canadian naivety can sometimes lead him to support principles that are unhealthy for Quebec. As we know, under clause 20, the bank will be allowed to do business directly with organizations or persons, without taking into account the will of the Quebec government.

Government Orders

I know the government whip would surely not have wanted the official opposition to support such principles that obviously—and this cannot be said too often—are very disrespectful to Canadian federalism.

As I have stated, Madam Speaker—and I will conclude with that since you indicate that my time is up—if the government is really serious about regional development, it should transfer tax points or make direct payments to the Quebec government, because we have plenty of projects.

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to address this House on Bill C-91. This bill seeks to do many things, including changing the name of the Federal Business Development Bank, which will become the Business Development Bank of Canada. As they say, what is in a name? What does that name change involve? Let me explain a few things, particularly as regards clause 21, which reads:

The Bank may carry out duties or functions that may be assigned to it by the Designated Minister in relation to the administration of any program supporting Canadian entrepreneurship, to the extent that it is able to recover the costs of carrying out the duties or functions.

The clause says “to the extent that it is able to recover the costs of carrying out the duties or functions”. As you know, when a bank lends money, it takes a risk. Here, the level of risk is not defined. We have reservations about that.

The minister responsible for implementing the act can ask the Business Development Bank of Canada to support Canadian entrepreneurship by carrying out duties or functions currently assigned to other federal departments or agencies.

(1650)

Bill C-91 seeks to ensure that the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, better known as the FORD-Q, will be the provider of federal services and programs to small and medium size businesses.

I have several objections regarding this bill. First, this legislation is another centralizing measure which will create unnecessary and costly duplication. Bill C-91 completely eliminates the role of the provincial government in terms of helping small and medium size businesses.

As you know, this contradicts the Liberal government's claims that it wants to abolish duplication and overlap with the provinces. This centralizing attempt is obvious in clauses 20 and 21, which will allow the Business Development Bank of Canada to enter into agreements with other federal departments to deliver assistance to small and medium size businesses directly.

The agreements signed, including with the Federal Office of Regional Development for Quebec, will allow the federal government to interfere more in regional development projects. I did not say “to get involved”, but to “interfere”, which is definitely not the same. “To get involved” is to act like a

partner, while “to interfere” is to usurp a place when you are not invited.

Clause 20 of the bill provides that the Business Development Bank of Canada may enter into agreements directly with any other body or person. That means that it could have agreements with regional development councils, which is precisely what the FORD-Q would like. In Quebec, the Act respecting the Ministère du Conseil exécutif does not allow agencies under provincial jurisdiction to enter into agreements with the federal government without the minister's approval. We can see here the difference between partnership and interference.

Consider the context of clause 20, which is far from innocuous because the Quebec legislation could be bypassed. Given the present budgetary restrictions, if the federal government wants to fund projects advocated by a regional development council, the council will strongly pressure the Quebec government for an exemption. Unfortunately, this is already a common occurrence. The federal and provincial governments are on a collision course because of legislation that does not foster partnership, but interference in a local process.

Once again, we have the federal government blatantly disregarding the very existence of the Quebec government and securing the legislative authority to act without prior consultation with Quebec or, for that matter, any other province. I am referring to the Quebec situation because I am familiar with it, but all provinces will suffer from the adverse impact of this bill.

My second misgiving concerns regional development and more particularly the federal government's centralist attack that is in direct contradiction with Quebec's regionalization policy.

I had the honour and the privilege to sit on the National Capital Commission—and I am talking about Quebec City and the future of Quebec—and I heard the presentations made by many stakeholders who believed that regionalization in the province of Quebec is crucial. However, the federal government has never recognized that regional development is an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

During every round of constitutional negotiations, Ottawa has ignored our demand. Instead, Ottawa promised the government of Quebec to limit its presence in the regions to what is provided for under the Canada-Quebec framework agreements. However, ERDA, the Economic and Regional Development Agreement to which my distinguished colleague referred earlier, came to an end, that was in December 1994 I think, and the federal government has refused to renew it. The Canada-Quebec agreement has expired.

(1655)

Without joint programs with the government of Quebec, the mandate of FORD-Q becomes practically obsolete. So, to maintain its visibility in the regions, the federal government has found nothing better than to redefine the mandate of FORD-Q.

Government Orders

Nowadays, *FORD-Q* is known as the delivery arm for all the small businesses assistance programs set up by the federal departments and will be able, on the one hand, to provide assistance services to small and medium size businesses through a single information window and, on the other hand, to develop new programs, particularly for exporting SMBs, through federal departments.

A third concern of mine has to do with the fact that the federal government prefers to withdraw from social program funding. It is well known. It takes the taxpayers' money to create useless overlaps with Quebec agencies which support small and medium size businesses.

The 1995 federal budget, as we know, cut more than \$7 billion from social programs. The federal government is asking people to make sacrifices because it has no more money. It even uses the surplus in the unemployment insurance fund—of all things—which is financed by employers and employees. And what does it do with this money? It finances new child care programs, new programs to fight against poverty, new manpower training programs, which, it must be said, all infringe on provincial jurisdictions.

Unfortunately, the federal government is in no hurry when it comes to responding to Quebec's demands, which are that it withdraw from the fields of manpower training and regional development and reduce this costly and useless duplication. However, Ottawa continues to ignore Quebec's demands, even though this waste of money affects taxpayers and creates an administrative mess, because the beneficiaries of these programs no longer know where to turn. Moreover, it creates unproductive and unhealthy competition between programs that are not even based on the same strategies. And that is where the problem lies. These programs are not based on the same strategies. Strategies which are useful, necessary and beneficial to Quebec are not necessarily the ones chosen by the federal government.

I will conclude by saying that I regret that this bill has been proposed in this form by the government and that I fervently hope that, this fall, Quebec will take control of its destiny and that we will no longer have to engage in these pointless negotiations cap in hand, with Ottawa, but rather will be able to negotiate as equals with the goal of a happy and healthy prosperity for all.

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today to speak to Bill C-91, an Act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada. The purpose of the bill is to replace the Federal Business Development Bank by the Business Development Bank of Canada.

The Liberal government has decided to introduce a totally new piece of legislation, creating a new body, the Business Development Bank of Canada, instead of amending the existing legislation governing the Federal Business Development Bank. We must not delude ourselves. This new legislation is fundamentally similar to the present legislation although it makes some major changes.

As for the mandate, it is changed in such a way that the Federal Business Development Bank will no longer offer only last resort financing, but will now have the power to offer financing to complement that available from other financial institutions.

It will also be easier for the new Business Development Bank of Canada to enter into agreements with private and public partners, at both the federal and provincial levels, to form lending consortiums. The new bank will therefore be able to establish subsidiaries and to use a greater number of financial tools to fulfil its mandate. Clause 20 of the bill gives the bank great flexibility to negotiate agreements with other federal departments as well as with provincial and local agencies in order to fulfil its specific mandate.

(1700)

By giving the bank greater leeway, the federal government will be able to develop an integrated approach to interfering in every aspect of regional development, in Quebec in particular, where the Federal Office of Regional Development has become the delivery arm for all federal programs.

In this context, Bill C-91 constitutes another centralizing offensive from the federal government, resulting in costly and needless duplication. It completely negates the role of the Quebec government in providing assistance to small business. This is in contradiction with repeated statements by the people opposite, who said they wanted to eliminate duplication and overlap with provincial programs. On the contrary, this a perfect way to perpetuate the problem.

As I said earlier, this is a centralizing offensive based on clauses 20 and 21 of the bill. These two clauses enable the Federal Business Development Bank to enter into agreements with other federal departments or agencies in order to deal directly with small and medium sized businesses, which will allow the federal government to interfere even more in regional development projects.

Clause 20 of the bill also enables the Federal Business Development Bank to enter directly into agreements with a person or agency, which means that the bank could enter into agreements with regional development councils for example. In Quebec, however, the Executive Council Act prohibits provincially regulated agencies from entering into agreements with the federal government without ministerial consent.

Government Orders

One could think that this section is harmless, since it is governed by a Quebec provincial statute. However, in the present context of fiscal restraint, if the federal government offers to fund projects put forward by a RDC, the latter will press the Quebec government to allow a departure from the law, which is common practice.

Once again, Ottawa dismisses Quebec's role in the matter and shamelessly gives itself the power to act without consulting the provinces. This centralizing offensive in regional development runs directly counter to Quebec's regionalization policy. The federal government has always refused to recognize regional development as an exclusive provincial jurisdiction, dismissing this claim in every constitutional negotiation, while implicitly making a commitment to the Quebec government to limit its action in regions through Canada-Quebec agreements.

However, the Economic and Regional Development Agreement, or ERDA, expired in December 1994 and the federal government refused to renew it. This government can never claim to support regional development by replacing essential components of a social plan with direct assistance to small and medium size businesses. By dismissing Quebec's achievements in terms of assisting exporting small and medium-size businesses, the federal government is trying to make Quebec look like the one responsible for the overlapping which it is creating with this bill.

The FBDB is a successful regional development tool which is greatly appreciated by small and medium size businesses. By and large, Quebec's small and medium size businesses get one third of the loans from the FBDB, but they definitely do not rely as heavily on the bank's extension services. Since the bank has no exclusive commercial objective, such as maximizing profits—it only seeks to recover its costs—, Mr. Rémillard, of the Canadian Bankers' Association, says that it helped develop new financial tools which were often used later by commercial financial institutions. The bank acts as an innovator by proposing new forms of financing which other financial institutions can apply when dealing with small and medium size businesses.

Therefore, the Bloc Québécois will make sure that the bank remains first and foremost a tool for economic development, that it does not compete with other such tools used by Quebecers, including the caisses populaires, the solidarity fund and the CNTU fund, and that it has the means to support Quebec businesses.

(1705)

The effect that the bill could have on the bank's role in economic development is very worrisome. In fact, two provisions in the bill, when combined, cast doubts on the bank's ability to maintain its role as a tool of economic development:

the broadening of the bank's mandate and the bank's ability to obtain private capital financing through hybrid instruments, contingent on certain conditions.

Firstly, the bank would no longer be just a last resort lender: it would be able to offer complementary financing which would be a little different from what existing financial institutions offer. The danger is that the bank could target its activities more towards complementary financing than last resort financing. Since there is less risk involved in complementary financing, naturally the bank will tend to favour this type of financing.

Bill C-91 is another move in the federal government's centralizing offensive, as I mentioned earlier, which only causes costly and useless duplication. Bill C-91 dismisses totally the provincial government's role regarding assistance to small and medium size businesses. It goes against the Liberal government's claims that it wants to abolish overlaps and duplication with the provinces.

Furthermore, clause 20 of the bill allows the bank, the FBDB, to enter into agreements directly with individuals and with organizations. This means that the FBDB could enter into agreements with regional development councils, for example.

But in Quebec, the Executive Council Act prohibits organizations which are governed by provincial law from entering into such agreements. Regarding regional development, the federal government's push for centralization runs counter to Quebec's policy on regionalization.

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak at the report stage of Bill C-91.

When the bill was tabled on first reading, I had the impression it would simply change the name of the bank and increase the amount of capital available. In other words, it would make a certain number of adjustments, considering the fact that the legislation establishing the bank was at least 20 years old. At first glance it seemed quite logical and understandable that the minister responsible for the bank should want to update the legislation.

However, after considering the bill and reflecting on the scope of certain clauses, I feel I must condemn this legislation and, as my Bloc Québécois colleagues have done, point out to the House that a number of clauses are potentially dangerous.

In fact, the bill would change the mission of the Federal Business Development Bank and allow the bank to be used for purposes which may be questionable and even unacceptable to the provinces and to certain regions in the provinces.

First, a few words about the bank's mission. As you know, the Federal Business Development Bank continues the tradition of institutions that were established after the war to help small

Government Orders

businesses raise the capital they needed. In the case of defence conversion, they were to help Canada build a thriving civilian industry that would contribute to the country's prosperity.

The institution was well received by Canadians and Quebecers. It has excellent credentials and has proved its worth.

(1710)

The bank's mission was, more or less, to provide last resort financing, in other words, to help developers who found it difficult to get financing from traditional financial institutions. The Federal Business Development Bank was set up to ensure that the necessary capital would be available to entrepreneurs so they could start small businesses.

It is clear that this bill will change the mission of the bank. It is now described as providing complementary financing not customarily provided by traditional financial institutions. Complementary financing is not the same as last resort financing. Last resort financing is needed when the institution or the developer goes to the institutions and although the banks agree the project is worthwhile, they cannot provide the capital, while complementary financing does not have quite the same connotation.

It is clear that if the bank is described as providing complementary financing, it is directly competing with institutions across Canada that were set up to help entrepreneurs find capital. An example is the venture capital fund which has become an institution in Quebec. It seems that in Canada, Quebec is known for its institutions that specialize in providing venture capital for entrepreneurs.

I am thinking as well of the solidarity fund of the FTQ, the industrial development corporation and the Innovatech companies. In short, the Federal Business Development Bank, by abandoning its purpose of providing last resort capital, will now be competing with institutions that make attractive capital available to promoters.

This change in the bank's purpose is regrettable. In my opinion, the aim of the bank was to provide last resort funds. It was good at that. By changing its purpose and allowing it to subtly change its objectives and the type of capital it will provide, we may be putting Canadian business seriously at risk.

Perhaps we of the Bloc could have viewed somewhat positively the purpose of providing complementary funding, but I think the bill should have provided that the purpose of the bank was to continue to provide last resort funds.

Two clauses are also cause for concern. Perhaps there are others, but I think my colleagues will look after pointing them out to the House. Clauses 20 and 21 raise problems, in my opinion. Clause 20 provides that "the Bank may enter into

agreements with —any department or agency of the government of Canada or a province or any other body—". The reference here is perhaps to cities, educational institutions, regional development councils—any other body in order to carry out its purpose.

If clause 20 were adopted as it stands, the bank could intervene directly with bodies that come under provincial jurisdiction.

I think this is potentially dangerous, given Canada's economic history and even its political history. One realizes that over the years one of the major problems with Canadian federalism has been that, given its spending power, the federal government has been able to interfere in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. The most obvious and striking example is education, an area which, under the constitution, clearly comes under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces but an area where, over the years, the federal government, with its spending power, has been able, first directly with the universities, and also directly with some school boards for certain programs, to step in and often, to a certain extent, divert these bodies from their goal because they had to meet the federal government's funding requirements.

(1715)

I am myself an educator by profession. Over the years, I have often seen federal programs proposed. It was a little difficult for the local administrators to refuse. They were afraid that if they did, they were going to be turning down large amounts of money, maybe \$10,000 or \$100,000. Administrators therefore did what the province of Quebec did in the fifties with respect to university funding.

Local or provincial governments must, in such a situation and as a last resort, accept the interference of the federal government because large sums of money are at stake.

In clause 20, the federal government provides itself with the necessary means to interfere, again, in areas that come under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces. It is probably also ensuring that there is yet more duplication so that federal, provincial and municipal agencies compete, which is very harmful. The history of the Canadian federation since day one shows that this was a serious flaw in the Canadian federal system, where different levels of government can compete in major areas.

I would have liked to say a few words more on clause 21, which mandates the bank to support entrepreneurship. This is an extremely vague term that could be made to mean just about anything. Again, this could be another excuse for the FBDB to interfere in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

Government Orders

Perhaps we would see less cause for concern or suspicion if the whole regional development policy had not changed so drastically these past few months. But since it did change, we suspect that the Federal Business Development Bank could be the federal government's way of making up for what it is no longer investing in the area of development and ensuring that there is more and more duplication in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to address Bill C-91, which seeks to change the name of the Federal Business Development Bank, as well as its purpose.

The Federal Business Development Bank is a long-standing institution which has played an important role in economic development, as a bank of last resort. That was and should continue to be its mandate since that bank should not compete with other financial institutions.

The bank gets a new name which is of strategic importance for the federal government. It will become the Business Development Bank of Canada. What does that name mean exactly? Will it strive to develop business and the economy of Canada?

It reminds me somewhat of development banks in Africa. I guess the government now recognizes that it is running a developing country. We must look like a developing country in the eyes of the international community. The federal government just confirmed that the state of its economy is appalling, that its debt is staggering. It just said so. It will probably get foreign money through the Business Development Bank of Canada, just like the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development gets money, even from Canada, the United States and Japan, to develop eastern countries which have problems.

(1720)

By using such a name, it should be easier for us to go to Japan, even China, and to richer countries, since Canada has become a developing country. In fact, we are among the 65 or 70 poorest countries of the world if you look at the national and foreign debts. Canada is on the same level as developing countries. This new name is a pretty smart idea. It will probably allow Canada to borrow more money abroad to promote its own development, before it goes bankrupt, assuming this is not already the case.

In Quebec, we took control of our financial institutions a long time ago. In Quebec, we already have control over a few hundreds of billions of dollars thanks to our *caisses populaires*, the Fédération des caisses d'économie Desjardins du Québec, the provincial charters we control ourselves, as well as over our priorities in terms of our activities, and we want to keep it. We also want very much to continue to cooperate with our financial institutions.

We do not want the federal government to interfere through a financial institution which will have a much broader mandate and will prevent Quebec from working hand in hand with its own financial institutions as it has always done.

We had to build our financial institutions ourselves because the federal government was not very useful in helping us to keep our money and invest in our industries. Again, I understand very well why the very centralist Liberal government wants to control everything. It wants to control our priorities, it wants to collect our tax revenues and spend the money according to its own priorities. Not only does it want to impose its priorities in terms of manpower training, but it also wants to do so in the trade area.

Let me give the House some examples which have led me to believe that the federal government is trying to increase its control. It says that it will be able to sign agreements with other financial institutions and with other private companies in order to defend some industries. For instance, we know, and I often come back to this issue which I find important, that the federal government never supported Quebec's hydro development programs. The province of Quebec was the sole investor in Hydro-Quebec. It invested tens of billions of dollars, while the federal government never spent a penny on these projects.

Again, the federal government will want to be the one to decide which industries should be given priority for development purposes. This means that the federal government could favour businesses in the uranium, natural gas or oil industry, for example, over businesses in the electric power industry. That is what it means. When we say that the federal government wants to control industrial priorities in Quebec, it does it through the Federal Business Development Bank by interfering even more and by making decisions regarding economic development priorities in that province. It is terrible.

Do not think that we are fooled. We can see very clearly what is going on. We know the history of Quebec. We have lived through it. I come from Quebec, I was part of the business community and I know full well that Quebecers had to work twice as hard to achieve the equivalent of what Ontario was able to achieve. Why is that? Because the federal government was working against us.

(1725)

The federal government has always worked against us. Just look at what is happening in Ottawa with regard to research and development, for example. Three or four years ago, I conducted a study to see who was getting research and development contracts. Well, in 1990, research and development contracts awarded to businesses and universities by the federal government totalled 1 billion—

Some hon. members: It was done previously.

Private Members' Business

Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil): Yes, it was done previously under the Liberals and it continued a little under the Conservatives. It cannot be done overnight; it takes time.

In 1990, the federal government gave \$1.2 billion more in contracts to businesses, universities and research centres for research and development in Ontario than it did in Quebec.

We are not totally blind in Quebec. I can assure you that this new financial institution which is coming to Quebec has gotten Quebecers quite worried. This worries not only the sovereignists, but also Quebec's other financial institutions. The reason we are protesting this new kind of bank which will in a certain way change the order of things in Quebec's financial system is that we are totally against any change in this system.

To reply, in part, to the hon. member who is muttering over there, back when I was a Conservative, we simply wanted to scrap the Federal Business Development Bank. We came very close to scrapping it precisely because we really do not need this financial institution, especially now with its new vocation, which will be to rock the boat when it comes to the agreements between our financial institutions, our businesses and our universities. If we could gain control of job training, we could close the loop and bring lasting prosperity to Quebec, and be rid of the federal government that is stifling our growth. We are really looking forward to becoming sovereign.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to Bill C-91, whose purpose is to provide a new name for what was referred to as the Federal Business Development Bank and will now become the Business Development Bank of Canada.

As usual, and as has been going on for a long time, the federal government took advantage of this opportunity to change the mandate of the institution, so that from now on, as other Bloc members have said so eloquently, it can be used as an instrument, and it is indeed an instrument, to put the finishing touches on this contemptible encroaching on provincial jurisdictions, disguised as regional development.

I would like to elaborate somewhat on the monster the government is creating with this legislation. In this bill we sense the minister's involvement in the bank's administration. The minister appoints the chairperson of the board and the president. Speaking of instruments, the government seems to be creating an instrument for dispensing patronage. According to clause 21, the minister will be able to control the bank's functions by using his influence with the people he appointed, perhaps by persuading them to approve loans in cases where they would have been reluctant to do so. That is a real danger.

In Quebec under the Liberals, they gave \$950 million over ten years to the Société de développement industriel as a political favour, which often happens just before an election. The Premier intervenes and says: You are going to approve this loan.

People appointed at the pleasure of the minister or the Prime Minister do not dare refuse and so grant the loan, which they would not otherwise have done. Gradually, Quebec was left with a bill for \$950 million because of principles just as laudable as those our colleagues opposite were talking about: helping development and helping small and medium size business become big business.

This new mission does not come about because of popular demand. We saw no one come before Parliament demanding a change in the purpose of the Federal Business Development Bank. The whole idea came from ministers' offices, the Privy Council, old friends who got talking and decided to change the vocation of the bank. We are creating an instrument of patronage.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, it being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

NATIONAL REGISTRY OF DRUGS AND IMPLANTED MEDICAL DEVICES

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should begin consultations with the provinces and territories to establish the parameters for a national registry of drugs, medical devices (implanted in the body for more than one year) and various forms of biotechnology.

She said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to move this private members' motion today calling for a national registry of drugs and implanted medical devices.

Many Canadians assume that any such drugs or medical devices that are used are safe and have been well tested. I am sure that in the majority of cases this is true, but there are some glaring exceptions which I will discuss later in my speech.

The motion under discussion today is taken directly from a 1992 report by a House of Commons subcommittee on the status of women entitled: "Breast Cancer: Unanswered Questions". While at the time the motion was meant to address the problems associated only with breast implants, the subcommittee recognized that a registry of many other medical devices would be a great step forward in protecting Canadian consumers. L'Association coopérative d'économie familiale du centre de Montréal made a call for a similar type of registry at that time.

I would like to say at the beginning that a national registration system would have to be voluntary and that privacy laws would have to be respected. At this point, we would be looking at something that both physicians and patients would have the choice to participate in.

Private Members' Business

Why do we need to consider such a national registry? What would it do for Canadian consumers? There are two issues. The first is that a national registry of medical devices would allow men and women who experience problems to notify a central data bank and document their complaints. The 1992 subcommittee suggested that Statistics Canada might be used to house such a registry.

The second value of such a registry is for those who might have some complaints about a drug or device to simply note who is on such a registry and do not necessarily have complaints. That would increase the long term safety of consumers by putting in place mechanisms to notify patients of potential problems or complications that arose or knowledge that came forward after the use of such drugs or devices.

As well, a registry could assist physicians in tracking those patients who may have experienced problems. It would open the door to more expansive research studies that could help to protect consumers.

At the moment, one of the problems is that there is no central data bank for researchers to collate information on people who may have had either devices or drugs. This kind of information is extremely important to consumers. It is an opportunity also for physicians to pass on new information to patients that may come to light and to better access long term risks and advantages of such medical practices. A national registry could certainly help Canadians to make more informed choices about their medical treatment and the options available to them.

(1735)

If we look at the Canadian experience with medical devices and compare that to other consumer practices, it is clear that the Canadian system for medical devices lacks some basic resources. Canadian consumers can register complaints about automobiles, business transactions and the houses they buy. However, there is still no comprehensive and central system in place for things like breast implants, heart valves, pacemakers or other medical devices and drugs people use.

With new technologies and new drug products coming on the market all of the time, it is increasingly important that consumers have an opportunity to access information on the possible complications and risk factors associated with these new devices and drugs. As it now stands the monitoring of medical devices in this country is based on the notion of voluntary compliance by the manufacturer. In other words the manufacturers will comply voluntarily with both health and welfare regulations and the parameters of their own health standards.

Ultimate responsibility for the safety and efficacy of medical devices rests on the assurances that manufacturers provide to Health and Welfare Canada. The role of Health and Welfare Canada is still largely an auditing role to ensure that market tests and studies have been carried out by the manufacturers.

Many Canadians probably assume and not necessarily correctly, that there are independent studies done by Health and Welfare Canada on the whole range of medical technology, but on the whole its role has been to monitor and to assess. It is the role of Health and Welfare Canada to ensure the safety of Canadians. The government obviously has to have responsibility for giving Canadians confidence in the kinds of medical devices and medications they take.

Although there are many successes in the Canadian system for monitoring such medical procedures, there are some instances and some very serious ones that clearly indicate how the system has broken down. One issue that is currently in the news is that of breast implants which has been discussed in the House many times.

Members will know that just yesterday a settlement against the American manufacturer of the Meme implant was reached on behalf of Quebec and Ontario women through a class action suit. It has been a long time in coming and of course it is still one more step in the battle of Canadian women for compensation. What is important in both the Dow Corning decision in the United States and the Bristol Myers decision is the fact that settlements have been made. This indicates that the manufacturer is accepting some responsibility and admits that these medical devices did cause problems to some of the women who used them.

My office spoke to a lawyer involved in the case just recently settled. He pointed out that one problem is that only the women involved in the class action suit benefited. There is no way of knowing if other women in Ontario or Quebec might have benefited who might have been a part of that case if there had been some way to contact them and make the resources available to them.

It is estimated, and it is just an estimation, that there are about 150,000 women across Canada who have received a breast implant since their introduction in the mid-1970s. They made that choice on the advice of physicians, governments and manufacturers that the implants were safe. Women were routinely told not only that they were safe, and I am talking now specifically about the silicone gel implants, but that they would also last a lifetime and there would be no problems.

(1740)

I might also add that there are now options to those silicone gel implants. The same assurances are being given and with the same lack of real data on the health risks associated with these implants.

Private Members' Business

For many women unfortunately the safety factor has not met the reassurances given by the manufacturer. For many it has been a nightmare. If members had been at many of the meetings I attended, they would have heard about women who had suffered a number of medical problems from outright rejection of implants causing massive infections to scarring. In some cases, women are reporting a variety of physical symptoms from chronic fatigue to autoimmune diseases. Even more, women are having difficulty in having their symptoms recognized as being legitimate symptoms. Many women were referred for psychiatric and psychological services. Their complaints were not taken seriously.

It was only when women came together that they began to realize their experience was not unique. Finding out there were other women who had similar experiences, they were able to approach physicians to tell them that there was a common thread and a problem. However, as in many areas of women's health, often the symptoms women present are not taken seriously. Looking at this simply in financial terms, the cost of multiple operations, the psychiatric and psychological counselling, apart from the personal devastation to these women who have had problems with the implants, is phenomenal to the health care system.

As the research has continued it is clear there are many symptoms including fatigue, skin lesions and neurological dysfunction that many women have experienced.

Just last month an Alberta study of 2,500 women with silicone gel implants reported preliminary findings showing a link between the implants and the way that a woman's body processes fat. I believe later this summer a report is expected on the association of implants and autoimmune diseases.

There clearly is a demonstrable connection between the implants and the complications reported by women. These court cases which we have seen successfully settled in favour of the women underline that there clearly was a problem. Long before we had to prove a problem this is where we come to the importance of adequate research being done, adequate data being kept and the responsibility of the federal government's health protection branch to ensure that Canadians are adequately protected in these areas.

In the case of the breast implants, there are still a lot of outstanding questions. There certainly is some dispute among physicians and researchers as to exactly what the effects have been. Of course there are women who have not had any symptoms. Having said that, I think this is one of the reasons that a national registry is so important. It could be useful in helping women to answer some of the questions they have about this issue.

Despite all the evidence women have had countless symptoms. Those symptoms while being increasingly recognized are

still by no means accepted by all physicians and all of those involved in the field. To the personal and family lives of those women, the trauma they have suffered both psychologically and physically is very real.

We do not really know how many people have experienced complications because adequate mechanisms are not in place to monitor complications or long term effects of these and other implanted devices. Consequently, there is no way to adequately and specifically identify the number of implants done and those that are in use at this time, the possible range of problems or indeed the level of satisfaction associated with these devices.

A national registry such as is proposed in this motion would go a long way to helping women assess their risks not only for silicone gel implants but also for the new versions, such as the saline implants now on the market.

(1745)

Today I have used the example of the breast implant to highlight the importance of a national registry system. Clearly the system would be a great benefit for consumers in other instances as well. It would help researchers track patients over a long period of time in order to provide for a clearer database for better research. It would give Canadian men and women a greater opportunity to access information and to be aware of potential problems.

There has been much written on the issue of health care in Canada, specifically about the increasing lack of confidence people have in the ability of the federal government to ensure the safety of drugs and products routinely used. The breast implant issue came to the House only as a result of certain members' raising the issue; they made it an issue. The Minister of Health at the time finally after much discussion and a lot of pressure did put in place a moratorium.

All this took place after the federal drug administration in the United States had made its findings. Most people may agree we are very reliant on the research of other countries to determine the level of safety for products used in Canada.

I do not want to suggest for a moment the health protection branch and its members are in some way at fault for this. Funding cutbacks to the system have affected the testing of new devices and drugs on the market with a greater reliance on secondary research as opposed to primary research by the department.

There is no doubt in the minds of Canadians they rely on the federal government, the department of health and welfare, the health promotion branch and the health protection branch to ensure certain standards. Most Canadians probably assume any product in this area which they take or is implanted has gone through a rigorous set of tests and is safe without question. It would be naive to assume anything can be safe without question since it is not a perfect science.

Private Members' Business

I urge support support for this motion. It is not a panacea to all the things that need to be done to ensure greater safety for the Canadian consumer in health related areas but it would be a positive step toward the protection of consumers, access to information and providing and assisting the maintenance of a database which would assist in the research of long term consequences.

I hope all parliamentarians will seriously consider this issue. I hope the Minister of Health will seriously consider this issue. It would be in the interest of all Canadians, men and women, and would provide Canadians with greater faith in our medical system.

Ms. Hedy Fry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the motion placed before the House by the member for Yukon is certainly worth considering. Any proposal that would contribute to maintaining and improving the health and safety of Canadians deserves thoughtful discussion.

There is some ambiguity in the member's motion. Does the hon. member want a national registry of drugs and devices or a national registry of patient profiles and adverse reactions to those drugs and devices or both?

The fundamental question regardless of what the member means is would setting up a national registry of drugs, medical devices and various forms of biotechnology protect the health of Canadians better than the system we have in place? Before we review that system we should consider the context of the motion.

In 1992 a resolution by the subcommittee on the status of women called for such a registry. In its report, "Breast Cancer: Unanswered Questions", the subcommittee said one of the problems with breast implants in particular and medical devices in general is adequate mechanisms are not in place to monitor the complications and long term effects of implanted devices. The resolution called for a national patient adverse reaction registry through which patients would be able to register any problems, complications or ill effects.

(1750)

No one disputes this but the resolution on which the motion is based was conceived in response to a specific problem, the need for women to have accurate information regarding the use of breast implants.

The subcommittee had heard wrenching testimony by women who said they had been scarred and made ill as a result of breast implant surgery. In its report the subcommittee concluded a crucial factor for women facing these decisions was the need for accurate information regarding the risks and possible complications associated with the use of implants, hence the idea of a national registry.

The report says: "We see the lack of such a registry as a major inadequacy in our current system. Without such a mechanism physicians and surgeons can easily lose track of patients who have breast or other implants. This complicates their ability to pass the new or emerging information on possible problems with implants".

This specific resolution and the motion go well beyond implants to take in drugs and various forms of biotechnology. Whatever the merits of a registry for breast implants, Canadian women and Canadians in general are at present well served when it comes to the safety and efficacy of medical drugs and devices.

Many Canadians and the hon. member may be unfamiliar with the co-operative system administered by federal, provincial and territorial governments which ensures medical drugs available in Canada are safe, effective and of high quality. I will limit my remarks to mostly drugs, and my hon. colleague will discuss devices.

The department's health protection branch through its drugs directorate not only approves all drugs offered for sale in Canada before they go on the market but monitors their use after they are on the market so that any drugs sold in Canada must meet the requirements of the food and drugs regulations.

Once a drug has met these requirements the department issues a notice of compliance, an NOC, and assigns a drug identification number, a DIN, to the drug. The drug directorate maintains a database that includes information on all the drug products assigned and the identification number. This database now contains information on approximately 22,000 drug products sold in Canada.

In addition, Health Canada makes information on drug products sold in Canada available to the public in a variety of ways, including the drug directorate's electronic bulletin board system which we can access through modem. The building blocks of a national drug registry are already in place through the co-operation of all three levels of government.

In addition to registering drugs and giving public information, the drugs directorate through its bureau of drug surveillance promotes and supports the safe and rational use of drugs after they enter the market and are in the public domain. This bureau ensures drugs are manufactured according to regulations and internationally recognized good manufacturing practices and standards, ensuring the safety of market drugs.

An important part of the bureau of drug surveillance is the adverse drug reaction monitoring program. Canada has had a system to gather information on adverse drug reactions since 1965. Under this program health professionals report adverse drug reactions voluntarily. Reporting by pharmaceutical manufacturers is subject to control by the Food and Drugs Act and regulations.

Private Members' Business

To enhance the value of spontaneous reporting in Canada the adverse drug reaction program has established a series of regional reporting centres across the country, serving as a front line for this reporting program.

There are four centres fully operational right now: the B.C. adverse reporting centre located at the drug and poison information centre at St. Paul's hospital in Vancouver; the Saskatchewan adverse drug reporting centre located at the drug information centre at the University of Saskatchewan's college of pharmacy; the regional drug information service for the Atlantic region at Camp Hill hospital in Halifax; the Quebec regional adverse drug reaction centre located at the Centre d'information pharmaceutique at Hôpital du Sacré Coeur de Montréal.

However, in my experience as a physician I believe voluntary reporting may not be as accurate as it should be. There should be mandatory reporting by physicians of adverse drug reactions.

What I am really trying to say is this building block will provide the basis for future evolution of national drug programs.

(1755)

The initiatives involve the federal, provincial and territorial governments as well as industry and a number of professional health organizations, including the Canadian Co-Ordinating Office for Health Technology Assessment, CCOHTA, the Canadian Institute for Health Information and the Patented Medicines Review Board. CCOHTA is an excellent example of the way the federal, provincial and territorial ministries of health work together and jointly fund it. CCOHTA collects, analyses, creates and disseminates information concerning the effectiveness and cost of technology and its impact on health.

Currently CCOHTA is conducting pharmaceutical evaluations to provide information on the relative therapeutic and economic value of medicines and alternatives.

Referring back to the original resolution on which the motion is based, we can safely say that when it comes to medical drugs we do have national mechanisms in place to ensure our medical drugs are safe and effective. Patients and physicians are educated about the side effects and use, and adverse effects are reported, albeit voluntarily, which is the weak link in a very strong national chain.

Would mandatory reporting by physicians of adverse drug reactions instead of the current voluntary system be the only step needed to put in place a complete system of drug and medical device safety? If so, the question to be asked of the hon. member is whether this motion is redundant.

[Translation]

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to motion M-375 brought forward by the hon. member for the Yukon. This motion proposes that the government begin consultations with the provinces and territories to establish the parameters for a national registry of drugs, medical devices implanted in the body for more than one year and various forms of biotechnology.

This motion deals mainly with the serious problem of breast implants and the deleterious effects they have on the health of those women who have them.

An estimated 150,000 women, in Canada and Quebec, have had silicone breast implant surgery between 1969 and 1992. Approximately 75 per cent of these implants were for purely aesthetic reasons, and the remaining 25 per cent for post-surgical reconstruction of the breast. Although the use of breast implants is strictly voluntary in both cases, medical considerations compounded with cultural factors turn this procedure into a complex source of concern for women's health.

Today, many women are confronted daily with the disastrous results of silicone leaking into their body. These leaks cause immune deficiencies. The implants contract and the body tries to reject this foreign substance, creating massive scar tissue.

Some women develop problems like the hardening of their breasts, chest pain or loss of sensitivity. Others have more systemic problems like pain in the joints, kidney trouble, infections, sclerosis, chronic fatigue, etc. All these complications are part of what we now call the silicone-related syndrome.

Canadian women are worried. Some scientists still refuse to admit the dangerous effects of silicone. Officials and representatives of the federal health department do recognize that some women with breast implants experience health problems, but they quickly add that no link has yet been proven between these health problems and the fact that they have received these silicone-filled prostheses. However, the potential health hazard of silicone has been a proven fact for a long time now. Hundreds of American women have sued and won their case against the makers of silicone gel breast implants; American courts have recognized that this product is dangerous and the victims have received substantial compensation.

(1800)

In 1992, the House of Commons Sub-committee on the Status of Women released a report entitled *Breast Cancer: Unanswered Questions*. Although this study was originally on breast cancer and the breast implant that was called Mème at the time, developments on silicone-based implants led the sub-committee to expand its study and to make several very significant recommendations concerning breast implants.

Private Members' Business

One of the greatest problems the sub-committee recognized was the lack of a satisfactory mechanism for monitoring the development of complications and the long term effects of these objects implanted in our body. So, it is now impossible to tell the number of breast implants that were used, the range of potential problems or the rate of satisfaction with these implants.

The lack of a national registry is a major flaw in the current medical system. Doctors and surgeons may easily lose track of people with breast or other implants, and this limits their ability to give their patients new information or updates on problems that may arise from these implants.

It also makes it impossible to follow up on patients for prolonged periods to produce the scientific data bases required for proper methodological research. A national registry would also make it possible to identify problems and complications related to implants or inquire about the incidence of complications related to the use of implants and other medical procedures.

At present, consumers can lodge complaints about business transactions, cars they buy or service contracts, but surprisingly enough, there is no equivalent for products such as breast implants, cardiac valves, artificial hip joints and what not.

This recommendation to establish a national registry is not new. It has already been made by several groups. For example, ACEF, the Montreal Association coopérative d'économie familiale, published a report on breast implants last year. In it, ACEF again urged Health Canada to provide women with adequate information on the subject and to establish a national registry of women with silicone gel breast implants to facilitate and ensure efficient medical follow-up.

In a study conducted in 1992, the Sub-committee on the Status of Women made further recommendations. It felt that "women have a fundamental right to accurate information regarding the risks and possible complications associated with the use of implants".

The sub-committee recommended that the Canadian Society of Plastic Surgeons and the Canadian Society for Aesthetic Surgery prepare in coordination with the appropriate government officials information sheets that accurately reflect current knowledge and debate around the possible effects of breast implants.

The sub-committee also requested that the federal government, in co-operation with the provinces, identify alternatives to breast implants and outline the conditions under which such surgery should be considered.

To develop properly, society cannot do without women or ignore women's issues and the problems they face.

(1805)

Women's health is one of the factors which have a direct bearing on the place of women in our society. Here, as elsewhere, we must take effective action. Women's health has always been neglected. There is never enough money allocated for research are always inadequate. There are major problems with research related to breast cancer, gynaecology and obstetrics, chronic and degenerative diseases, mental health, violence, occupational diseases, particular needs of immigrants and ethnic groups, teenagers, elderly women, etc.

When she first took office, the Minister of Health explained how she intended to promote women's health. She told us about the programs which her government was going to implement to correct the imbalance affecting women in the health care system. So far, not much has been done. When will a true health program will be developed for women?

If the Minister really cares about women's health, now is the time to act and support motion M-375. In doing so, she would make a concrete step toward that goal.

[English]

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the motion is fairly broad and the mover actually took some pains to narrow the focus of her motion. I am going to do the same. I have respect for the mover. The member for Yukon has a significant and specific interest in this subject.

The hon. member did take the time to focus on silicone breast implants and went on to say that this motion would be a voluntary motion where physicians and patients would voluntarily comply, that it would help with notification and the tracking of those individuals who had medical device problems.

If we look carefully at the issue of silicone breast implants we could say that a registry of these devices would have been a help in tracking those women who had them implanted. As it turned out it was consumer groups that took up the slack, women who had advocacy groups set up to take that information. Today that is still the case. Whether a government registry would have been the most cost efficient and best mechanism for this, I am not convinced. I leave that as a question I cannot answer.

As the member spoke about silicone breast implants, she suggested that it was the FDA in the U.S. that was really the instigator of our regulatory process here in Canada. Because this is a subject of great personal interest to me, I went back and researched very carefully the genesis of this problem. I am not sure I agree with the member on this specific issue. Let me tell this House what I found on silicone breast implants.

One of the very first individuals in the world who expressed concern about silicone breast implants was a scientist of our Canadian HPB. This scientist went to the manufacturer of the Meme implant and found manufacturing techniques that he said were completely unacceptable for a device to be implanted in the human body. He came home to Canada and made that public

Private Members' Business

over a fair portion of time. I have copies of his original memo saying that he had grave reservations and he advised the HPB to discontinue the certificate of compliance for the Meme implant.

What happened to that scientist? He was fired. The HPB, through pressures that went beyond the scientific data, fired him. That scientist, a Canadian, was not at all convinced that he was wrong and he went to the FDA in the United States and asked if it had any concerns. He was personally instrumental in getting the FDA to move toward the moratorium that subsequently was established.

(1810)

If members who were not part of the debate in this House on the breast implant issue want to go back and look at a fascinating series of documents, I invite them to do that. It sounds like a spy story with manufacturers making claims, the health minister making promises, the regulators involved in the middle and finally, a big moratorium established. Most people know the subsequent events of the manufacturers having been accused of some inappropriate behaviour and lawsuits are now on the table.

I go back to the regulatory process. A scientist in a very good department said there was a problem and he was fired. What has happened to him since? Has he been honoured in Canada? Has he been elevated on a pedestal as a hero of the regulatory process? Not a chance. Today that scientist is still vilified by his record from HPB.

I think that someday Dr. Pierre Blais will stand in this Chamber to be recognized for his contribution to the health of women in this country. Someday he will be recognized for the visionary scientist that he was, the man who put his reputation on the line, who put his avocation on the line, who said that it is more important to tell the truth than it is to go through a process of saying that it is okay.

I direct all my comments to: Is our regulatory process in Canada effective and efficient? Is it the best regulatory process? Politicians, and I include myself in this group, should only be certain the regulators are doing their job.

I have watched with great interest BST. What is happening to BST? It has become a political hot potato. Forces from three different directions are coming at us on BST.

I simply say that when members of Parliament start to think they are scientists, that they are regulators, they are stepping beyond their purview. We, as politicians, should be making sure the regulatory process is perfect, as best as it can be. When the scientists make their decision to make certain that new data, new information is readily available to them, then politicians should get out of the regulatory process.

I considered this motion carefully. I have not decided fixed in my own mind that all the things this motion asks for would be suitable for Canada. I do believe that a registry of medical devices makes good sense and I will limit my support to that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak this afternoon on Motion M-375 moved by the hon. member for Yukon.

[*English*]

More than one million Canadians have some type of surgically implanted medical device. Some implants such as heart valves and pacemakers are life sustaining devices. The recipients will not survive without them. Other implants, such as intraocular lenses, joint replacements and breast prostheses improve the quality of life.

In considering the merits of a registry of implant patients, let me first discuss the question of therapeutic implants.

Recent widely publicized problems with some implants, such as heart valves, pacemakers and teflon coated jaw implants have highlighted the need to track implant recipients so that they can be quickly notified by their physicians in case of serious problems.

[*Translation*]

A better option would be to set up a national registry of medical devices implanted in the body, similar to the one already in existence in England for high risk cardiac implants.

(1815)

Such a registry would provide all the required information to track down the patient.

[*English*]

It would also provide additional data needed to develop risk management strategies and valuable feedback, including earlier warnings about device failures to clinicians, manufacturers, Health Canada, and provincial health ministries.

A national registry could be administered by a board of directors made up of representatives from the implanting surgeons, manufacturers, Health Canada, and provincial ministries of health. The board will be responsible for managing the collection, storage, analysis, and dissemination of the data. All information in the registry will be deemed confidential. To protect the privacy of registered patients rules will have to be established by the board of directors for the use and release of information contained in the registry.

*Private Members' Business**[Translation]*

There is strong support for the creation of such a registry from the Canadian Orthopaedic Association and the Ontario cardiac care network. Medical device manufacturers have also shown a keen interest, because this registry would allow them to meet mandatory standards on the replacement of medical devices.

In short, what is being suggested is the creation of a new program to improve the follow-up on all implants and medical devices used in the human body.

[English]

Since medical services are delivered and funded by the provinces and territories, the authority of the different levels of government to require patients to register or to require surgeons to register their patients will have to be explored, as will the authority to collect change of address information from provincial or federal records. The federal government could coordinate the involvement of provincial health ministries across Canada to ensure that the registry will meet the requirements of all participants.

The major drawback of the establishment of implant registries has been the lack of money. The start-up costs would be about \$200,000. These will include the costs to develop the computer database program and data entry forms, negotiating participation in the registry, setting up a board of directors, developing a long-range plan and operating procedures, and establishing longterm funding.

[Translation]

Since about one million Canadians now have implants or medical devices, the annual costs would be \$20 million.

[English]

Maintenance of a registry of implant patients is estimated to cost about \$20 per patient per year. There are approximately one million Canadians with medical device implants, resulting in a total annual cost of \$20 million.

[Translation]

Cost sharing will have to be considered with the federal government, the provinces and territories, manufacturers and patients.

[English]

The medical device industry and the provincial governments already spend resources on implant monitoring. It may be possible to redirect these funds to a national implant registry.

Let me now address the special case of a registry for breast implant patients.

In 1992 the Minister of Health instituted a moratorium on the use of silicone gel breast implants and commissioned an independent advisory committee to examine their safety. One of the key recommendations made by the committee in April 1992 was to create a national registry of breast implants. The proposal was for a confidential continuing registry of consenting recipients of breast implants in Canada.

Since most cosmetic surgery is not funded by provincial health insurance plans and provinces would therefore not have health records on breast augmentation procedures, the only way to collect information on such patients will be by voluntary participation of the patients.

It was recommended that start-up funding be provided by manufacturers and that the registry be operated by a national not for profit organization.

[Translation]

The initial cost of this national registry could be anywhere between \$120,000 and \$190,000, with an estimate of 5,000 new patients each year. After that, annual operating costs could be covered by a \$10 registration fee.

[English]

The drawbacks that will be encountered in setting up a breast implant registry are the difficulty in the collection of patient information and inaccurate patient information, since many breast implant recipients do not know the type of implant they have or the manufacturer. These deficiencies will limit the usefulness of the registry.

After completing its preliminary assessment of the issue, the department believed it was not feasible to implement a breast implant registry for recipients who had surgery more than a few years ago because of the high cost and inherent difficulties in collecting complete and accurate information.

In summary, a registry for patients with therapeutic implants that is funded by provincial health insurance plans will have advantages for federal and provincial regulatory agencies, manufacturers and patients, provided that financial, legal, and organizational problems can be solved.

[Translation]

The benefits of such a national registry would be: a very quick way to trace the women concerned, when problems are discovered following the insertion of such implants; the gathering of useful data on the value of such products for clinical practitioners, manufacturers, Health Canada, as well as the health departments of the provinces and territories. Moreover, it would be possible to analyze the long term evolution of these implants.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 6.21 p.m. and there being no more members rising for debate and the motion

Government Orders

not being designated as a votable item, the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper pursuant to Standing Order 96(1).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Committee; and of Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Resuming debate. The hon. member for Chambly. You have seven minutes left.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank you for giving me the floor again.

[*English*]

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I understood the Chair correctly, you said we would resume debate on the second set of motions. That suits the government quite well, but is it the second set or are we going back to Group No. 1?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry. It is Group No. 1.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lebel: Madam Speaker, I was thanking you for giving me the floor after interrupting me so abruptly earlier. I do acknowledge your sense of fairness.

Earlier, before I was interrupted, I was saying that this new Business Development Bank of Canada will be used for patronage and propaganda purposes, including the promotion of federalism by the members opposite. I urge them not to make the same mistakes as did the former Quebec government with the Société de développement industriel. Indeed, we recently learned—with the arrival of a responsible provincial party in office—that \$950 million had been wasted on all kinds of unnecessary projects, because of the intervention of some ministers who were urging the corporation to grant loans which should never have been made. However, because of the authority exerted then by the responsible minister, or the Quebec Premier, over that agency, it ran up a bill of \$959 million. So, there is a real danger.

That danger also exists with Bill C-91 now before us. For example, if you look at clause 6, you will see that the minister appoints the chairperson and president.

(1825)

I am tempted to say that I support this bill, because it will make the number of independentists swell. Indeed, this is the

kind of legislation which explains why an independentist such as myself is here to speak on Quebec's behalf. I have seen too many measures like this one.

I read literally every bill tabled in this House and I realize that the government, although it has not publicly said it and will not do so, is currently trying to destabilize the provinces and really infringe on fields of provincial jurisdiction. I am not referring only to Quebec. The other provinces are also affected. However, the danger is greater for Quebec than for the English speaking provinces, because the infringing authority if you will is English-speaking.

Westerners and easterners recognize this government as their primary government, while Quebecers, because of their different language as well as other factors such as culture, consider the Quebec government their primary government. The fact is that the Quebec government did not only do bad things, quite the contrary. Just think of the Quebec Deposit and Investment Fund, created in 1964. We literally got rid of the Canadian capitalists who were using the pension plans of Quebec workers, both in the public and the private sectors. Some people have become immensely rich playing with the money of others like that, without our governments paying any attention to the security of the investments made.

So, the Quebec Deposit and Investment Fund was established, as well as the General Investment Corporation of Quebec. The government has created several instruments that have met their objectives. We now have before us Bill C-91, with its Federal Business Development Bank renamed Business Development Bank of Canada. When we say that there is duplication in personnel, that is what is happening. One can only wonder what changing the role of the FBDB to give it complementary status is meant to achieve.

I can remember, back in my days as a notary, when I was very involved with business financing, seeing people go to the FBDB although their investment was no less safe than others. The bank refused to lend money when it knew the project would not get off the ground. The exception, I must admit, was slightly out of the ordinary projects, where the entrepreneur wanted to set up a business in an area less familiar to traditional bankers but still had a fair chance of being successful. Then, the FBDB got involved.

We are now debating a bill to turn it into a complementary bank. We know the criteria used by banks. For instance, in business financing, you do not lend more than 75 per cent of the investment value. Does complementary mean lending the remaining 25 per cent? Will the bank lend 75 per cent and the Business Development Bank the rest? I think not. At least, I hope not, because it would be terrible.

Giving the bank this complementary status will mean that anyone who wants to market or commercialize a new product and, as a last resort after being refused everywhere, goes to the Business Development Bank will get the answer: "Sorry, friend. Your application was rejected everywhere else. Even if we wanted to, we could not help you. We are no longer qualified". I can understand giving a complementary role to this institution,

Government Orders

but it is a bit difficult to complement what does not exist in the first place.

(1830)

I do not want to accuse the people who tabled this bill of having bad intentions, but I do have to say that this will serve only to increase political intervention in loans, which would not have been granted by any other institution anyway. Talk about political intervention—

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Oh, oh.

Mr. Lebel: I know that the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood just yelled something, but I am not accusing him of having bad intentions, far from it. Sometimes, politicians, and especially politicians in power, feel the need to intervene in areas only because of the next election and in order to get the Canadian economy going, I think.

Ministers are people too, like you and I, and they are not impervious to lobbying. Chairpersons and presidents are also human and also have to deal with ministers twisting their arms, saying: Think about it, in such and such a sector, in such a place, will you not reconsider your decision? Will you not thoroughly review the issue, to see whether you can swing it?

If this were to happen, it could very well have unfortunate outcomes. I would have suggested that the chairman and the president be appointed by the House of Commons, by the government and not by the minister himself. Then, you and I would have to assume responsibility for the appointment. Then, in the future, if it did not work out, if we did not have a good president, we could blame everybody, not just a certain minister or hon. member. This was the issue I wanted to speak about.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Madam Speaker, it may be the first time since I have been a member of this House that we have actually been critical of name changes. Usually, this is a mere technicality. A name will be changed to make it a little more modern or more precise, but in this case, when we see the Federal Business Development Bank being renamed as the Business Development Bank of Canada, it is clearly all part of this vast strategy of a federal government that has decided, in its wisdom, that it is going to run the show.

I would put this on a par with the agreement on internal trade in Canada, where again, a bill is being used to let the federal government penalize the provinces that do not comply with the agreement by cutting funding in their social programs, and I am referring to Bill C-76, where in any case it wants to intervene in sectors that are not its responsibility. In the case of the bank, which is going to be the Business Development Bank of Canada, if the House ever passes this bill, personally, I think the name is rather pretentious.

Canada has quite a few financial institutions that are involved in development. There are other banking institutions that may be involved in a positive and occasionally in a negative way in development and which are very much part of the process. There cannot be just one business development bank of Canada, unless there is more than meets the eye here.

I am also somewhat amazed at the direction in which this bill is going. During the first few months I was in the House, I was a member of the industry committee. At the time, members from Ontario were looking for ways to make the banks more sensitive to the problems of small entrepreneurs. They were interested to see what Quebec had in the way of institutions that provide complementary financing. I am thinking for instance of the Centre d'aide aux entreprises, the Mouvement Desjardins, the FTQ Fonds de solidarité—the CNTU is about to develop a similar fund.

It was clear Ontario had had a difficult time during the last recession and there was this feeling of hostility towards the banks.

(1835)

Now with this bill, this feeling seems to have disappeared. Does it mean that the bank lobby was successful? Does the fact that they contribute very generously to the Liberal Party of Canada make a difference? I do not know for sure, but there is something strange going on here.

This decision also seems to be part of a broader strategy I would like to explain very briefly. When the Liberals came to power, there was a network referred to as business development centres. It was decided to amalgamate these with the community futures committees. Now that these two bodies have been amalgamated, they are attached directly to the Federal Office of Regional Development.

Therefore, the whole community development element set up by the community futures committees will, in my opinion, lead to the systematic and progressive dropping of the community development mandate over the next few months, since the transfer to the FORD takes place on September 30.

There was already one regional office per administrative region, but the Federal Office of Regional Development will try through the Business Development Bank of Canada to set up a network of branch offices to catch bigger service points across Canada in the web.

What is particularly sad is that two networks are being set up in parallel, one beside the other. Neither Quebec nor Canada has the means to pay for a double network. A choice has to be made. Quebecers will have the opportunity this fall to decide once and for all who they want to serve them.

Government Orders

Do they want Canadian banks—like the Royal Bank, for example? Is this the network we want to look after our interests in the future? Or do we want a network that belongs to us much more and that is under our complete control? We must not forget that Quebec has found itself in a very bad situation in relation to the federal government on a number of occasions in the past.

What about the time they wanted to limit the number of CN shares that could be purchased. Each time Quebec capital tried to get in, it was foiled. This seems to be very much the approach of the Business Development Bank of Canada.

Another rather paradoxical element in the current bill is that the government, which claims to be in favour of a free market environment, is directly infringing on the Mouvement Desjardins, among others, and the banking institutions. All of a sudden, the government takes a step backward and decides that there will be an additional competitor.

Just what is this complementary loan? It is not very clear and we are not sure of the result which will be achieved. How will it be integrated into the Canadian banking system? One can understand the concerns of those who already corner the market.

Before changing the mandate of an agency such as the Federal Business Development Bank, we must take a close look and see if we can afford more duplication. I doubt that there is a single Quebecer or Canadian who thinks so.

If the federal government dismisses the solutions which will avoid such duplication and wants first and foremost to ensure its presence in every province and in every sector when there are already other stakeholders involved, it will only follow the pattern set a long time ago, particularly during the Trudeau years. Remember the sign war, when the federal and Quebec would each claim to have made the largest contribution to a given project.

(1840)

There was some kind of blackmail going on at that time, which we all paid for in a way. Today, answers are sought much more in terms of guidelines and comprehensive solutions. In that regard, this bill will not solve anything as it only increases duplication. What is happening here is the same thing that happened to the Federal Office of Regional Development a while ago. The FORD's mission was changed by taking away the resources that allowed it to play an active role in the Quebec economy, while at the same time increasing the number of service points, when services were already available from the Quebec ministries of tourism as well as Industry, Commerce and Technology.

That is what happened to the FORD. The same thing is now happening to the Federal Business Development Bank, and I think this is a bad move on the part of the government. It reflects the old belief that Ottawa provides, that it has the answer to whatever problems the people of Quebec, British Columbia, the maritimes and elsewhere may have, when the fact of the matter is that tools are already in place in many regions.

Therefore, the federal government should review its bill to make sure that it will not result in the interference that the implementation of the Business Development Bank of Canada Act will bring about.

[English]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak in the debate this evening. I listened with interest when the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, made his presentation.

I must say from the outset that for many years I have listened to my hon. colleague from Broadview—Greenwood and I have learned from much of what he has had to say. I have appreciated the sincerity he has always brought to the debate. I appreciate his personal commitment to small business and the funding plight it faces. I have never heard a more pathetic explanation in terms of why the government has done something.

First I want to take him off the hook. I cannot imagine that what he was saying was his own idea. I can only assume that he has been given marching orders from cabinet. As an advocate of small business funding he has stood in the House for years urging the previous government and encouraging the present government to take action. He has led the way on a number of initiatives in terms of support for small business. He has been actively involved in the development of the report called "Funding for Small Business" which had a whole set of recommendations. To make this proposal is not the kind of initiative he would take.

When I first saw Bill C-91 I was elated. I was encouraged because after years and years of the Liberals saying we had to take dramatic action to provide funding for small business here was the opportunity. I read the bill. I suggest we should make another name change.

The bill at the moment is entitled "an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Small Business Bank of Canada". Probably a more accurate title would be an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank with an inadequate mandate, with a pointless mandate, with a wimpy mandate. We could use whatever word we like because in my judgment we have missed a real opportunity, looking at Bill C-91.

Government Orders

At the moment we are talking about the name change. Most members of Parliament were elated when they saw that the government had listened to the committee and had decided to call the Federal Business Development Bank the Small Business Bank of Canada. We could hear cheering from coast to coast to coast. We could hear small business organizations, chambers of commerce and boards of trade saying that finally the federal government had acknowledged the fact that something needed to be done in the country to provide funding for small enterprises.

I am talking about the kind of enterprise that requires a \$10,000, \$20,000, \$50,000, \$75,000 or \$100,000 loan. All of us have countless cases on our desks that we have worked on over the years. We know small enterprisers, small entrepreneurs or small business people have a difficult time obtaining capital for their operations, to start a new venture or to expand a venture. If they need \$20,000 they might as well forget about it because they just cannot go to the traditional lending institutions, the big banks.

(1845)

We are not here to assist the big banks. Headlines the last few days read: "Banks on track to record profits. The earnings for the first half of 1995 exceed even last year's \$4.25 billion pace". In other words, the chartered banks are doing just fine. As a matter of fact they have never done so well. They can take care of the large enterprises, traditional enterprises and so on.

However, we are not here to facilitate the chartered banks. They make profits for their shareholders and that is it. We understand their mandate. We are here as members of Parliament for something else. We are here to provide opportunities for that job creating sector of the economy called the small business sector.

In my judgment, having looked at Bill C-91 for many days, clause by clause, we have missed an incredible opportunity. Part of the opportunity we have missed is betrayed by what the government is now asking us to do. It said it first came up with a winning idea based on the recommendations of the committee to call the FBDB the small business bank of Canada. I say, right on, government. It has done the right thing. However, it now says: "Hold it, we want to change that. We are going to call it the development bank of Canada". What does that mean? What kind of a signal does that send?

By changing the name of this bank, a tremendous cost will accrue to change every bank sign across the country, every letterhead, envelope, and all kinds of other things. It is going to cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps even millions, to call it the development bank. We do not need another development bank. We have the large chartered banks. We have other federal lending institutions that are able to provide that kind of capital. We need something to assist the small business sector.

The name the small business bank of Canada would indicate a new initiative or a new direction or a new mandate for the FBDB. God knows it needs it.

However, according to the legislation this is the purpose of the bank. It reads: "The purpose of the bank is to provide Canadian entrepreneurship by providing financial and management services—in carrying out its activities. The bank must give particular consideration to the needs of small and medium size enterprises".

I have read wimpy legislation and legislation that meant absolutely nothing and this legislation says absolutely nothing. It states that the bank will give some consideration to small and medium size businesses. Well big, bloody deal. What does that mean? What kind of a mandate does that give the bank? What requirements does it give the bank? Absolutely none.

What was going to be called the small business bank of Canada and not called the business development bank of Canada will be just like the Royal Bank of Canada or the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. It will be lending to the very secure borrowers, the larger businesses and so on. Those small entrepreneurs and small business people will still have to be scraping and searching to find capital for their new enterprises. This is wrong. This is a missed opportunity.

I wonder if there is any sensitivity to the fact that we have to encourage the bank to carry out a fair lending practice across Canada so that one region does not benefit over another. Acknowledging that 85 per cent of the new jobs in the future are going to be created by small businesses, will that same business be created in the eastern, central and western part of Canada? No, not with this legislation. Every single cent of this new bank could be put into one province, into one region, into a few cities. Is that the kind of bank we want? Absolutely not. It is a disgrace and a disappointment.

I do not hold my hon. friend from Broadview—Greenwood responsible for this wimpy initiative. I hold the government and the cabinet responsible. I am pleased to see that representatives of the cabinet are here because they have not only done a disservice to the small enterprises of Canada, but they have done a disservice to the incredibly excellent work done by that committee which worked hard for months on end to incorporate diverse points of view and had an excellent set of recommendations. Then the cabinet and the minister said: "We don't care about the work you have done. We don't care about the research that has been done. We don't care what the witnesses said. We want to simply put our stamp on this legislation". That is wrong.

I do not think this is a good piece of legislation. I do not think this is a good amendment. When I vote later tonight I am not going to be voting to do away with the name the small business bank of Canada and replace it with the business development bank of Canada. It is wrong and bad. It sends the wrong signal. It says we do not care about those enterprises that create jobs, that

Government Orders

we want to continue to support the GMs, the Nova Corporations, the big corporations.

(1850)

I know my friend across the way, the member for Broadview—Greenwood, was making a valiant attempt to explain the government's initiative when he said that the small business title limits and restricts loans, that the government wants to encourage the leading edge technologies to seek funding through this federal bank. So they should.

The fact that small business does not exist in the present name does not preclude small businesses from seeking loans. Calling it a small business bank does not preclude a medium size business from seeking loans. We will do the entrepreneurial sector of Canada a disservice if we pass this amendment.

I call on my colleagues from all sides of the House, from the Bloc, from the Reform and particularly those members of the government that have some sensitivity to small business and some respect for the work of the committee, to give some respect to the people that come into our offices day after day seeking capital to assist their small business enterprises. In other words, listen to the people just once.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 1. The motions have been declared read. In Group No. 1 we are covering Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6, 26 to 33. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Motion No. 1 stands deferred and the recorded division also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33.

In Group No. 2 pursuant to an agreement made earlier Motions Nos. 7 to 11, 14, 15 and 19 to 25 are deemed moved.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-91, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 8, on page 3, with the following:

“4. (1) The objects of the Bank are to promote and assist in the establishment and development of business enterprises in Canada by providing, in the manner and to the extent authorized by this Act, financial assistance, management counselling, management training, information and advice and such other services as are ancillary or incidental to any of the foregoing.

(2) The Bank in carrying out its objects shall give particular consideration to the needs of small business enterprises.”

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.): moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-91, in Clause 14, be amended by adding after line 23, on page 6, the following:

“(1.1) The total amount of all loans made by the Bank shall not exceed \$18 billion.”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-91, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 2 and 3, on page 7, with the following:

“are offered to a person only if such services are not otherwise available to that person on reasonable terms and conditions.”

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-91, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 8, with the following:

“made or given by another person, other than a Crown corporation, if”.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-91, in Clause 17, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 35, on page 8, with the following:

“(a) business planning services; and

(b) management counselling and training, including seminars, conferences and meetings.”

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-91, in Clause 22, be amended by deleting lines 25 to 27, on page 10.

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-91, in Clause 22, be amended by replacing line 29, on page 10, with the following:

Government Orders

“any entity by any means, except an entity that is a trust company, insurance company or dealer in investments or securities;”.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 19

That Bill C-91, in Clause 28, be amended by adding after line 29, on page 13, the following:

“(1.1) The yield of hybrid capital instruments issued by the Bank shall not be fixed according to the profits of the Bank.”

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-91, in Clause 31, be amended

(a) by replacing line 27, on page 14, with the following:

“parent of a director;” and

(b) by replacing line 29, on page 14, with the following:

“parent of a director, or

(d) the father, the mother, the sister or the brother of the spouse of a director.”

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Bill C-91, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 34, on page 14 and lines 1 to 29, on page 15, with the following:

“32. The Bank shall not grant any assistance, whether in the form of a loan, investment, guarantee, purchase or lease, to an applicant who is an interested person or, if the applicant is a firm or corporation, to a firm or corporation where a partner of the firm or a shareholder, director or officer of the corporation is an interested person.”

Motion No. 22

That Bill C-91, in Clause 35, be amended by replacing lines 38 and 39, on page 15, with the following:

“35. (1) Five years after this Act comes into force, and every five years afterward, the”.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 23

That Bill C-91, in Clause 36, be amended

(a) by replacing line 28, on page 16, with the following:

“Tax Act;” and

(b) by replacing line 30, on page 16, with the following:

“whom the information relates; or

(e) for the purposes of a committee of either House of Parliament.”

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That clause 37 of Bill C-91 be amended by substituting the following:

“Except with the consent in writing of the Bank, a person must not in any prospectus or advertisement, or for any other business purpose, use the name of the Bank, the names “B.D. Canada”, “Federal Business Development Bank” or “Industrial Development Bank” or the initials “B.D.B.C.” or “F.B.D.B.”, in English, or the names “Banque fédérale de développement”, “Banque d’expansion industrielle” or “B.D. Canada” or the initials “B.D.C” or “B.F.D”, in French.”

Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-91 be amended by adding after line 5, on page 17, the following new Clause:

“39. The Governor in Council may, by regulation, define “hybrid capital instrument”.”

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Group No. 2 includes Motions Nos. 7 to 11, but Motions Nos. 2 and 5 are not in that group. They were in Group No. 1 which we just dealt with.

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, Motions Nos. 2 and 5 are not among the motions which you mentioned earlier. Since these are motions tabled by a Bloc Québécois member, we expected to vote in support of our two proposed amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Motions Nos. 1 to 6 and 26 to 33 are in Group No. 1.

(1855)

A vote will be taken on Motions Nos. 2 and 5 if Motion No. 1 is lost. These motions are included in Group No. 1. You may refer to the Speaker’s ruling, which explains this clearly.

Mr. Laurin: Madam Speaker, from what I gather, this means that we will not have to vote on the two motions, unless two others, before them, are lost.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): That is correct. As I was saying, Motions Nos. 7 to 11, 14, 15 and 19 to 25 are in Group No. 2.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am supposed to discuss Group No. 2 on behalf of the official opposition.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): You are right, dear colleague. I apologize.

Mr. Rocheleau: We are slowly but surely getting to the heart of the matter, Madam Speaker. This important bill will significantly change the operations of a Canadian institution which has proven successful, both from a financial point of view, as well as in terms of fulfilling the federal government’s role.

However, I draw your attention to the fact that the government is not only working in secret, but is also using misleading terms. The title of the bill itself is confusing and does not adequately inform the reader as to its scope.

Government Orders

Indeed, Bill C-91, An Act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, alludes to the new name, but not to the new purpose of the bank.

This legislation changes the role of the former Federal Business Development Bank, which will soon become the Business Development Bank of Canada. The mandate is changed because, in the past, the Federal Business Development Bank was formally recognized as a bank of last resort.

Last year, when the committee looked at the role of the FBDB, it is the Bloc Québécois which, along with the other members of the committee, in an attempt to convey the notion of last resort, proposed the term “complementary”. That term was accepted by the committee. The word “complementary” therefore defined the role of last resort bank under the act.

Today—I do not know how to qualify it, and some words may be a little too strong—but there is definitely something wrong. The word ‘complementary’ completely changes the bank’s mandate and completely obliterates the concept of last resort.

The Federal Business Development Bank is switching leagues and is more or less going into direct competition with the current network of chartered banks and the network of Caisses populaires Desjardins.

Last resort implied that the whole outlook of the Federal Business Development Bank was geared to concern about regional development, expressed through *ad hoc* financial aid for small and medium size businesses. It assisted small and medium size businesses which had higher than usual risk factors because of their capital outlay or the economic sector in which they operated.

Therefore, the bank’s mandate, under the legislation, was to look at cases which had already been rejected by at least two conventional financial institutions. That was the last resort mandate. Consequently, the whole outlook was geared to regional development.

(1900)

Today, the bank will soon be competing with conventional institutions and this may perhaps fulfil needs in the rest of Canada. Although the operation seems quintessentially political, the changing of names is a perfect example—without condemning too harshly the people from the Langevin Block and the minister’s office—of the government’s desire to fill existing market needs in the rest of Canada.

But, this will also affect institutions in Quebec which have already carved out their niches, which have solid reputations and have been successful in filling the needs of the market. In particular, I am thinking of the Mouvement Desjardins, which is very concerned, by the way, by the federal government’s ap-

proach, and of the Fonds de solidarité de la FTQ and the Société de développement industriel du Québec, which, together with the Caisse de dépôt and the Banque nationale, worked and contributed to making it possible for businesses in need in the various regions of Quebec to obtain loans.

Therefore, we had cultivated a last resort mentality, and I am personally very upset when I hear people at the Federal Business Development Bank say that it will no longer be a bank for losers. We have to see things more objectively.

Life in the business world is not always rosy. It is difficult at times. There are nuances. It is absolutely necessary to have a lending institution like the Federal Business Development Bank with a mandate to review the situation of businesses which are different from others, out of an almost socio-economic concern to ensure that businesses which otherwise would not be backed by conventional sources will find backing in the public sector.

I often heard the president of the FBDB refer to the case of Lassonde, in Quebec, a company that today is thriving and at the time had access to funds from the federal bank when traditional institutions could not, I suppose, justify approving a loan because the risk may have been too high, but the federal bank, acting in the public interest, did, and the rest is history.

There has been one obvious change. The clause on last resort financing has been eliminated, and the new Business Development Bank of Canada will, as a result, be competing directly with traditional institutions.

There are some subtle changes as well, because the Federal Business Development Bank has a new way to raise funds. So far, the bank has been operating only with public funds. From now on, it will be able to turn to private financing as well. The private sector will be able to lend money to the new Business Development Bank of Canada through what are commonly called hybrid instruments.

The bank’s mandate has changed in two ways. Formerly, the bank only had to break even. Today, when it deals with the private sector, it will have to be a good investment in terms of interest yields on investments by the private sector. So it will have to pay attractive rates which, we must assume, will be based on the bank’s profits. This is no longer about breaking even. The yield will be based on profits. The bank’s focus on regional development will have to change. The bank will have to change its culture, its vision and gradually become a strictly commercial bank. This is a profound change in the bank’s mission.

Finally, I am worried. Let me explain. As our NDP colleague said earlier, 52 per cent of the loans approved by the Federal Business Development Bank were for \$100,000 or less. Once we no longer have this philosophy that the bank should promote genuine regional development by small business but instead operate on a more commercial basis so that it can offer

Government Orders

attractive yields to private investors, where are these loans going to come from, those 52 per cent?

(1905)

Who will approve these loans worth \$100,000 or less which represent 52 per cent of the FBDB's portfolio at the present time? We have every reason to be concerned about the future impact of these changes.

[*English*]

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Madam Speaker, on a point of clarification. Do I understand correctly that the government has only one opportunity to respond to the opposition's motions? The member for Trois-Rivières spoke on basically half of the motions in group 2?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There are no periods for questions and comments or responses. The government can partake in the debate or lead off if the hon. members had been on their feet. On that point, I apologize to the member for Simcoe Centre.

[*Translation*]

In the case of the hon. member of Trois-Rivières, there is no precedent since he was one of the movers.

[*English*]

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the amendments to Bill C-91 we are addressing this evening. I am pleased to do this because of my small business background.

As a small businessman for many years I had many sleepless nights looking for capital. Therefore I am very hopeful that the changes we are attempting to make to this bill will improve the access to capital for those new small businesses starting up.

The amount of time spent on the correct name bothers me to some degree. I do not think the name is all that important. What is in the bill is important to small businesses which we are trying to help.

I was interested in some of the comments coming from my colleagues in the Bloc, particularly the member for Longueuil when said he had been in business in Quebec and found that Quebec businessmen had to work twice as hard as the businessmen in Ontario. I had a little trouble with that because I challenge anybody to have worked twice as hard as I did in my business. If one is to be successful in small business today one must work hard.

In my business, the tire and automotive service business, I had occasion to come in contact with people in the same business in Quebec. At no time did I get from them that they were working or attempting to work twice as hard as I was. Those in business

in Quebec I came in contact with were doing very well because they were working hard. That was the secret.

I listened to the comments about the FBDB and what is happening in Quebec. I look at the 1994 annual report from the FBDB and see that some 23 per cent of its portfolio is in Quebec. Its head office is there as well. At some point during the debate earlier I was wondering if the scenario was that people were being forced at gun point to borrow from the FBDB. It is not compulsory. If businesses want to go there they go on their own volition, as it should be.

I will briefly run through the amendments in group 2 and outline Reform's position on them. The first is Motion No. 7. Reform is opposing this motion because the term financial assistance is too broad, too sweeping and too general in terms.

When I read that I thought I would have really appreciated, when I went to my bank for funding, that I could say I wanted financial assistance and the bank manager would have been prepared to take it on that basis. Whenever I asked for financial assistance, the next question was how much financial assistance. The decision was then made on that. Therefore we feel it is too sweeping and we will be opposing Motion No. 7.

Motion No. 8 deals with limiting the bank's ability to go to \$18 billion rather than \$23 billion as is in the bill now. We think there should be a limit there. In our estimation the limit should be \$18 billion. We will be supporting Motion No. 8.

(1910)

We are opposing Motion No. 9. The mandate of the bank in our opinion is still not satisfactorily defined.

On Motion No. 10, a Reform motion by the member for Edmonton South, we will be supporting it because it eliminates loans to crown corporations. I do not know whether that was anticipated or thought of at the time but it might appear to the public as a form of double dipping. We will be supporting the amendment to eliminate loans to crown corporations.

Motion No. 11 restricts the role of the bank to complementary activities not already provided by the private sector. We will be supporting Motion No. 11.

Moving into the grouping of Motions Nos. 14 and 15, Motion No. 14 we feel removes some restrictions we feel are necessary in the bill. We will be opposing the removal of those sections.

Motion No. 15 is also a Reform motion and we will be supporting it. It ensures the bank is not active in trust, insurance or security companies.

Motion No. 19 is proposed by the Bloc. We will be opposing it. Yield of hybrid instruments will reflect the profit and cost of borrowing.

Government Orders

Motion No. 20, a Bloc motion, does not change the potential for conflict. It refers only to disclosure. We do not feel it covers that and we will be opposing it.

Motion No. 21, a Reform motion which we will be supporting, refers to the conflict of interest that changes the requirement from disclosing conflict to not doing any business with an interested person.

Motion No. 22, a Reform motion, will be supported and I see it was adopted at committee stage. Motion No. 21, a Bloc motion, we will be opposing because the motion appears to be unnecessary in our estimation. Motion No. 24 we will be opposing for the same reasons as were outlined on Motion No. 1; because it refers to the name change.

Motion No. 25 requires a definition of a hybrid capital instrument be included in the bill. Reform put forward this motion and we will be supporting it.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will deal with the motions and then with some of the comments members of the opposition parties have put forward.

We will be supporting Motion No. 20 put forward by the member from Trois-Rivières. We will also be supporting Motions Nos. 24 and 25. Motion No. 24 is ours and Motion No. 25 is put forward by the Reform Party. All other motions in this section we will be opposing.

I will deal with some of the concerns the member for Trois-Rivières put forward and some of the concerns expressed by our colleague from Simcoe Centre. Before I do, I will deal with some of the comments made by the hon. member for Kamloops.

The member said earlier the government has missed a tremendous opportunity to move this bank forward with a very specific mandate to help small business.

(1915)

We will not miss that opportunity. Even though in the committee we felt strongly about the name that was on the bill—it was changed today—there is one thing we will make sure the Business Development Bank of Canada does: we will make sure that its marketing thrust will be centred around the small business sector.

Make absolutely no mistake that as sure as I am standing here, if there is one issue this Prime Minister continues to be committed to with all the energy and passion he has—and I say that straight out—it is the small business sector.

Through you, Madam Speaker, to the opposition members and especially to the member for Kamloops, who, like myself, has campaigned vigorously in this House in opposition and in

government, we have not let go and we will not let go. And we will not let the executive of this government forget that we were given the trust 20 months ago due in large part to the Prime Minister's commitment and the Minister of Finance's commitment even before the red book that we were going to be the government that championed small business and we were going to be the government that took on the financial institutions of this country, the chartered banks.

There is not a member on this side of the House who will stand up and defend the chartered banks of Canada and say that they are doing a great job for small business. If anyone can find a member on the government side of the House who will stand up and say that the banks of Canada are doing a great job for small business, name them. I certainly could not find one. We talk about this among ourselves and in our ridings. We are committed to that sector.

Getting back to this bill, this Business Development Bank will be committed to small business. I want to read into the record a note from the newly appointed chairman of the board of this bank, which I just received. He has been listening to this debate. I was summoned to the phone by him and I received a letter. We are going to make him accountable for this letter by reading it into *Hansard*. It is from Patrick J. Lavelle, the chairman of the board of the Business Development Bank of Canada:

In passing this legislation, the House is giving the bank expanded powers and greater responsibilities. The implementation of which will test the mettle of the banks directors and its management.

This House isn't giving the bank a blank check. The mandate calls for the bank to increase its activities in the new economy of Canada, in telecommunications, biotechnology and other technologies of the future. We must not abandon the declining sectors but we must see change and progress in the new ones.

The determination of the banks portfolio should reflect the country in that all regions: the Atlantic, Ontario, as well as Quebec and the West see increases in the availability of capital; after all that is what the bank is supposed to do.

The new bank with its new name should be visible and accountable. And we are going to bring the banks management before the committee to gauge what actions they are taking to fulfil their new mandate as quickly as possible.

Make no mistake the expectations for the bank are high and it will take extra efforts on the part of the management and its directors to achieve the promised results.

I want to deal specifically with the concerns the Bloc Québécois has. They talk—

(1920)

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the reference the hon. colleague has made to the communiqué by the new bank chair is appropriate. I wonder if it would not be appropriate for my hon. friend to seek unanimous consent to append that letter to be part of *Hansard* today.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Mahen): Does the hon. member have the unanimous consent?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(1925)

[*Editor's Note: Please refer to Sessional Paper Number 8530-351-37 in today's Journals*]

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Madam Speaker, I would just like to take some of my personal notes off it before we append it to *Hansard*.

I would like to deal with the remarks I put on this note to the member for Trois-Rivières. We can see what the concerns are of the Bloc Québécois. Make no mistake about the fact that the Bloc Québécois does not in any way, shape, or form support the Government of Canada presence in the province of Quebec. They object to this instrument. As the Bloc Canadien on this side of the House, we believe this instrument is there to help small business.

The Bloc Québécois does not want this instrument in the province because it is going to show Quebecers, small business men and women, that the people and the Government of Canada play a vital role, a central role, an integral role in their development as a part of Canada.

Make no mistake about it, we intend to use this bank to make sure that the Government of Canada presence is alive and well in the province of Quebec.

I cannot speak for the cabinet here, but as a committee and for those of us who believe in Canada, we would be encouraging the new Business Development Bank of Canada to have many locations in the province of Quebec, just as many as we hope to have in all the other provinces across Canada.

Quite frankly, I would find it very hard to imagine that the small business men and women in the province of Quebec would reject that kind of financial support, and not just financial support but counselling assistance. We must make sure that we understand that this Federal Business Development Bank of Canada now has another unique feature attached to it. It supplies counselling assistance for small enterprise and for entrepreneurs, both men and women. What better way to show the new and emerging entrepreneurs in the province of Quebec that the counselling assistance provided by the Government of Canada is alive and well?

This Business Development Bank of Canada I believe will play an integral role in helping to galvanize this spirit of Canada from coast to coast, including the province of Quebec. I would encourage members to support the government's amendments on this section of motions.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Madam Speaker, again I am pleased to have an opportunity to make some remarks regarding this grouping of amendments to the bill regarding the new federal bank's name and some changes in the mandate.

I listened with interest to my colleague from Broadview—Greenwood when he said that the government will not miss that opportunity—and I suspect he is obviously implying the bank will not miss this opportunity—to provide an increased level of service to the small business sector. I am pleased when he reminded us that the new chair of the bank is listening in and is obviously getting a sense of the feeling among members of the House.

The member goes on to say that we can be assured that the new marketing thrust of this newly revised bank will be taking into consideration the needs of the small business sector. I will not even qualify it by saying probably, because I know he speaks the truth. I know this is what he wants to do. But why could we not have a little clearer direction actually in the legislation to guarantee that? We have seen tonight, in my judgment, that what the hon. member wants and what the executive wants can be two different things.

So let us acknowledge that, yes, it is good to say these great things and it is nice to comment on all the things the government plans to do, but we also remember the government's plan to abolish the GST. I suspect that probably somebody in there actually meant that at one time. They also said that they would abrogate the free trade agreement, and so on. It goes on and on.

There is some hesitation for us in opposition to become enthusiastic when we hear these commitments, verbal as they are. Mind you, the government even had the abolishment of the GST and abrogating free trade in their red book. These were actually written down, and they obviously have set those aside.

However, let us be positive this evening and assume that the member is accurate and that the new chair listening in will hear us and will take this bank in the right direction.

I listened with interest to my hon. colleague talk about the sensitivity the bank will have to ensure that adequate provision is given to small business enterprises in all the regions of Canada. We applaud that.

I just want to point out that my hon. friend refers to the west. I know he is from Broadview—Greenwood and I know that he recognizes the realities of western Canada. I want to remind my friend that the west includes two regions: the cordillera regions of British Columbia and the Yukon, and of course the prairie region. So let us be sensitive that we want to balance that B.C. and Yukon is actually a region that ought to get their fair share separate from the prairies and so on and so forth. That is just a little sensitivity from us across the mountain range.

I got a little shaky when my hon. friend was up talking about the letter from the new chair that said we must provide special consideration for the newly emerging technologies, biotechnology and telecommunications and so on. No one would dispute

Government Orders

that. I question whether or not this is the small business sector we are talking about here tonight in large part. It may be.

When I think of biotechnology and telecommunications, I often do not think of the person making the loan for \$20,000 or \$30,000. I would call for a little extra sensitivity. Yes, we would applaud that the bank ought to be leading a lot of the capital and funding initiatives into these sectors, but also we are talking about small business that is quite often apart from these two sectors.

We want to see expanded powers. Again, I will be looking carefully at the new initiatives. My hon. friend can simply nod at this, but I think he said that the chair of the bank wanted to come before the committee with his directors and meet with the committee to develop some of these ideas further. I think that is what he said. I applaud that initiative and look forward to that opportunity.

On behalf of my party we will be supporting with some enthusiasm Motion No. 7 by my colleague from Trois-Rivières. We will also be supporting Motion No. 10, by my friend from Edmonton Southwest. We will also be supporting Motion No. 20, Motion No. 21, Motion No. 22, Motion No. 23, and Motion No. 25.

I want to make a comment about Motion No. 23, and that is the addition in the legislation of the line “for the purposes of a committee or either House of Parliament” as the possibility of reviewing what the bank is doing. I do think that is an appropriate initiative if in fact that inclination is there.

Again, these are very thoughtful amendments. Some do not receive our enthusiastic endorsement. I appreciate the reasons people are bringing them forward, but I do not see the necessity and some of them I find actually rather regressive. We are being positive here tonight, so I will keep my statements on the upbeat and positive note.

(1930)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Arseneault: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It was my understanding that you called the division and indicated that the nays carried it and there were not five members standing.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I saw five members standing when they said nay. I will deem the motion deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 9.

[*Translation*]

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 76.(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

[*English*]

Mr. Milliken: Madam Speaker, I think you might find unanimous consent to consider that the divisions on the rest of the motions in Group No. 2 have been demanded and deferred.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): We now move to Group No. 3. Motions Nos. 12 and 13 will be grouped together for the purpose of the debate and the division on Motion No. 12 will apply to Motion No. 13.

(1935)

Mr. Yves Rochelleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): moved:

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-91 be amended by deleting Clause 20.

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-91 be amended by deleting Clause 21.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak for the last time at this stage, following the impassioned speech by the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Industry, whom I would like to congratulate on his candour. We no longer hear from Liberals who are proud to be Canadian and proud to tell Quebecers what it means to be Canadian at this time and what Canada will become.

We have seen the passion of the member for Broadview—Greenwood in defending the Trudeau vision of post-referendum Canada. I almost feel like congratulating him, because it helps us understand the scope of the present debate, the role foreseen for the Federal Business Development Bank, the Business Development Bank of Canada, in this post-referendum Canada.

In particular, the Bank will be able to meddle, and this is the aim of clause 20, in regional development throughout Canada, and particularly in Quebec. The legislation provides that the new Bank will be able to do business with so-called “provincial” agencies, despite the fact that, in Quebec, however, there is a law that provides that provincial government agencies must deal with the Government of Quebec, which then does business with the federal government and subsequently authorizes its agencies to act as it sees fit.

Ignoring the presence and the existence of the Government of Quebec, the bill provides that the federal government will now deal with provincial agencies. This raises the whole leadership problem. Who is primarily responsible for regional development in Quebec? In our opinion, it is the Government of Quebec. The federal government could perhaps support it, but it does not have to try to duplicate it, as it is currently doing.

Quebec has established so many agencies. With the SDI, the regional development councils, the solidarity funds, the deposit fund for major matters, and so on, Quebec’s regional development organization is well structured.

We refuse to permit waste of public funds and competition between officials, as we have too often seen in the past, or between two groups of officials, which compete with each other, instead of helping each other, and will be encouraged to compete more. We all know that the new Bank of Canada will back the Federal Business Development Bank, which has become merely an empty shell since its mandate changed.

And it is about to start adding its energies to those that the departments of Industry and of International Trade devote to exporters, mostly high tech companies. They are going to supply them, like an agent of federal interventionism, through the Federal Business Development Bank in total disregard for the regional development infrastructure already in place in Quebec.

I feel that this describes the mentality prevailing in this government. They use clause 21 to spread it, which I will read to you:

21. The Bank may carry out duties or functions that may be assigned to it by the Designated Minister in relation to the administration of any program supporting Canadian entrepreneurship, to the extent that it is able to recover the costs of carrying out the duties or functions.

Therefore, having changed the mandate, they are not only mobilizing to try to develop entrepreneurship in Canada by any means they feel are good means, but they also want to develop programs. We asked this question in committee. What programs? What does business administration mean?

That is a very vague catch-all term which the federal government could use to give itself any mandate or to assume any responsibility without consulting with either the provincial government in Quebec, for the time that we will remain a provincial government, or the other provincial governments.

This demonstrates the mentality behind this bill and how urgent it truly is for Quebecers to realize how serious the situation is and to realize that, in the Langevin Block, people are drawing up the Canada of tomorrow which will be centralized and unified like Pierre Elliott Trudeau always wanted it to be.

(1940)

Except that the process does not allow for debate or consultation and all of the other provinces are being tricked, along with Quebec, in an anti-Quebec referendum strategy. They are pulling a fast one

Government Orders

on the other provinces. I personally find it dishonest to make lofty speeches on the Canada of the future instead of really debating this bill. Alas, this is a small-time short-sighted Canada, run as if it were a chip truck.

That is what we are in for. I can feel it, the measures are already in place. And if Quebec makes the catastrophic decision to vote no, this is what Canada and Quebec will have to endure. They will have to live in this Canada or Quebec, which, as it is, is not recognized as a province that is different from the others; they will have to yield to the bulldozer that they are setting in motion in order to build the Canada of the future, and I hope that this kind of measure will make Quebecers think twice.

[English]

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to the last grouping of amendments on Bill C-91, Motions Nos. 12 and 13.

I am very much impressed by the comments of the member for Broadview—Greenwood about his dedication to small business and the government's dedication to helping small business. I hope the sincerity and dedication extend beyond access to funding.

There are many other important areas that are really big factors to small businesses. Certainly they are looking for relief from the tax burden they are under and their customers are under. It is number one on their list, as well as the government bureaucracy that is on their backs. These are two areas we have to address to encourage not only new businesses but small businesses to expand and grow as we know we need them to do.

The Reform Party will be opposing both Motions Nos. 12 and 13 because they remove some restrictions from the bill that we feel are important and should remain in there.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, this is the last grouping. The government will not be supporting these Bloc amendments.

I listened carefully to the member for Trois-Rivières. I was surprised he would suggest that the business development bank would be perceived as an anti-Quebec initiative.

The member referred to the Langevin Block. He indicated that the bill was some scheme for the pre-referendum exercise. Being a former assistant to Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau and having worked in the Langevin Block, I say that he is giving them too much credit. The bill was really the work of all members of the industry committee.

The member for Trois-Rivières does not believe in Government of Canada presence in the province of Quebec. That is fair ball; he is entitled to that opinion. That is the hon. member's ideology. However, the member knows that all the other mem-

bers on the committee are not anti-Quebec. The member cannot stand in the House and say I am anti-Quebec.

(1945)

I cannot imagine that a Quebecer listening tonight to the critic for the Reform Party or to the hon. member for Simcoe Centre would say this debate was anti-Quebec.

This debate is about assisting and supporting small business men and women who represent the greatest hope for putting Canadians back to work. That is what this bill is about.

Mr. Ramsay: Will the bill work?

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): An hon. member opposite asked if the bill will work. I do not know the answer to that question. Are we to stay with the status quo?

This work was the result of members of the Reform Party, members of the Bloc and our members listening to dozens of small business men and women. We listened to bankers. This was not the government's idea. This was not an idea conjured up in the Langevin Block. This was a bill designed by all parties for the small business men and women of Canada.

With the deepest respect to my friend whom I have enjoyed working with from the Bloc Québécois, please reflect between now and the vote tonight. I ask him to reconsider his position and get behind the government bill in the interests of putting the unemployed people of Quebec back to work. That kind of spirit will have a ripple effect throughout Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question is on Group No. 3, Motions No. 12.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

An hon. member: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): In my opinion the nays have it.

An hon. member: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare Motion No. 12 negatived. Therefore I declare Motion No. 13 negatived.

(Motion No. 12 negatived.)

Government Orders

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of the bill now before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until 11.30 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

* * *

(1950)

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I have a ruling by the Speaker on Bill C-82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act.

[*Translation*]

There is, on the Order Paper, a motion to amend Bill C-82, an Act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, at the report stage.

[*English*]

The motion is substantially similar to an amendment previously moved and defeated in committee. Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(5), it has not been selected and we will now proceed to the concurrence motion at report stage.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE

Hon. Jon Gerrard (for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion agreed to)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Gerrard (for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.) moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Réginald Bélair (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today to address Bill C-82, a bill which will enable the Government of Canada to replace the \$2 note with a \$2 coin.

The bill was recently studied by the Standing Committee on Government Operations. I am pleased to say all witnesses appearing before the committee supported the introduction of a \$2 coin as a cost saving measure. This confirms the results of earlier surveys conducted by the Royal Canadian Mint whereby Canadians strongly approved of the new coin given the substantial savings that accrue to the government.

Clearly Canadians appreciate any step their government takes to reduce the deficit and save money.

[*Translation*]

Representatives from the vending machine industry confirmed their support for the proposed coin, even though they expressed some concern regarding the date of introduction of this coin. They fear that they will not have time to adjust the mechanisms of all their machines by the introduction date.

I can assure hon. members that we are sensitive to these concerns. In response to these concerns the Royal Canadian Mint, the Department of Finance and the Bank of Canada will co-operate with the individuals and groups involved, and especially with the vending machine industry, to ensure a smooth introduction of the new coin on the market, in order to minimize sale and business disruptions.

There will be a public awareness campaign to promote acceptance and use of the \$2 coin by the Canadian public.

[*English*]

The government intends to introduce the new \$2 coin in early 1996, as announced by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech in February 1995. We cannot afford to delay this budget item because we all stand to gain from the introduction of this new coin.

By replacing the \$2 note with the coin, Canadians will save approximately \$254 million over 20 years from the reduced production and distribution costs of the \$2 coin as compared to the note.

The average life span of a note is one year while the average life span of a coin is twenty years. The cost to produce the note is 6 cents per unit compared to the estimated cost to produce the coin at 16 cents per unit. This combined with the savings the government will generate by changing the metal composition of the lower denominations will result in total savings of \$500 million over 20 years.

(1955)

Some have suggested that half a billion in savings is small change. We disagree. In our fight to eliminate the deficit we believe every dollar saved is a dollar earned. No saving is too small or insignificant.

Government Orders

As the Minister of Public Works and Government Services explained to the committee members, we need five pennies to make a nickel, five nickels to make a quarter, and four quarters to make a dollar; every penny counts.

The government takes deficit reduction very seriously. Any member of the House elected on a platform to reduce or eliminate the deficit must support this initiative. As we all know, the deficit cannot be eliminated through program cuts alone. Innovative ways must be found to cut government expenditures. The introduction of the \$2 coin to replace the \$2 note is an innovative cost saving measure.

[*Translation*]

Some people wonder why we did not simply do away with the \$2 bill. They say we would have saved even more money, but we disagree.

Canadians use \$2 notes in a large number of transactions every day. Because they are so heavily used, these notes tend to be in poor condition. The coin is a practical and far more durable alternative to the note. It allows the government to save more money than it would by simply eliminating the note.

If we eliminated the \$2 denomination, we would not reduce the number of coins in the purses of Canadians, on the contrary. Studies have shown that the combination of \$1, \$2, \$5 and \$10 values is the most effective in reducing the number of coins and notes required. Without the \$2 note, more loonies would be needed and Canadians would carry even more change in their pockets. Two loonies weigh 14 grammes, compared to 7.3 grammes for the proposed \$2 coin. If we eliminated the \$2 denomination, we would have to mint more \$1 coins and that would cost an extra \$23 million over a period of 20 years.

[*English*]

Some others might wonder why the government is proposing to introduce a \$2 coin at a time when more and more people are using credit and debit cards. A \$2 coin might seem a step backward to a time before paper money instead of a step forward toward more plastic. Cash cards will not mean the end of cash in society.

For the foreseeable future cash will be a necessary requirement. Like credit cards and debit cards, cash cards will find their own market niche for people who prefer to manage their cash in this way. However, there will always be a need for cash. This was also confirmed during the hearings of the government operations committee.

The presentation by the Canadian Federation of Independent Grocers revealed that debit cards are not being used as often as anticipated. The extent to which cash cards may replace coinage is at this time only a matter of conjecture. However, even if cash cards replace a significant percentage of transactions most of these will be of higher value and not coinage.

Coins will continue to play a role in commercial transactions. Already coins are used to acquire numerous services such as mass transit, telephone calls, washing machines at the laundromat, video and pool games, parking meters, even showers at campgrounds. The vending machine industry is presenting us with a greater variety of products and choices. These changes reflect the nature of the vending machine industry and of our economy in general.

(2000)

The only constant is change and in the modern world, the process of change is rapid, wide reaching and never ending. Businesses must constantly adapt to new technologies and new practices.

As an aside, I want to point out to my colleagues in the House that representatives of the vending industry, including the president of Coca-Cola, clearly stated the costs of converting vending equipment would not be passed on to consumers.

Some people have suggested that we should compensate the vending machine industry for the expense of altering their machines. In an era of fiscal restraint, we simply cannot afford it. We must use our limited resources very strategically in ways that result in the greatest possible benefit for the greatest possible number of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

As I said earlier, the Royal Canadian Mint, the Department of Finance and the Bank of Canada will co-operate with the industry to ensure a smooth transition. Studies conducted by the Royal Canadian Mint have shown that 79 per cent of Canadians approved of this initiative when told that it would save the government millions of dollars.

Moreover, the disappearance of the \$2 note does not seem to worry Canadians too much. Forty-five per cent said they were not very concerned, while only 19 per cent felt some nostalgia but no real concern. In concluding, we believe that to be practical a currency system must adapt to change. We must stay in the lead and be an example to others.

This bill reflects the will of the Canadian government to accept change in areas where others avoided it. Change is never easy. We believe that it is by making choices that we show leadership. Sometimes, making choices means letting go of some traditions to turn with confidence towards innovation and renewal.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today on the subject of Bill C-82. Unlike Bill C-91 and other bills introduced by the government, which are opposed in Quebec, this bill is not. It does, however, prove conclusively that the government has blocked its ears and that it is ready to do anything when the time comes to have its bills adopted.

Government Orders

We have heard a speech by the minister's parliamentary secretary that was full of errors and had little to do with reality. For example, it is not right to say that the business people most affected by the issue of a \$2 coin were in favour of it. It is not true. They were not in favour of it. Not a single representation was made by businessmen in favour of a \$2 coin being issued. A representative of the Coca-Cola company told us they were indifferent, that is, they were prepared to make the adjustment and they, like all the other business people, asked that the government at least delay the issue of the \$2 coin for a year so that the industries most affected could adjust.

This is the least we can do for the business people, industries, vending machines and companies most affected by the issue. The government plugged its ears. Companies are not even being given a year to get ready for the new coin.

(2005)

Why is the government in such a hurry?

An hon. member: It is a matter of money.

Mr. Marchand: Yes, it is definitely a matter of money. It is incredible how little time the government took to consult people.

The member for Cochrane—Superior said earlier, or seemed to imply, that, in fact, people had been consulted and were in favour. A look, however, at the government's so-called survey reveals the extent to which it was manipulated. It is not a real survey. Some people were asked if they were in favour of a \$2 coin being issued if it meant a saving of \$300 million.

Half the respondents were opposed, really opposed. One cannot be opposed in principle to the government saving money, but in its survey, the government did not even discuss more economical alternatives, like maintaining the status quo or eliminating the \$2 bill. The people were not consulted. In fact, the public in general does not even know, in principle, that the government is planning to put out a \$2 coin. This measure is slipped through, as though they wanted to impose it. Well, that is what they want to do.

Mr. Bélair: It was announced in the budget.

Mr. Marchand: The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior is telling me it was announced in the budget. Spoken like a true Liberal. Whatever the minister or the Prime Minister says, we will vote yea.

Regardless of the fact that the business community is asking for the decision to be deferred and is against the idea, the Liberal members are all for it. Furthermore, this is the conclusion reached about Liberals in an article in the *Ottawa Sun* written by Douglas Fisher. When it comes to proposing bills, it is "Forget constituents, forget personal belief—" and, I would add, forget public opinion, forget all the people who might have something

to say about the bills. "Being a Liberal MP begins with always saying yea at the leader's command".

They blindly follow the leader, unable it seems to express their own opinions. For all I know, maybe they are not capable of expressing their own opinions, they lack intelligence. Bill C-82 certainly does not show any signs of intelligence, just the government's indifference.

It shows that this government is not listening. It could not care less. The bill smacks of arrogance, of disregard for public opinion. The government could have consulted the public, it could have informed people that it was planning a \$2 coin and really tried to find out if they were in agreement or not, but this was not done. The public has not been prepared for this soon to be introduced change.

Having done nothing to pave the way and shown little interest in public opinion, the government is going ahead. As I said, even the best informed people, those most affected by the introduction of a \$2 coin, who know that it is coming, are concerned about the speed with which it is being introduced. Why the haste? Why not give the business community time to adjust?

The member for Cochrane—Superior tells us that the government will co-operate with business people in introducing the coin. This government is making empty promises. Furthermore, we were already promised consultation on this matter.

(2010)

When members of the business community presented their report to the public works committee, they said that the government had promised them that after the reception given the loonie, there would be consultation when it came time to discuss the introduction of a \$2 coin. There was no such consultation. If the government were truly interested in the opinion of business people or in public opinion, it would take the time to talk to them, to provide them with adequate information and to ensure that they understood the importance of issuing this coin. And if there was opposition, the government could at least have suggested alternatives, which it has not done.

It is presenting the \$2 coin and saying that it will lead to huge savings. This suggestion is a joke, because any way you look at it, it would not create any savings. And there are costs involved. Admittedly, the government will save approximately \$250 million, like the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior said earlier, but it will probably cost the business sector twice that amount to make the adjustments necessitated by this \$2 coin. It is almost as if they are claiming that the introduction of the \$2 coin will have no effect, no impact, that it will not bother anyone and that co-ops and IGAs will not have to change their cash trays and that vending machines will not have to be adjusted to make allowances for the \$2 coin. All coin-operated devices will have to be updated.

Government Orders

Elementary math shows that the introduction of the \$2 coin could cost business up to \$400 million within the first year.

Mr. Bélair: Eighty million.

Mr. Marchand: Four hundred million. The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior said \$80 million. That figure is only for one industry. There are 200,000 vending machines in Canada and it costs between \$300 and \$800 to adapt them to accept a new coin. For this industry alone, the total cost will be between \$60 million and \$160 million.

The hon. member just told me that it will cost the vending machine industry \$80 million, but that is not important because the government will be saving \$200 million. But the cost will be between \$60 million and \$160 million for the vending machine industry alone in Canada.

Some hon. members: No. No.

Mr. Marchand: Yes it will. There are 200,000 of them in Canada. Who is going to foot the bill? The A.F.I. Automatic Vending Company, perhaps, which objected to the bill when it appeared before the Standing Committee on Government Operations?

The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior said earlier that all businesspeople supported this move. In a letter to the members of the committee, a representative of the vending machine industry said: "The government's cost savings is my expense". He is not in agreement. If you read the letter, you notice that the representative of the industry is opposed to the introduction of a \$2 coin. Once again, he suggests that he will not only incur expenses, but also that he is aware that the bottom line is that consumers will end up paying the \$60 million to \$160 million that the vending machine industry will have to shell out. Ultimately, consumers will end up paying.

(2015)

Consumers will have to pay. This is only the beginning. Imagine, every cash register in every store across the country will eventually have to be replaced to accommodate a \$2 coin.

The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior and our colleague from Manitoba do not realize that. They do not see that. This is the down to earth stuff, but they are up there in the clouds, they hear no evil and see no evil but they listen to their minister because he said: You are going to vote for this bill, come hell or high water.

How many cash registers? In Canada, probably half a million. All stores have cash registers, every cornerstore and every IGA. They will all have to change eventually. First they will have to adjust to the changeover but eventually they will have to replace them.

The representative for this association, and this for the benefit of the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior, appeared before our committee to say no, we do not want the \$2 coin because it will cost us a lot of money. I will have to buy another cash register which costs between \$100 and \$150. They do not come cheap.

An hon. member: You do not have to take them.

Mr. Marchand: No, of course not. People in northern Ontario will put their \$2 coins in their piggybank or in another box, I imagine. That is one way. We have responsible people who are listening, people who know about these things, who are professionals and who know that cornerstores and shops will have to spend \$100 and \$150 to buy another cash register. This is another \$75 million people will have to spend. And who is going to pay? The consumer, Mr. Speaker. You and me and the people watching us on television. They are going to have to pay. This is only the tip of the iceberg. Eventually, we will also have to change the parking meters, as the hon. member pointed out earlier, and all types of vending machines.

There are administration costs and conversion costs. Costs the government did not take the trouble to calculate, because it could not care less.

As for the cost of handling coins as opposed to bills, for example, the representative for Canada's grocers explained that to us. I think the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior was there, and if he was, he was not listening, because the hon. member for Ottawa Centre and the hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester were there, and they will be able to confirm this: introducing the new coin will cost more and it will be heavier to carry. We will have to pay someone to count the coins. There are additional costs. In his own store, he figured that introducing the new \$2 coin would cost him between \$10,000 and \$15,000 in administration and conversion costs. And if we multiply this by 500,000 stores, it starts to add up, and quite a bit. Millions of dollars consumers will have to pay.

When the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior tells me the government will save \$250 million by introducing the \$2 coin, I think he is pretty gullible.

(2020)

Because, in the end, who is going to pay for it? Consumers will pay two or three times more. It is too bad, because the saving we are talking about is the one the Royal Canadian Mint could theoretically make. This is the only saving we are talking about. There is no mention of all the costs that will be generated by the issue of this coin. Even here, when we look at the savings mentioned by the member for Cochrane—Superior of \$250 million over 20 years—not \$250 million next year—they amount to \$12 million a year over 20 years. We realize that the issue of the \$2 coin will cost industry and the Royal Canadian Mint dearly, because, for the Mint, it will mean producing these coins, which cost a lot more to produce than a bank note.

Government Orders

A \$2 bill costs six cents to produce. A \$2 coin costs 16 cents. In the first few years, it will cost the government and the Mint a lot. The government will have to borrow money to produce the coin. The \$250 million will not be saved in the first year. The savings will be made over the long term. The turning point will come after five, six or seven years. Over time, the value of money changes. You know just as well as I do that saving a million dollars today is not the same as saving a million dollars twenty years from now, because the million in 20 years will not be worth the same as this year's million. That is a fact.

So, when the government and the member for Cochrane—Superior tell me we will be saving \$254 million over 20 years, when 20 years have passed we will realize we have not saved a cent. We will, however, have forced industry, business, companies, corner stores, the IGA and everyone affected by the issue of the \$2 coin to spend money immediately, next year, after the coin is issued. They will have to pay right away. Consumers are going to have to pay up front for this change.

The most absurd thing about this bill is that, as the member indicated in his presentation, the time is near when the money of the future, electronic money, will be introduced. He seemed to want to say that it did not matter. After all, we will continue to have coins, hard cash.

But if the government had taken the trouble to read up on the magnitude of the current currency revolution, it would realize that indeed times are changing. Many changes are already under way. The government does not really have to impose more costly changes that will ultimately be for nothing when, in five years perhaps, coins will be replaced with chip cards. A few days ago, on June 19, 1995, *La Presse* was reporting what a smart wallet the chip card was.

(2025)

It was introduced in Canada on May 12 by the Royal Bank and a few other institutions under the name MONDEX. Let me read you part of the article: "A plastic card containing a microchip, the MONDEX wallet can be refilled at automatic teller machines and through certain telephones. The MONDEX package also includes an electronic safe about the size of an electronic memo pad. This safe can interface with a bank account through telephone circuits. It allows the chip card to be refilled without having to use communications channels. It will be widely available this summer".

This is taking place in Canada. The article goes on to describe how the introduction of electronic money will revolutionize the way we pay for what we buy. It is already in use in Europe. In France, money is no longer used to pay for telephone calls; they have been using cards for over ten years. In my riding, I can even pay for my newspaper with my card. The technology exists, here

in Canada as well. But, apparently, government members do not read papers or magazines.

MONDEX. There a lengthy article on the subject in the June 12 issue of *Business Week*. That is quite recent. It is the feature article of this issue entitled "The Future". They refer to MONDEX as "a new kind of electronic money known as E money", adding that: "Digital money is the ultimate and inevitable medium of exchange for an increasingly wired world".

Earlier, I got the impression from the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior that he could see into the future and predict that coins will always be used, that there will always be a need for our \$2 coins. It seems that others have a different opinion. It is possible that we will use less real money, that we will replace it with "E money", electronic money, and that may be happening very soon.

According to the experts who wrote the article, it could happen within the next five years. The "E money" revolution could take place that soon. This does not surprise me. In our rapidly changing world, the idea of using an electronic card to replace money does not surprise me. In fact, I would not be surprised if we more or less stopped using money, and if most people were to start using cards.

Ten or fifteen years ago, who would have thought that the use of credit cards would become so widespread? If people had been told then that, five or ten years later, they would use credit cards to pay in any hotel or store, they would not have believed that.

Sometimes, we have to open our eyes and ears to see and to understand. The government has obviously not done that in this case. We are about to enter an era which will see the introduction of a new form of money. According to experts, electronic money is definitely the way of the future, and it is also what businesspeople, merchants, bankers, corner store owners and grocery owners want.

Even if it may cost them more, they are prepared to invest in this new system, because it reduces their handling costs and their losses, it eliminates fraud and NSF cheques, it simplifies the system, and it is also a step in the right direction.

(2030)

Business people are ready to invest in such a system, but not one of them supports the issuance of a \$2 coin. As the hon. member for Cochrane—Superior knows, all the witnesses and all the business people who appeared before the committee were against this measure.

However, since the government will go ahead with it anyway, these business people have asked for at least a year to find new cash registers. It takes some time to change 500,000 cash registers as well as all the vending machines.

Government Orders

This bill provides for the issuance of a \$2 coin by January 1996, which is just a few months away. The bill has not been passed yet, but the Royal Canadian Mint has already called for bids to produce the \$2 metal coin.

The hon. member for Cochrane—Superior may deny it, but on May 31, 1995, the *Ottawa Citizen* ran as a headline “Government calls standards for two dollar coin”. It is written in black and white. Another headline read “Industry seeks help with coin flip”. All the same, the government has already received several bids. We called and were told that the bids must be in by October 31, 1995.

If we need to take another five minutes to try to hammer some sense into these people, we will do it. We will at least take the time to explain these things that the government members unfortunately still do not understand.

Again, the government has called for bids to produce the \$2 coin. It wants to start production on October 1, 1995, in a few months, and start distribution on January 1, 1996. This is fast, very fast.

All those affected by this measure say that things should not go so fast, that they do not totally agree with the introduction of the new \$2 coin, that they want a year to adjust. But the government is not listening and still wants to go ahead with this initiative.

What is troubling me is that there are no solid arguments justifying the introduction of a \$2 coin. The savings that will result from the introduction of this new coin are not a sure thing. We cannot say that savings will be achieved when we know that adjusting to the new coin will cost our industries money and that, ultimately, these costs will be passed on to the consumers.

Is this a good time to introduce a \$2 coin? The government has not taken the time to consider the alternatives. Domtar, which produces our present \$2 bill, has proposed to make it more durable. Right now, the life span of the bill is said to be only a year. Domtar has offered to produce a bill that could last up to three years, which would represent considerable savings. The government has not considered this alternative.

There are also other alternatives that it has not considered, such as maintaining the status quo or even eliminating the \$2 bill. If the government really wanted to save money, eliminating the \$2 bill would be a good way of doing it. It would not cost anything.

(2035)

The government could really save money. Industries, tuck shops, municipalities would not have to adapt to a \$2 coin. This is an alternative. I am not saying that it is the solution, but why rush? Why not wait a certain time, one or two years, and see how the electronic card is being integrated into people's lives? The elimination of the \$2 denomination could be considered. It

could always be put back in circulation later on if needed, but why now and why so fast?

The government is incredibly irresponsible because, really, nothing truly justifies a new \$2 coin. If this government were really serious about saving money, I could suggest to the public works minister several ways to achieve real savings. He could have saved \$300 million right off the bat this year by eliminating ACOA. This is \$300 million he gives to industries. He could have supported, for instance, bills to give people in his own department the right to speak up and disclose abuses, which are numerous.

The member for Cochrane—Superior is well aware of this. The government has no control over contracting out. The government is wasting billions of dollars. But the minister will not support such bills, and yet they would be real money savers. This Minister of Public Works has also made the news with some ill considered projects, and occasionally some almost shady deals.

He had a wall, the famous Dingwall that cost several hundreds of thousands of dollars, built on a campus in his riding in Cape Breton. That was part of a \$600,000 envelope squandered. I could give examples of the considerable sums of money wasted by the Minister of Public Works.

Examples of questionable spending involving the Minister of Public Works are legion and involve millions of dollars. The member for Cochrane—Superior has just said that this is a minister interested in savings. I have my doubts. This cannot be the main reason for presenting this bill with such haste, when the people actually affected by the introduction of a \$2 coin want at least a year to prepare for the transition.

I would not give you \$2 for this bill. In conclusion, I would say that the MP's role is often an empty one. Here we all are debating, giving speeches and arguing as reasonably as possible, but we know that the power rests with the people across the way and power often has a dulling effect. It also corrupts.

(2040)

Absolute power corrupts absolutely; power just corrupts. We have examples of this. If we had the time and if it was worth the trouble to list the instances of corruption, we would do it, but I would rather conclude my comments on Bill C-82 by saying that the Bloc Quebecois is in favour of the government saving money. But we are in favour of real savings. We have suggested all kinds of ways for the government to really save money, from taxing family trusts to taxing banks. We have also made many suggestions to the Minister of Public Works regarding how he could reduce wastage of all kinds. We from the Bloc want savings. On this point, we agree. But, there is no proof that Bill C-82 will really create savings. On the contrary, it will be costly to business and consumers. People are not prepared.

Government Orders

There already are some 40 to 50 million \$1 coins which are out of circulation. We could easily encourage the circulation of loonies which are not being used. We would have preferred that the government consider at least delaying this bill and doing its job, which is to consult with the public and to think of alternatives, such as eliminating the \$2 denomination. I am not saying that this is the best option, but they could at least consider it, because there are apparently more savings to be had by dropping this denomination than by issuing a new \$2 coin. They could even decide to keep up the status quo.

There are at least a few alternatives worth examining, which the government did not take the time to do. Once again, the government is not doing its job, it did not take the time to consult the public, it did not listen to the concerns and worries of the business community, it does not really have any solid arguments for introducing Bill C-82 and certainly has no solid arguments for doing it so quickly.

That is why the Bloc opposes Bill C-82.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, sometimes we hurry through our days without pausing to give thanks to people. While I listened to that amazing speech just past, it occurred to me again that because much to my regret I am unilingual English I would not have understood a word of it if it were not for the interpreters. I think they did a fine job in translating not only the words of the hon. member but also the emotion with which he spoke. I would like to thank and congratulate the interpreters.

We are here today to discuss Bill C-82, which would permit the government to introduce the \$2 coin. When we come to the question of the \$2 coin, of course when we hear of the savings that will be made it looks at first glance like an excellent idea and one we should wholeheartedly support. However, in the Reform Party we are accustomed to asking questions about these initiatives of the government. We always begin by asking what it will cost and what the net effect will be to the taxpayer.

(2045)

We were sent here, all 52 of us, primarily on the platform of fiscal responsibility and the desire to balance the budget. We need to get into perspective how totally inadequate the initiatives and priorities of this government are. Here we are in the closing days of this session and this government is invoking closure and extended hours in order to put through all of this really important legislation before we are all sent home to our constituencies to do our work there.

Among all the things the Liberals have deemed to be a high priority, we have this \$2 coin. Of course anyone hearing the member from the government speak earlier would have said this is indeed important; we are going to save \$254 million. We could make it sound like even more by saying a quarter of a billion dollars. Instead of saying we are going to save that over 20 years, we could say we are going to save a billion dollars in 80 years. That would make it sound much more significant.

The fact of the matter is that this government speaks of this as such a huge priority, which will keep us here late at night debating and voting on these issues, as if this is going to save the country. Frankly, I wish it could. I really do. I would then be so strongly in favour of this motion that I would just say let us go for it, let us get it done, let us not wait until tomorrow, let us pass it and get it under way.

However, we need to ask what the real effect is. We need to be aware of the fact that in proportion to the total indebtedness of this government, this is really, although I hesitate to say it, a drop in the bucket. I suppose we could say it is a drop in the ocean. Unfortunately, we are taking as a priority this one little drop and allowing the big one to slip away from us. While we are worried about the cup of water that spilled off the cupboard, as the people in southern Alberta would know firsthand from their experiences, the basement is full of water from the flood. This is what the relationship is in our debt's picture.

It is very important for all members and all Canadian citizens to be aware that this saving of some \$254 million over 20 years comes down to about \$12.7 million per year. If we also consider that every day we are increasing our indebtedness by about \$110 million, then we become aware that the saving of \$254 million over 20 years is just a little over the amount by which we are increasing our indebtedness in two days. That is a shame. I hope this is not unparliamentary, but I think this is a crime.

I am not accusing the government of committing a crime, but it is derelict in its duties. It is not focusing on the picture of having to balance the budget and get government spending down in a real way.

As a matter of fact, as the House will hear in the next few minutes, this savings the government is getting is really a form of a hidden tax, as I will show in the next few minutes. The savings that are derived are so derived by increasing the costs to taxpayers, and thereby the real saving to the government is simply a form of taxation on the already overburdened taxpayer.

(2050)

The question we need to ask and have answered is, as I have already indicated, why this should be such a high priority. Even though it is a significant amount of money to any individual, in balance with total government spending it is not significant enough. We ought not to be chasing this rabbit when we should be out hunting bear.

Government Orders

There is a big challenge out there, and we are being detracted by something glistening on the side of the road. We are being detracted while our country is going into the ditch.

I would like to ask a few questions and talk a little about the answers the government has given to some of the questions. It is important for us to become aware of what is happening here.

The first question: What is the total plan of the government in terms of currency? We are told that for the present, at least for the next five years, this is probably the only change it is going to make, with four coins being changed at the same time. Again we need to be aware that the change in metal content to the nickel, the dime, the quarter, and the 50-cent piece has nothing to do with the bill. It is just being done at the same time.

If we are going to add a \$2 coin, it is wise to do it at the same time so all the coin recognition systems in coin operated machines will not have to be changed twice. It can be done all at once. We must commend the government for deciding that if we are going to make a change, let us do it all at the same time. However, we should ask whether we should be doing it at all. Is it really a saving to the taxpayer? My contention is that it is not. Here is my reasoning.

If one divides the total savings projected by the government, the \$12.7 million per year over 20 years, one does not have to be a math whiz to compute this. There are approximately 29 million Canadians. Using round numbers, quite clearly we are going to be saving less than half a dollar for each one of the 29 million Canadians. As a matter of fact, it is very close to 44 cents.

If we can save \$12.7 million per year, should we not be doing that? My answer would be yes, if it were a true saving. However it is a fairly safe assumption that every Canadian would use a coin operated machine a minimum of five times a year. If that is true and if the cost of retooling machines in order to recognize the new coins is included in the new cost to the vendors, say at a nominal rate of 10 cents per purchase—a 90-cent chocolate bar going up to \$1, which would be typical and we can probably expect that—then for every person who uses a machine more than five times per year, which is a safe assumption, it is going to end up costing more. They will pay less in taxes but more in services. Right off the bat the equation is counterbalanced. The saving disappears when we look at it from the point of view of the taxpayer.

In addition, there is the scenario that there is going to be an accrued value here because with the old \$2 bill the banks were permitted to return the surplus currency for a credit. I remember reading somewhere that the total value of being able to return the currency to the Bank of Canada, even at 5 per cent interest, worked out to a benefit of approximately \$80 million per year.

(2055)

There is a saving there to the government because under the rules of the banks coinage is not eligible to be returned to the bank when it is in surplus. The banks have to hold it. Consequently, there is an \$80 million cost there that will go to the banks.

I suppose we should not perhaps worry about that too much, because the banks would then have an opportunity in some tangible way to contribute to our government's coffers. It would be an indirect tax, which would require no bookkeeping or anything. It is just an expense, for which they could no longer get reimbursement.

However, the banks, like other businesses, are there to make a profit and retain their earnings. Undoubtedly they will recover that cost as one of their additional costs in other ways, which again will come out of the pocket of the consumer. There is a saving to the government, which will be taken out of the consumer's pocket in another form.

Then we heard about the issue of seigniorage. This of course is very important. The difference between the value of the coin and the cost of its production is really quite significant. These new \$2 coins are projected to cost around 16 cents each to produce, but of course their face value is \$2. Therefore the difference, \$1.84, is seigniorage. For every coin that is produced there is \$1.84 benefit to the government. Here again the government's briefing notes to us included the fact that this is a large benefit to the government and they are expecting around \$400 million of seigniorage.

Let us ask ourselves the question. If we can do that by producing some 244 million coins and we can give a benefit to the government of almost half a billion dollars, the temptation arises to ask why we do not produce about 10 times as many of these coins. If we did that we could pay off \$5 billion worth of the government's debt. Maybe we should do a hundred times as many coins and pay it all off. Then we would not have to pay any interest.

The fact is that the seigniorage is another form of tax. The government issues a coin to a bank that pays \$2 for it to the government. That is true. That is currency, which is really a representative value of each citizen's proportional share of the assets of this country. That is really what it is, because the coin in itself does not have the value. It is not a gold coin that is worth \$2 in metal. It has a couple of components in it. It is nickel and things like that. The total value of the coin is 16 cents. So the coin has no inherent value. Hence, in a way very similar to our printed currency, it is a promissory note. It is a coin of value against the assets of the country.

Government Orders

If you increase the number of coins, then really you simply divide the value of the country among all the citizens. You would say that is done with the \$2 bill right now. That is absolutely correct. If we take the \$2 bills out of circulation and put the \$2 coins into circulation, then there is no difference. The fact that we claim seigniorage on it is a magical rabbit trick, which tries to tell people that we now have more value to the Canadian government when we do not.

I would like to talk a little about the changes that should be made to this bill.

(2100)

As was indicated at the time we started to debate the bill today, we tried to introduce an amendment because we were concerned, as were all members of the committee. I hasten to remind members of the committee that we shared a concern regarding the implementation of the new currency. Even though it is outside the concern of this bill and outside the study of the committee, we were concerned about the implementation and the introduction of all the new coins: the new dime, nickel, quarter and 50-cent piece. Very few coin machines recognize the 50-cent piece. Most of them recognize nickels, dimes, quarters and loonies.

When the new coins are introduced every one of them will require a coin recognition system for the three new coins. Two nickels, two dimes and two quarters will have to be recognized by the machine because they have different weight properties. Just that change would require an alteration to the mechanism that recognizes coins for all coin operated machines.

In addition, the machines have to recognize the new two-dollar coin as well as the old loonie. Whereas the old ones had to recognize only four coins, the new mechanism will now have to recognize eight different coins.

It is important to recognize that this change is a very costly one. There are some devices out there right now which, with a minimum of adjustment, will be able to accommodate the new machines. We have heard in committee testimony some estimates as low as \$70 per machine. However there are many machines with mechanisms that will be obsolete. Individual owners of the machines will either be forced to replace them entirely or simply take the machines out of business. In some instances perhaps the individual will simply stop the business of coin operated machines.

We have no idea how many machines are out there. We are talking about food vending machines, pop machines, cigarette vending machines and lottery machines. By listing the machines I am not indicating in any way my approval of them but they are out there. We also have telephones and parking meters.

I know there was some giggling on the other side when the member from the Bloc was listing these items. That represented a lack of concern for all businesses, and there are many of them, that make their livelihood in this way.

I received a letter from a person in an adjoining riding to mine. I assume he felt he would perhaps get a little better hearing from me than from his Liberal MP. Perhaps he wrote to me because I was on the committee and in opposition. It was not Edmonton Southeast; it was a different riding adjacent to mine and with a Liberal representative. We can all figure it out if we know the geography.

The person said that he was in this business. He had a number of coin operated machines and because of his business he had a number of change making machines, machines which were geared up to making change for a two-dollar bill, a five-dollar bill and a ten-dollar bill. He said those machines would have to be changed. Either he would have to change his vending machines to recognize the two-dollar coin or he would have to change his change making machines to recognize the two-dollar coin. He also said it would cost a minimum of \$750 each to alter the machines. This was how he made his living.

The total cost of his small family business was \$138,000. He said: "This is a tremendous cost to me. If you just dump it on me it is far more than I can afford to take in one year". Among all other considerations for going slowly on making these alterations that is another reason. He would have the opportunity to amortize the cost over a greater length of time without incurring huge interest costs.

(2105)

We talked earlier today about lending money to small business people. I am sure he would have to borrow the money if this measure were implemented quickly. There is a cost that is very real and it is a large amount of money to him.

There is another reason for giving a little better time line. Businesses cannot produce overnight the new coin identification devices. There must be time for research and development. We heard in committee testimony that the mint had not submitted true industrial quality samples of the coins. That is rightfully so because it has not been approved by Parliament. They need to get all the coins. They need to have all the nickels, both the dimes and both the quarters. The loonie stays the same but they need the new two-dollar coin. They need samples of the four new coins before they can begin their research and development into the design of the new mechanism.

After that they have to build a prototype and go through sufficient testing to ascertain that those coin recognition devices are accurate and dependable. The last thing we want to do is to arrange the affairs of the country in such a way that the recognition devices of all business people who directly depend

Government Orders

on our coinage system and its acuity, size and weight will not clearly discriminate between them.

Let me explain that. There are two kinds of errors the machines can make that are both very detrimental. The first error is that of not recognizing a legitimate coin. If a customer goes to a machine wanting to make a purchase and his new quarter and new two-dollar coins are rejected, he gets upset. We are told by people in the industry that when people submit a coin which is rejected several things happen. First, some of the rejections result in jamming so the person does not get the product or his coin back. Therefore the mechanism must be very reliable in recognizing legitimate coins. It must not jam. It must recognize them and accept them.

Another thing that frustrates the customer is if he submits the coin and it goes straight through to the coin return pocket. He wants the machine to accept the coin because he wants to buy the product, whatever he is after. If he cannot get it because the machine will not accept the coin, he will probably kick the machine. The industry people told us that in committee. They say their coin recognition machines must be highly reliable because if they fail to recognize legitimate coins their machines are subject to a lot of vandalism.

(2110)

We would not want to impose that on people who depend upon the Canadian government's coinage system. That is why they have to be given ample time to research and develop coin recognition machines.

As I said there are two types of errors. One is failing to accept a legitimate coin. The other is failing to reject an illegitimate coin. That is every bit as important. Coin recognition devices must also have the ability to recognize a slug from the electrical department or a washer or something that is not a legitimate coin. The devices must reject those or the merchant will be ripped off. The devices must be very reliable.

It is not realistic for us to pass Bill C-82 at the end of June and give the government the right to introduce these new coins in early 1996. That is less than a year away. It is just over six months away. That is not adequate and the industry has told us so.

I will not make several pejorative statements to the government. I will rather try to appeal to its common sense and concern for the business people that we have heard expressed often. I am challenging the government to put actions to its words. I appeal to its business sense and to its sense of caring for Canadian people. That is what we are here for.

A very legitimate concern is that the coin recognition systems have to be developed. They have to be brought into production. As I said that requires a research and development phase, a

testing phase of the prototypes and then full production. After that the devices get shipped out. In some cases they will be retrofits for existing mechanisms. In other cases they will be actual replacements. The merchants will have to take the old device out of the machine and replace it completely with a new one. Sometimes that will involve changing from some of the old mechanical devices to the new electronic devices. It may mean wiring changes. It can mean all sorts of different things. In some cases it will mean the changing of the solenoids that actually operate the delivery systems.

We have to give industry time for the research, the development, the testing, the production and the installation. If we in the House believe that by snapping our fingers and passing a law it can be done overnight, it is not realistic. I appeal to members opposite to do it right.

I remember a colleague at the technical institute where I worked who used to have a little placard over his desk that read: "If you don't have time to do it right, when will you find time to do it again?" That is the issue here. If we do not do it right we will produce a lot of frustration and anger. Right now we are already facing that. Many small business people I talk to keep crying about the GST. A lot of the vending machine operators are in that category. They landed up picking up the tab for GST out of their own pockets. They were opposed to it. They are still opposed to it. They are saying: "The government said it would eliminate it and it is still here. When will that happen?"

There is already a deep anger across the country about the GST and other unfair taxes. If we add this frustration and difficulty for the same people again it will further erode the respect of people for the government and their willingness to participate in our economy through our voluntary tax system. Without that, the whole system would fail.

(2115)

We need to make certain we do this right. If the government is going to go through with this despite my previous pleading that it is not economic and should not be done, then at least it should get the timing right. That is very important.

In my previous speech I asked the minister a number of questions. The minister was kind enough to give me a written response. In his covering letter he said: "Thank you for your letter". After the speech I received a phone call in my office. I was asked to submit my questions in writing and the minister would provide answers to them. He said: "I trust these responses will satisfy your concerns and that you will now be in a position to support Bill C-82".

Frankly I am appreciative of the minister and his staff taking the time to answer my questions. They covered about five or six pages.

Government Orders

I regret the answers are insufficient. For example, I asked what was the estimated total impact on the retail sector, including items such as cashier trays and coin counting machines. Basically the answer was that one year ago the industry estimated it would cost \$25 million. Since then they have raised their cost to \$80 million and the last line is: "The cost of adjustment will vary". In other words, the government does not have the answer. That is not good enough. Until we have those answers it should not jam this bill through.

I asked what the effect would be on the economy. Again, some answers were given but they were very general. No real work has been done. Consider the soft drink industry.

Again we urge the government to consider not having a new \$2 dollar coin. If it costs too much to print \$2 bills, just eliminate them. I know there are two sides to the argument of eliminating the \$2 currency. We do this for values less than \$1. If you look at our currencies for less than \$1 we go from 1 cent to 5 cents. Why can we not go from a \$1 coin to a \$5 bill? It is exactly the same. I am not going to repeat myself but I insist it is absolutely the same. If you go from 1 cent coin to a 5 cent coin that is parallel to going from \$1 coin to a \$5 bill.

I am not going to repeat what I said in my previous speech. If anybody is interested in this I urge them to read it since I gave a really good, well thought out, well documented speech when this bill was debated previously. I raised the same point then that with the weight of these coins we are talking about the difference to a person of having to carry an extra one-half ounce. That is the difference.

Some members opposite may disagree. For a small fee I will give a math lesson after hours. I would have to ask the government to seriously consider that as an option. It would not cost a great deal to implement that change, only the cost of producing the currency. If we are going to stay with the \$2 currency, there is one thing that was not properly considered: the use of a more durable substrate. That has not been studied.

The current \$2 bills wear out very rapidly. That is because the quality of the paper provided is not adequate for the kind of circulation these \$2 bills get.

We talked to suppliers of the substrate for the printing of the bills. They said with the new plasticized material they could produce a \$2 note that could last two to four times as long and it would only cost marginally more to produce. Has that been studied as an alternative? As far as we know it has not and we think it should be.

We had many other questions. I would concede that some were adequately answered. When I asked if dropping the \$2 denomination was considered, the government simply answered that eliminating the \$2 coin was considered and rejected. It then

went on to say that Canadians depend on the \$2 note for a great number of their transactions. I believe that to be true because it is there.

(2120)

However, if the next denomination in paper were \$5 we would still only be required to carry four coins in order to produce the \$4 and the next one would be the \$5 and then we would have the change in between as well.

With all that being said, the message I want to give to the members opposite is one that is very clear. I appeal to their common sense to reject this bill but failing that, I would like to at least have it amended. The work of this Parliament is to pass good laws. Is that not our prayer at the beginning of each day: "Help us to pass good laws?"

However, included in that definition is that we must reject bad laws or we must amend bad portions of laws before we pass them so they will be good laws.

Therefore I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following:

That Bill C-82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act be not now read a third time, but be referred back to the Standing Committee on Government Operations for the purpose of reconsidering clause 1.

That clause is with respect to the issue of the timing of the bill.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the members opposite that I will not be long, but it is only fair that having seconded an amendment that I speak briefly to it. I assure members opposite, who I know are concerned about the time, that I will be the only Reformer speaking on the amendment.

All across Canada, Canadians are doing business today. They were buying and selling. They were working and travelling. They were caring for kids and patients in hospitals. That is the real Canada. In here we are debating minting a \$2 coin in place of a \$2 bill when this country is going \$100 million a day in the hole. That is a really sad case to consider.

I just want to briefly outline why we suggest that a January 1996 implementation date is not a reasonable and fair imposition on small business, which is the engine of our economy.

In the bill the government has failed to address the actual cost to the industry of the conversion to a \$2 coin. My hon. colleague from Elk Island has given us 101 on the cost of implementing this bill and certainly a 101 course on vending machines and the problems involved in converting them to accept \$2 coins in the new regime that is being planned by the Canadian Mint under the supervision of the minister of public works.

Government Orders

The cost to the industry will be substantial and in all likelihood these costs will be passed down to the consumer. As just an example for comparison, when pulp prices increased there was an increase in the price of newsprint resulting in an increase in the price of newspapers which was then passed on to the consumer. The same will happen with the vending machine industry.

Three organizations have asked the government to reconsider this proposal and, in particular, the implementation timetable for Bill C-82. They are the Canadian Soft Drink Association, the Canadian Automatic Vending Merchandising Association and the Canadian Bankers Association. The CSDA represents manufacturers and distributors of soft drinks across Canada. Members distribute their products through approximately 100,000 vending machines. The CSDA, along with all vending industries, is requesting that the federal government delay by one year the introduction of the new coins to provide adequate time to convert existing coin mechanisms to new ones.

(2125)

Paulette Vinette, president and CEO of the Canadian Soft Drink Distributors Association estimates that it will cost its industry \$200 per machine to convert existing mechanisms to accept the new coins and as much as \$600 to replace an existing mechanism. The total cost to the industry would be approximately \$30 million.

The Canadian Automatic Vending Machine Association estimates that changes to pop, potato chip and candy machines will cost between \$75 and \$800. The total cost of conversion to the industry, according to Canadian Automatic Vending, will be as much as \$80 million. This \$80 million cost also includes the government's plans to replace the metal alloy used in pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters and 50-cent pieces with cheaper plated steel coins.

They also bemoan the fact that the proposed date of implementation will not provide the industry with enough time to develop and implement the required modifications. That is a real problem. The industry has yet to receive sample coins from the Mint so that it can develop coin recognition equipment.

Vending machine operators are asking that the federal government provide compensation to help defray the cost of conversion to some 200,000 pop and candy machines. These operators insist that they are unfairly bearing the burden of cost cutting by the government.

In 1967, when the government fiddled with the metal content of the coin, the government agreed to compensate vending machine operators for half the replacement costs of the coin mechanisms. That is not the case in this bill, therefore more time should be offered to the industry.

Cash registers will also have to accommodate the extra coin. Instead of having five slots for coins, the registers will have to have six. This will result in additional costs for the cash register users.

The Canadian Bankers Association also has concerns with the introduction of the \$2 coin, as I pointed out during second reading. The Canadian Bankers Association has proposed a total abandoning of the \$2 coin as mentioned by my colleague from Elk Island.

The banks have anywhere from \$30 to \$50 million in excess loonies sitting in the vaults and as the government has refused to take back the surplus coins, the banks are unable to earn interest on that money. This is likely to be repeated with the \$2 coin.

The government is so confident that the Commons will approve the \$2 coin that it has asked manufacturers for quotes to deliver 25 million blanks by the beginning of October 1, 1995.

The Reform Party proposes that the government reconsider its decision to delay the introduction of the coin for a year. This will allow vending operators the time needed to convert the machines. Ideally we should scrap the coin but if that does not happen, we should certainly delay its implementation.

Mark my words, there will be big problems if the government pushes this ahead too quickly. The minister of public works has not shown good judgment in the past and he is not showing good judgment now by insisting on ramming this legislation through before the industry and small business people have time to adjust to its consequences. I would appeal to the minister to be more considerate.

In closing, I want to update the House. In my speech at second reading I recognized that the government was probably going to ram this bill through. We would prefer that it did not ram it through but it probably will. We would prefer if it was to ram it through that it would consider some amendments.

If it is going to go through, those members have said that they want suggestions for what should be put on the \$2 coin. I made a suggestion at second reading and surprisingly enough it is getting a lot of support from across the country.

I ask that the minister of public works consider putting a replica of the Hanson buck, a white tailed deer on the \$2 coin. I did that to deal with some disparity in the images and the representations on our bills.

I have to be careful not to use props in the House but I am using real notes. We have a \$20 bill which was actually donated by the hon. member for Simcoe Centre to the Heart Foundation for me to ride a bicycle to raise money for the Heart Foundation this coming weekend.

It has on it a replica of the common loon swimming in a pond.

Government Orders

(2130)

We have the \$10 dollar bill with a replica of the osprey. It is a beautiful animal. May I have a donation to my cause by from the hon. member from Kingston and the Islands? I appreciate that he donated five dollars for me to ride this bike on the weekend to raise dollars for the heart foundation.

The \$5 dollar bill has on it a belted king fisher, a beautiful animal as well. Then we are to get rid of the two dollar bill. It has on it a very nice picture of two robins. I guess we will have to say goodbye to the robins and have a new coin.

We have the loonie in existence already and it has a loon on its tail side. The quarter has a caribou. The loon actually is from the wetlands; the caribou is from the north. Our next coin is the dime with the *Bluenose* on it, representing the history of the Maritimes and the wonderful history surrounding the *Bluenose*.

The next denomination is the five cent piece with a beaver on it, representing the development of Canada when the fur trade occurred and the country was inhabited by trappers and traders looking for this pelt. The penny has a maple leaf.

It so happens the prairies were overlooked in all these symbols and so I have recommended to the minister of public works and to the Canadian mint that they consider a replica of the Hanson buck on our new \$2 dollar coin should they go ahead with it. I have a lot of support for this idea. I have had support from people from Halifax to Montreal. Fellow members of Parliament have supported this.

A newspaper report said I wanted to put a dead deer on the \$2 dollar coin. I do not know if that beaver is alive, but I know the Hanson buck was and was a beautiful animal. It represents a world champion record for the nicest antlers of any white tail ever taken. It broke an 80 year old record held by the Americans and certainly it would be a wonderful replica, a wonderful image to put on our \$2 dollar coin should we pass this bill. It is elegant. It has been represented in paintings, in photographs. It represents an animal that has been an environmental success through proper conservation practices.

If the minister goes ahead with this \$2 dollar coin, please delay its implementation. I ask the minister to consider putting the Hanson buck on the coin.

I encourage entrepreneurs who might be listening to invest and start manufacturing men's suspenders because our pants will weigh a lot more with our pockets full of \$2 dollar coins. Women's apparel manufacturers may need more shoulder shoulder pads and probably stronger purse straps.

Mr. Lastewka: Mr. Speaker, being a new member I would from time to time like to get clarifications on using props in the

House. I wanted to make sure I understood for my future speeches that flaunting the rules, bending and breaking them every which way is permissible. Is there a rule on that?

The Deputy Speaker: I was watching the member like a hawk and he did not turn any of his coins or his bills, as far as I could see from here with my fading eyesight, in the direction of the camera. It is a question of holding it up to the camera. I watched him and he was quite careful.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ): I know that the government will go ahead with Bill C-82 and introduce the \$2 coin. We also know that the business community, which will be most affected by the introduction of this coin, would prefer to see its circulation postponed for at least a year, so it can adjust.

That is why the Bloc Quebecois will support the amendment presented by the Reform Party.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

(2135)

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on the amendment.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Amendment negated.)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on the main motion.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT (FEDERAL AGENCIES)

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-65, An act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleagues, there are 16 motions in amendment on the Order Paper for the report stage of Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

[English]

Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 will be grouped for debate and voted on as follows. A vote on Motion No. 1 applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15, and 16. Motion No. 13 will be voted on separately.

[Translation]

Motion No. 2 will be debated and voted on separately. Motion No. 8 will be debated and voted on separately. Motions Nos. 10 and 11 will be grouped for the purposes of debate. A vote on Motion No. 10 will apply to Motion No. 11.

[English]

I will now propose Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 to the House.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-65, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 1, with the following:

“recommendation of the Minister, following consultation with the Lieutenant Governor of each province in Atlantic Canada and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to industry, to hold of-”.

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-65, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing line 16, on page 2, with the following:

“Council, on the recommendation of the Minister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

(2.1) The Board of Directors shall include representatives of the various regions in Canada.”

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-65, in Clause 6, be amended by replacing line 31, on page 2, with the following:

“Council as provided in section 4, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

3.1 The Council shall include representatives of the various regions of Canada.”

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if there would be unanimous consent so that all these motions you are about to read be deemed to have been put, thereby giving more time for debate instead of reading motions.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-65, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 28, on page 5, with the following:

“the recommendation of the Corporation, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters, ap-”.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-65, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing line 19, on page 6, with the following:

“ister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

(1.1) The Board shall include representatives of the various regions in Canada.”

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-65, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing line 30, on page 7, with the following:

“required, to the government of each province and to other ministers on the emer-”.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-65, in Clause 46, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 12, with the following:

Government Orders

“ed in section 19, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

(1.1) The Board shall include representatives of the various regions of Canada.”

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-65, in Clause 54, be amended by adding after line 16, on page 14, the following:

“(3.1) The members, the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson shall be appointed following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to this Act.”

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-65, in Clause 54, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 25, on page 14, with the following:

“(c) one from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region;

(d) one from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region; and”.

Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec—Est, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-65, in Clause 54, be amended by adding after line 28, on page 14, the following:

“(4.1) The members appointed under paragraph (4)(e) shall represent the various regions of Canada.”

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-65, in Clause 57, be amended by replacing lines 16 to 18, on page 15, with the following:

“appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters.

(1.1) the Board shall include representatives of the various regions of Canada.”

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-65, in Clause 64, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 17, with the following:

“Minister, following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the Governor in Council and the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to industry, to hold office during pleasure for”.

The Deputy Speaker: We will now debate Group No. 1.

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies. As we are all aware, the government is proposing to get rid of many boards and commissions and reduce drastically a great number of them for greater efficiency and as a cost saving measure.

One of the agencies which interests me greatly is the National Capital Commission. The bill proposes the membership of the National Capital Commission be composed as follows: two from the city of Ottawa, one from the city of Hull, one from a local municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, one from a local municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, and eight from Canada generally, other than from the cities or municipalities just referred to. Clauses (c) and (d) give me great concern, the ones that refer to a local municipality in Ontario and a local municipality in Quebec. I shall explain.

(2140)

I would like to replace this with my motion:

That Bill C-65 in clause 54 be amended by replacing lines 22 to 25 on page 14 with the following:

(c) one from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, wholly or partly within the national capital region

(d) one from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, wholly or partly within the national capital region.

My explanation for this is it has been the practice to have representation from local municipalities around the capital city of Ottawa. In Ontario a local municipality could be Sarnia, Kapuskasing, Smiths Falls, Kingston or a variety of other places. We have like in the province of Quebec, regional municipalities such as the Municipalité régionale d'Ottawa—Carleton, and we have, du côté de l'outaouais, la Municipalité régionale de l'Outaouais.

[*Translation*]

Just like Montreal has the MUC, the Montreal Urban Community. I may add that these regional municipalities represent several local municipalities.

So when the definition refers to a local municipality, this is not the same as a regional municipality. In this particular case, we must remember there is a difference between a local municipality and a regional municipality, which could be, Kapuskasing or Hearst, for instance. We should refer to the National Capital Region. And to justify this explanation, we consult the—

[*English*]

The National Capital Act, chapter N-4, section 2, gives a description of the national capital region. It gives a description of all the municipalities surrounding the national capital, Ottawa. In the description it talks of Gatineau, Aylmer, Hull and on the Ontario side it talks of Gloucester, Cumberland, Nepean and a dozen other local municipalities.

Government Orders

The reference here is that in the National Capital Act it is well defined what is meant by a local municipality. People do not juggle from one act to the other. When governments change and commission memberships change or board memberships change I would not appreciate seeing errors made and instead of having a representative from a local municipality of the national capital region, having a local municipality within the province of Ontario or the province of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

And now there will be representatives from the Province of Quebec. The last part mentions eight members from Canada generally. Ontario, of course, will not be left out. It will also have a representative among the additional eight.

[*English*]

The government is proposing the national commission should be reduced from 20 to 15 members appointed by the governor in council, which translates into a reduction of five members. It is something I agree with but, as I was stating, it is extremely important that the local municipality in the region be respected.

[*Translation*]

We have the city of Gloucester, for instance, where 52 per cent of the land belongs to the federal government. This means that there is a lot of negotiating with the federal government. Activities within the Greenbelt or at Ottawa Airport, for instance, are very restricted. Infrastructure projects always require agreements between the municipalities and the NCC.

(2145)

If you go from Ottawa to Cumberland, you have to go through Gloucester, and if you want to build sewer mains or water pipes, you have to negotiate agreements with the NCC. That is why it is so important for local municipalities within the National Capital Region to be included. The same applies on the Quebec side. For instance, we have Gatineau and also Aylmer, which is involved in the National Capital Region.

My motion reads as follows:

“(c) one from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region;

Paragraph (d) would read:

(d) one from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull, wholly or partly within the National Capital Region;

I appreciate the support I received for this amendment from the Minister responsible for the Privy Council and Intergovernmental Affairs and the government. This proves once again that the government is very flexible when it introduces legislation, and that it listens to government and opposition members when they make reasonable suggestions. Personally, I believe it is entirely reasonable to make sure that the wording of the bill is clear.

The way the bill was worded originally, my local municipality in Ontario was confusing and a local municipality in Quebec was confusing, and by ensuring that the local municipality is within the National Capital Region, either on the Quebec side or the Ontario side, we comply with the National Capital Act's definition of the boundaries of the region. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to explain the reasons for my amendment.

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking on the motions in Group No. 1, and I may have something to say on the other groups later. Thank you. I am pleased to speak once again in the debate on Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

As I mentioned in my last speech on this bill, Bill C-65 changes and reorganizes 15 federal agencies by reducing the number of their members. It also dismantles seven other federal organizations. I say dismantles, because their function becomes incorporated into a sector department, in certain instances, or is amalgamated with that of another organization.

There are 16 motions for amendment to this bill; 11 are from Bloc members, four are from the Reform member for Elk Island and one is from the Liberal member for Carleton—Gloucester, who has just spoken to us. I would first like to express my unequivocal support for Motions Nos. 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15, and 16 tabled by the members for Trois-Rivières, Chicoutimi, Châteauguay, Québec-Est and Joliette, respectively.

In essence, these motions recommend that the main appointments to the boards of government agencies be made only after consultation with the government of each province, not only Quebec, but of all the provinces in Canada, and with the approval of the standing committee of the House normally charged with matters concerning the sectoral department responsible for these agencies. In this case, Heritage Canada, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Industry and other departments are involved with certain agencies.

I invite the members of the House to also support Motions Nos. 4, 5, and 6, which I proposed and for which notices were given on May 15.

(2150)

These motions propose, respectively, that the appointments of the chairperson and vice-chairperson of the Canada Council, the executive director of the Canadian Film Development Corporation and a maximum of ten members including the chairperson of the Canadian Cultural Property Export Review Board be made only “following consultation with the government of each province and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers cultural matters—in this instance, the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

Government Orders

The idea of cutting political appointments by order in Council, in reality by the Prime Minister's office, is aimed at reducing the arbitrary decisions and the waste of public money. This bill tries to put an end to patronage and too high a number of what I would call almost honorary appointments.

However, *The Globe and Mail* has revealed over the past year that, despite Bill C-65, under the Liberal government, political appointments are being made with renewed vigour. In several instances, the elimination of any legal reference to advisory bodies leads us to question the genuineness of the Liberals' commitment to administrative transparency.

Will the House of Commons have a say regarding appointments to advisory bodies which will no longer have a legal status? Whither transparency? This question is central to the whole debate; Bill C-65 provides only a timid answer.

Under its present form and without the amendments brought forward by the Bloc Québécois, we cannot support this bill. The motions brought forward by the Bloc Québécois are aimed at making clearer and more transparent the appointment process to the boards of the bodies mentioned in there.

We are in agreement with Motion No. 13 presented by the member for Carleton—Gloucester to the effect that a member of the National Capital Commission, other than the chairperson and vice-chairperson, must come from a municipality in Ontario, other than the city of Ottawa—and the member adds—from a municipality wholly or partly within the National Capital Region.

Also, under the motion presented by the member for Carleton—Gloucester, a member of the Commission must come from a municipality in Quebec, other than the city of Hull—and the member adds—wholly or partly within the National Capital Region.

What would be more normal than having commission members come from the area covered by the National Capital Commission? We believe that this proposal is important and should be accepted. In a few minutes I will deal with the other groups.

[English]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my debate on Group No. 1 by saying that in general we in the Reform Party believe the provinces ought to be more involved in issues that affect them directly.

In general, we agree with the impetus of the motions in this group put forward by the members of the Bloc. I would like to qualify that agreement and also ask a question about the reasonableness of this in terms of the total amount of bureaucratic and administrative time that would be taken to administer these things as they are proposing.

They are basically saying that before the governor in council appointments are made they should be approved by the various provinces. Although I said that in general we agree the provinces should be more involved in the workings of our country, I do not believe it should be done in this way.

They speak of contacting the lieutenant governor in each province. If we stop to think about it, the lieutenant governor is an appointed, unelected position, so this is not necessarily going to get the democratic input from the people. That would probably be the greatest reason for us to oppose most of the motions in this group.

(2155)

I would like to speak about several of the motions. The hon. member from the Liberal Party who spoke earlier talked about the necessity of having input into the board of the National Capital Commission. He was quite concerned that there should be more representation from areas around the region. In other words, if they are not a part of Ottawa they should be included if they are adjacent to Ottawa.

There are two parts to the administration of the different functions. Whether it is the National Capital Commission, one of the museums, or something else, these people do two things. They generally oversee the administration of the facilities. And they are wonderful facilities; I do not want to minimize them in any way. However, another aspect of this, which is so important and which is overlooked, is that the taxpayers come from across the entire country.

I did not have the privilege of visiting the canal during the winter festival, but I was told by someone who went there that every garbage can has NCC written on it. In other words, the National Capital Commission owns the garbage cans. I suppose that is good. If there are people skating on the canal they have to have garbage cans, and if it is under the jurisdiction of the National Capital Commission then they should be identified. However, the question occurred to me: What possible fiscal interest could any voter living more than 100 miles away from Ottawa have in buying garbage cans for the city of Ottawa?

I would be opposed to the idea of concentrating more heavily the representation on the board in terms of the people who want to spend the money and try to increase it for those who are more distant, who would have a greater interest in trying to save the money.

It is sort of a spend versus save conflict we have, and it needs to be balanced according to the different regions. There is no doubt in my mind that the formula should specify very clearly which regions of the country the members should come from. I do not think it should necessarily be the lieutenant governor in the province who should be involved in the consultation. There should be a better mechanism for that. Perhaps it could be the choice of elected legislatures putting forward a slate from which people could be chosen.

Government Orders

While we appreciate the general principle the Bloc members are after, we would be opposed to most of the amendments on the basis of their practicality.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to take the floor on Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

My motion deals more specifically with the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, or ACOA, and reads as follows:

That Bill C-65, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 1, with the following:

“recommendations of the Minister, following consultation with the Lieutenant Governor of each province in Atlantic Canada and with the approval of the standing committee of the House of Commons, that normally considers matters relating to industry, to hold of—”

The goal of this motion is both simple and two fold. We would like that the government of each of the Atlantic provinces, as well as all the members normally interested in such matters, that is the members of the industry committee, be involved in the appointments.

(2200)

This would make for a better climate in government and fulfil a need. We know that it is rewarding to be a Liberal, as the *Globe and Mail* showed, but our amendment would avoid situations like the one we are experiencing, where the minister responsible for ACOA recently nominated political organizers to the board of a federal agency based in his riding.

This is the kind of thing we want to correct or at the very least avoid.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to some of the comments made on these amendments.

The Deputy Speaker: Excuse me. There are two other members who wish to speak. Would the member wish to wait until everybody else has spoken on these amendments? Is that acceptable? Very well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate on the amendments proposed by the official opposition to Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies. As you know, this bill amends the statutes that establish fifteen federal boards, agencies or commissions, in order to reorganize them or to reduce the

number of their members. The bill also dissolves seven federal organizations.

Since the bill received first reading on December 14, the official opposition has been emphasizing the importance of using this opportunity to improve the democratic process in the public service. Indeed, we feel it is important to democratize the appointment process for office holders within the organizations affected by this legislation. We want less patronage and more transparency. It is in that spirit that the Bloc is presenting a series of ten amendments.

I want to concentrate on the amendment which deals with subclause 25(2) of the bill. That clause amends a provision of the Emergency Preparedness Act. More specifically, the bill seeks to increase the ministerial responsibility. To that end, it more or less replaces Emergency Preparedness Canada by the minister himself. In other words, the minister will assume full responsibility with respect to the development and implementation of civil emergency plans.

It is in regard to the implementation of these plans that we want to make a suggestion to the government. Subclause 25(2) of the bill currently reads:

The responsibilities of the Minister with respect to the implementation of civil emergency plans are

(a) to monitor any potential, imminent or actual civil emergency and to report, as required, to other ministers on the emergency and any measures necessary for dealing with it;

We feel that the minister should also have to report to the government of each province. An emergency situation, whether potential, imminent or actual, is never something which takes place in isolation. It may be potential or obvious, but it always concerns a specific place, community, region or province. This is why we feel that provincial authorities should be informed of the measures taken by the federal minister responsible for emergency preparedness.

This is too good an opportunity to miss. I would like to refer to a civil emergency that has forever scarred my riding, the electoral district of Châteauguay. The events of the summer of 1990 were officially classified as a provincial emergency under the Emergency Preparedness Act as a matter of fact.

All the hon. members will remember that, on July 11, 1990, armed warriors withstood a tactical operation carried out by the Sûreté du Québec in the Oka area. Following this, another group of warriors blocked access to the Mercier bridge linking the greater Châteauguay area to Montreal Island. As a result of this coup de force, more than 80,000 commuters were unable to cross the bridge, with implications that are still underestimated. Peaceful people were the victims of this action. Businesses were closed, jobs were lost and incalculable time was lost because of detours.

Government Orders

(2205)

We know that the handling of this crisis was a disaster. This lack of initiative was one of the main reasons why the Liberals were defeated in the last provincial election. That government was weak. This was a government without backbone or vision and dependent on this Canadian constitution which no longer meets modern-day needs.

This government which has seen one of its cabinet members fly off to Ottawa after losing the last provincial election is now advocating the constitutional status quo like its leader. This status quo, however, could well plunge the city of Châteauguay into another crisis, since this constitution contains no specific division of responsibilities between the parties involved. After having demanded, with her former leader, constitutional changes, how can a former Quebec minister stand for the status quo? Moreover, no effort has been made to set up real negotiations between the native peoples and the federal government on their respective rights and responsibilities.

At least the federal government did not step in on its own initiative. It only acted at the request of the Quebec government, fortunately. We can easily assume that if the federal government had stepped in on its own, it would have messed up things even more.

Now, to get back to the case in point with Bill C-65. According to this piece of legislation, the minister would only have to report to his or her fellow cabinet members. Everybody will agree with me that, in such circumstances, it would be unthinkable for the Quebec government not to be officially informed of the measures taken by the minister.

This is a good example that shows the need for the amendment to Bill C-65 moved by the Bloc Québécois. We think it is important that the federal minister be required to report to his provincial counterpart when he implements civil emergency plans and more particularly when he monitors any situation of potential, imminent or real crisis. Public security requires positive discussions between all governments and public authorities.

The federal government should not overlook its responsibilities when it reorganizes or abolishes any of its agencies, as it does under Bill C-65. That is also true of the minister who becomes responsible for Emergency Preparedness Canada. His duty to co-ordinate with provincial and local authorities must not be limited to the development and implementation of civil emergency plans. He must also report to all public authorities concerned by the actions he will take in matters of civil defence, including provinces.

It is a question of good co-ordination but also a question of transparency. The federal government is concentrating powers in the hands of the ministers. This concentration increases the risk of abuse, discretionary decisions, partisan treatments and arbitrary choices. Therefore it is increasingly necessary to establish transparency mechanisms in order to preserve the integrity of the government.

The Auditor General of Canada keeps asking for such accountability mechanisms. They are even more necessary when power is placed in the hands of fewer people. This is what is happening now within the federal government, and Bill C-65 is another move in that direction.

This is why the Bloc Québécois is presenting amendments asking for more transparency. This is what we want when we ask that the minister responsible for civil preparedness be accountable to the provinces, when we ask that the lieutenant governor in council of each province be consulted before some of the appointments, when we ask that the appropriate standing committee of the House approve some of the appointments and when we ask that each provincial government be consulted before certain appointments.

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-65 received a lot of publicity. The minister responsible for the bill had announced very proudly that it was very important because it would have the effect of eliminating several government agencies that had become useless and cutting back others.

(2210)

There is no need to exaggerate the importance of this bill financially since we are talking about savings of only \$4 million. For the people who are listening to us, it takes only about an hour and a quarter for the Canadian deficit to absorb \$4 million.

Through this very important bill on the streamlining of some agencies and the elimination of others, the government will have made it possible to pay for an hour and a quarter of the Canadian deficit. This is not as important as the minister would have had us believe when he made the announcement.

On the other hand, there is something that could have been more important than the amount of money. We agree with trimming the government, and when it comes to savings, even a paltry \$4 million, we must seize the opportunity. This is not the reason why we are criticizing the government. If we criticize the government, it is because while saving these \$4 million, it could have taken the opportunity to improve the appointment process in these governmental agencies.

In its red book, chapter 6, the Liberal Party promised to restore integrity in our political institutions. One of the recommendations to increase this integrity is to have a thorough review of order in council appointments.

Government Orders

During all the years they were sitting in opposition, the Liberals were always criticizing the political appointments made by the Conservative government and they were promising to review the whole appointment system for people sitting on boards, commissions and agencies.

Unfortunately, in this bill, the government is not proposing anything radical to change this appointment system which allows the government to reward its friends. If the Liberal Party had wanted to keep its promise, it would have added a clause specifying that all appointments should be approved by a parliamentary committee.

The government did not have the courage to do that. It preferred to maintain an unclear partisan appointment system. Its decision to simply reduce the number of board members is only a diversion tactic. The appointment process in itself remains the same.

To prove it, I would like to quote major changes made in this bill. For example, let us take the Petro-Canada Limited Act. Section 64 to be amended by the bill reads as follows:

“There shall be a Board of Directors of the Corporation consisting of the Chairman of the Board, the President of the Corporation and not more than thirteen other persons”.

This was the old section. The new clause reads as follows:

“There shall be a Board of Directors of the Corporation consisting of the Chairperson of the Board, the President of the Corporation and one other person.”

The only fundamental difference between these two versions is that the number of directors is reduced from 15 to 3. I can see savings related to the attendance fees paid by these corporations to directors.

The second subclause deals with the way directors are appointed to the corporation. Under the old section, the thirteen other directors of Petro-Canada, for example, were appointed by the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to hold office during pleasure for a term not exceeding three years.

The new clause provides that the director still to be appointed, since the chairperson and the president of the corporation are ex officio members, the director who is neither the chairperson of the board nor the president of the corporation shall also be appointed by the minister, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to hold office during pleasure for a term not exceeding three years. Therefore, nothing has changed.

(2215)

When we look at both texts, we realize that the only thing changed is the number of board members. Nothing at all has been changed in the vague and partisan process of appointing people to these boards. That is why we say that this system must go. Measures have to be taken to put an end to the patronage system.

Let me quote, as an example, a very well-documented article published in the *Globe and Mail* of February 7, under the headline: «Liberal loyalty being rewarded with jobs, jobs, jobs». The article explained the philosophy of the Liberals on party friends. According to the article, more than 100 persons close to the Liberals were appointed over the first fifteen months of the Chrétien government: former candidates; a nephew of the Prime Minister; a fundraiser for the party; an organizer, and mostly, more than 15 defeated candidates who have all been generously rewarded for services rendered to the Liberal Party, out of the public purse. This is the function of crown corporations.

The recent appointment of Jacques Saada, Liberal candidate defeated in La Prairie, is one of the most obvious examples of patronage. Mr. Saada, who is a friend of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, was hired to implement a communication plan for CIDA.

Since Mr. Saada is a translator by trade, we have a hard time figuring out where he acquired the experience and the expertise required to prepare a communication plan for CIDA. Moreover, his contract amounts to a tidy \$99,150 for one year. What a coincidence. It is just under the \$100,000 limit over which the government has to call for tenders, in which case Mr. Saada would likely not have won because of his lack of experience and expertise in that area. The name is Saada.

Sometimes we have difficulty understanding when friends are involved. We can easily forget their names, but I am glad to remind the House of it. That explains the importance they wanted to give to the bill. These are the savings to be made. But fundamentally there is nothing changed. Friends of the government will continue to be appointed to the boards of large crown corporations et large para-governmental corporations. They could at least have done things differently.

Many of those large agencies, and this is another feature of this bill, have an impact on the taxation of provinces and many of those agencies and boards in the bill definitely have an impact. Nowhere in the amendments proposed by the government are provinces consulted nor do they take part in the decisions which are taken. This is why we have proposed an amendment, a motion. That is Motion No. 16 that I moved, seconded by my colleague for La Prairie, which reads: “That Bill C-65, in Clause 64, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 17, with the following:”

The board members I spoke about earlier should be appointed by the minister to hold office during pleasure, but not in a discretionary way; they should be appointed by the minister following consultation with the government of each province, since these corporations have an influence on the administration of the provinces, and with the approval of the governor in council and, moreover, of the standing committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to industry.

If we want to practice openness to improve the situation, if we want to fundamentally change what is not working properly, we must be straightforward and honest and deal with the real problems.

I hope this amendment will be supported not only by my colleagues of the opposition, but also by my Liberal friends across the way.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to the bill and to respond to some of the comments made by the members of the Bloc Quebecois and the member for Elk Island.

The amendment moved by the member for Carleton—Gloucester is a constructive amendment which the government accepts. It is the kind of amendment which contributes to the nature of the bill in recognizing that regional interest must be served.

(2220)

We do not think, however, that regional interest should be served specifically in the bill on a national basis. The member for Carleton—Gloucester moved that regional interest be recognized on a local basis in the national capital region. That seems appropriate, but regional representation is only one element of the qualifications for boards and agencies.

In a broader sense the amendments offered by the member for Elk Island and the members of the Bloc Quebecois fall under two categories. The first is that the provinces must play a larger role in appointments. Appointments made by the federal government under federal government legislation should be subject to provincial approval.

The point raised by the member for Elk Island is a very sensible one. This is a cumbersome, costly and time consuming process. Moreover, reciprocity does not exist. The provincial governments do not offer the capacity for the federal government to approve provincial government appointments made by their lieutenant governor in council. Surely some reciprocity on this basis must exist.

In this respect the bill is to simplify federal government agencies. It is part of a process begun in the budget of February 1994. What has occurred since that time is that we have eliminated 150 patronage positions with the bill. This is the first stage of agency review. The second stage will take place later in the fall and it will eliminate 350 so-called patronage positions.

Government Orders

When we look at the total numbers, this is the first time I can recall since the second world war that there has been any reduction in patronage positions. This is a radical reduction and it is something to be commended.

The member for Joliette said that the reduction amounts to only \$4 million. I am sure the member for Elk Island will agree that this is not a meagre amount. It is a significant contribution and it is a pattern for the process the government is going through under agency review and in the budget itself.

In terms of the standing committees the Bloc amendments tend to emphasize the need for standing committees to approve of the appointments. The standing orders currently allow committees to review appointments made by the governor in council to non-judicial bodies.

We are not seeking to revise the parliamentary system in the bill. Certainly in terms of standing committees there may need to be in the future some revision in the work they do. However, in this bill we are working to simplify, we are working to do it quickly, and we are working to deal with what we have now. In that respect the amendments offered are not constructive at this time.

I emphasize that this is a bill to simplify government, to make it more efficient, and to fulfil the aims we have expressed in the red book and in the budget.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 1. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division stands deferred. This also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16.

The next question is on Motion No. 13. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), the recorded division on Motion No. 13 stands deferred.

(2225)

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-65, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14, on page 2, with the following:

“the Corporation consisting of two directors, not including the Chairperson and the pres—”.

He said: Mr. Speaker, once again we have the challenge of persuading the government members since they outnumber us. In the next few moments I will try to persuade them to our point of view.

This motion specifically concerns the CBC and its board of directors. We are all aware that Bill C-65 reduces the number of directors from 15 to 12. We have the horse headed in the right direction and somebody will have to slap its rump so that it gets going.

To go from 15 to 12 directors, we barely started doing it. We want to be a little more dramatic in our cutting of the CBC board because we feel the functions it performs could be efficiently carried out by two members, a chairman and the president.

It is unfortunate we do not have full freedom in the House to do whatever we want. Maybe that is okay, it helps to limit us from bizarre decisions. The amendment we would have really liked to make would be that CBC be privatized or sold to private interests.

We think it is time CBC make money for the country, that its shareholders should make a profit and should all pay some taxes instead of taxpayers funding the broadcasting organization.

In saying this I am certainly not speaking against the CBC. I am one of many Canadians who enjoys the CBC and certain parts of its programming. It is not all bad, it is not all useless. It has a lot of very good public service time. Some of its musical programs are excellent.

We object to its being such a sinkhole for taxpayers' dollars. CBC radio operates without commercials and I guess we could argue that if we listen to other radio stations we pay for them through the products we buy. We indirectly pay for the advertis-

ing costs those producers incur by advertising on other radio or television stations.

CBC television, on the other hand, has ample advertising. It has such a large share of the market potential. It was in there ahead of the game and taxpayers funded a great deal of hardware for it. They gave it the inroad into many markets not originally viable financially.

Why in the present day of modern technology with very efficient and excellent ways of communicating electronically with people can this organization not now be turned around and made into a profit producing organization?

As long as it stays under government control with government subsidization most likely this will not happen. That is why we favour privatizing the CBC. We believe good solid entrepreneurs could turn it into a real money making machine.

A person who started a small television station out west told me a few years ago that having a television station was like having a printing press to print money. It was very lucrative 20 years ago. He has had difficult times more recently.

We want to support a substantial reduction in the size of the board of directors. If we had had the total freedom to do what we wanted we would have reduced them to zero with the recommendation to privatize. However, we were told that would be outside the limits of this bill and would be ruled as an illegal amendment. So we compromised. We knew we already had them going in the right direction by reducing the number of members from 15 to 12, so we should just take 10 more off and we would be down to two and that would do the trick for now and would give a very clear message as to the direction in which we would choose to go.

(2230)

We also want to indicate that the CBC, as other crown corporations, must get the message very clearly that they have to become more efficient. They need to operate with lower costs and wherever possible with as large a generation of income as possible. That is the message that goes along with this amendment. It reflects the Reform Party's position that we ought not to be taking by coercion money from Canadians via the medium of taxation in order to fund a particular point of view. We believe that the marketplace would carry that through.

It has been enlightening in the last little while to find that the CRTC has been giving approval to some types of broadcasting companies that before this would not have been considered. So there is that move anyway, and we feel that this would hasten it.

We are the stewards of the money entrusted to us by the Canadian taxpayer. Consequently, in promoting and encouraging support for this motion we are simply strengthening that message. I urge all members opposite, who by their majority have the power to determine how things will be, to think very carefully and do the right thing here.

Government Orders

We know that the deficit and the debt need to be cut. The CBC, with its access to the Canadian taxpayer dollars of over a billion dollars per year, has to undergo a very rapid restructuring.

With that, I simply urge the people to support this amendment and get the show on the road. Let us get that horse moving.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, representatives of the Canadian provinces would greatly appreciate being consulted about the appointments to all agencies mentioned in Bill C-65.

I would like to mention here two of those representatives to whom I wrote recently. Ken Rostad, the Alberta minister for federal and intergovernmental affairs, had this to say: "We appreciated greatly being informed of the suggestions you made in this debate concerning consultation with provincial governments".

Let me quote also Mr. Stephen Kakfwi, the minister of intergovernmental and aboriginal affairs of the Northwest Territories: "We do not oppose this fundamental principle of consultation. If your motions recognize territorial governments for the purposes of consultation, the Northwest Territories government could support those motions".

These quotations speak for themselves.

Concerning Motion No. 2 moved by the hon. member for Elk Island, I have to say we do not support it, because it involves reducing from twelve to four the number of directors on the CBC board. We all know that this kind of board is often a haven for political friends, and that real decisions are made by the chairman and the president and chief executive officer under the approving eye of the minister. Bringing down to four the number of board members, as in the case of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, would risk turning it into even more of select club where, between friends, they would decide on the allocation and use of taxpayers' money.

We have to change that practice and ensure better provincial representation, better representation for Quebec. The number of members on the CBC board of directors has to be kept to twelve, with a fair representation for Quebec.

(2235)

I would also like to take this opportunity to make a few comments on the three other motions put forward by the hon. member for Elk Island. The Bloc Québécois is in favour of and supports Motions Nos. 10 and 11 put forward by the Reform member. The Bloc wants to maintain a National Archives of Canada Advisory Board, and to ensure that a committee of the House of Commons composed of two members from the govern-

ment party and three members from opposition parties be authorized, as required by Motions Nos. 10 and 11, to select seven out of the ten members of this advisory board. That is the price for openness, and we will thus prevent the government from politicizing the operation of this National Archives of Canada Advisory Board.

One could wonder how this kind of advisory council, with such a technical mandate, could have any political influence.

In April 1986, the federal government ordered the destruction of a large part of the archives kept by the Canadian Unity Information Office, which would have helped to determine the rather obscure role the federal government played in the 1980 referendum campaign and the full amount of funds invested beyond what the Quebec legislation allowed.

Nevertheless, since the documentation has been destroyed, we have estimated that the federal government spent about \$17.5 million on the NO campaign during the 1980 referendum. An advisory board partially composed of members from opposition parties might have avoided the destruction of these archives, which was done only for partisan purposes, to hide the role Ottawa played in 1980 and the excess amount the federal government invested at that time.

To conclude, I just want to add that we are in favour of amendment No. 8, put forward by the Reform member, which provides for Emergency Preparedness Canada to submit an annual report to the House of Commons.

Three of the four motions moved by the hon. member for Elk Island seek to give Parliament better control over the management of government operations and to allow opposition members to monitor more closely the operations of the National Archives of Canada. We support Motions Nos. 8, 10 and 11.

If Bill C-65 is passed, Emergency Preparedness Canada will come under the Minister of Defence. Emergency Preparedness Canada will no longer be a separate agency for budgetary purposes. Why then should a service under the Minister of National Defence have to table a separate annual report in the House of Commons? We agree that Emergency Preparedness Canada should be accountable to Parliament and the best way to ensure that this happens is to have the agency table in the House of Commons an annual report which would then be directly examined by Parliamentarians. So, we support this motion put forward by the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the comments of the member for Elk Island on the excellence of CBC programming. I share his views in that respect.

Government Orders

The difficulty with this motion by the member for Elk Island is that the proposal to reduce the CBC board of directors from twelve to two plus the president and the chairperson to form the board would in effect render the CBC's programming excellence that we just heard complimented operationally dysfunctional.

Secondly, there is a more technical reason why this amendment cannot be supported by the government. The statutory committee structure of the CBC board of directors would be rendered redundant. Under the Broadcasting Act the corporation has to have two permanent committees on English and French programming, plus an audit committee of at least three directors. With a board of two directors of course these committees would again be operationally dysfunctional. Therefore a subsequent amendment to the Broadcasting Act would be required. Naturally that is a separate exercise from this bill and one we did not intend in the presentation of this bill.

Finally, the regional representation would be dramatically affected. With only two directors it would be impossible to recognize all of Canada's regions and diverse interests and therefore it would completely undermine regional representation.

It is therefore impossible for the government to support this amendment.

(2240)

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 2. All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

Debate is on Motion No. 8, Group No. 3.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-65, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 3, on page 8, with the following:

"26. The Act is amended by adding the following after section 6:

"6.1 The Minister may, with the approval of"".

He said: Mr. Speaker, we spoke about the proposed changes to Bill C-65 to reduce the number of members of the board.

Motion No. 8 is a little different. It has to do with the Minister of Public Works and his requirement to oversee emergency preparedness in the country. That is a very important role. In this instance, we feel there is one small change that would be required. I would like to persuade members opposite this time by appealing to the red book.

The red book has become the standard by which we gauge whether or not legislation is effective and whether it is going in the right direction. The red book said there would be more openness, more accountability, and a renewed trust in government. This amendment is very small, but it is in that direction. I do not think it is so dramatic an amendment that members of the Liberal Party could in any way be against it. It does go in the right direction and it does not go so far that they should be frightened by it. It simply requires that the minister report annually on his activities and on the degree of emergency preparedness that is in place. That is a very important aspect for the security of the country, for a country that is ready to deal with emergencies of all kinds, whether they are civil insurrections or natural disasters.

We are simply asking the minister to open up a little and report annually. I do not know whether members know what is involved. For example, the minister has the power to require that the railroads have a one-year supply of fuel on hand, so that if for some reason the normal supplies of fuel are destroyed by some disaster, either natural or through some sort of an act of war, we would still be able to operate our railroads for a reasonable length of time. It is good for Canadians to know what kinds of arrangements the minister has made in this area.

What we are asking is very simple. I plead with members opposite, in order to fulfil the promises of the red book, to vote in favour of the amendment. It would provide a little more openness, a little more accountability, and a little more transparency. It would go a long way in undoing some of the criticism that has been levelled at them in terms of their being secretive and too closed.

I will abbreviate my comments because of the urgency of the day. I will gladly stop speaking in exchange for the commitment of Liberal members to support the amendment.

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has spoken most eloquently about the need for transparency

and openness. He has also spoken often in the House of Commons about the word "economy". In the case of this motion the two purposes are in conflict.

(2245)

I say this with respect to the hon. member's amendment. This motion seems to perpetuate the requirement that the minister lay before Parliament an annual report on the operations of the act.

The rationale for eliminating annual reports is government-wide. It is an attempt to lower costs and is focused on reducing associated preparation costs. We intend to provide new mechanisms such as expanded Part III estimates, and most important, new department outlet documents will be provided to parliamentary committees for this review.

In this case the argument for economy is a very cogent one. There are other means through which transparency and openness will be provided.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 8. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Motion No. 8 stands deferred.

We will move to Group No. 4 with debate on Motions Nos. 10 and 11.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-65, in Clause 49, be amended by replacing lines 10 and 11, on page 13, with the following:

"49. Subsection 9(1) of the Act is replaced by the following:

"9. (1) The Minister shall establish a board to be known as the National Archives of Canada Advisory Board, consisting of the Archivist, the National Librarian, the Director of the Canadian Museum of Civilization and not more than seven other members appointed, from among persons who are experienced

Government Orders

in archival matters, by a committee of the House of Commons composed of two members from the government party and three members from opposition parties.""

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-65 be amended by deleting Clause 50.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am having a busy evening but I am still smiling. I have to concede it is somewhat frustrating to have such well thought out amendments, which I sincerely believe are defensible, decided against by the members opposite. It is a bit of a rebuff but I will try to live with it and I will recover by tomorrow. The Liberals now have an opportunity to redeem themselves by supporting Motions Nos. 10 and 11.

The National Archives have a problem. The amount of material to be saved keeps growing. It grows and grows. Until now to dispose of things the administration of the archives had to consult with the members of the board. These members, who are GIC appointments, held the archivists responsible for not destroying records which should be kept.

It is almost like having a Senate, a place of sober second thought, but a real one. It is a case of: "Here is a decision to throw something away. Do you agree?" Perhaps the judgment of one person could be flawed. Perhaps that person could miss something that is important. It would be an advantage to have more people involved to provide for checks and balances against discarding material which others would have the insight to recognize might have value in the future and should be kept.

In this instance the amendment would only require a very small expenditure. It says that the national archives advisory board should not be eliminated entirely. This is a change in the system. Sometimes members of the Reform Party are charged with only wanting to cut, cut, cut. We want to cut in the right places. We want to manage the fiscal affairs of the country so that we do not have cut in areas where cuts are unwarranted. This is one area where we want to retain the powers.

I want to give an example. We presently have in the country and in Parliament a very sharp division on what is important. The members of the Bloc Quebecois are very interested in taking their province out of the country and the rest of us want to keep Canada together.

The individual looking at the archives' records may have a certain historical perspective and even a certain present political perspective. It could cloud the decision of whether certain documents should be kept or destroyed. That is why we are strongly recommending that the decision not be made by an individual, but that there should be consultation involved. This small board would have a very real and very important function.

Government Orders

(2250)

Consequently I am recommending that the backbenchers in this instance exercise their powers of thinking and cogitation to consider very carefully the argument I have made and notwithstanding anything they have been led to believe earlier today, think of the weight of the arguments and vote in favour to the amendment.

Mr. John English (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is a very important matter.

I believe the member for Elk Island raises some important points about the retention of certain records and the importance of the decision prior to destruction.

Currently the situation is that all proposals for destruction under the care of the archivist must be reviewed internally. There will be an examination of all contractual and legal obligations, the importance of the records in relation to the mandate of the National Archives, and that the National Archives acquisition policy must determine if these specimens or copies are held in other depositories.

I am inclined to agree with the member for La Prairie that it is deplorable that some records have been destroyed in the past which fall within the purview of historical records of importance. It is important that a board of this kind recognize at all times the importance of the historicity of records.

I do not think this amendment responds to that need. The current board of voluntary users effectively scrutinizes historical records. Moreover, the archivist has undertaken to establish a voluntary panel of experts on archives matters which will represent a cross section of interests across Canada, representing users, institutions and archival communities. This board will preserve historical records as is necessary.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 76.1(8) a recorded division on the motion stands deferred. The recorded division will also apply to Motion No. 11.

* * *

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

Hon. Allan Rock (for the Minister of Human Resources Development) moved that Bill C-54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you would find in the interests of expediting the business of the House that the time between now and 11.30 p.m. could be divided among the three parties in the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to begin third reading debate on Bill C-54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada Pension Plan, the Children's Allowance Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act.

I am pleased to do so for two reasons. First, as chair of the House of Commons committee on human resources development I had the opportunity to review the legislation in detail when it went through clause by clause consideration. I want to thank the members of that committee on all sides of the House for their careful work in examining the provisions of this sometimes complex and very technical bill.

(2255)

Second, I thank the officials of the human resources development department, the income security programs division, for their patience in explaining the complex, technical aspects of these programs.

Particularly I thank those groups who came on short notice and made representations to the committee on behalf of seniors and Canadians with disabilities who are most affected by this legislation. I especially to thank the Council of Canadians with disabilities and the one voice, the Canadian Seniors Network, for their valuable contribution to the work of the committee studying Bill C-54.

Second, I am pleased to speak to the legislation as a regular member of Parliament for whom sorting out difficulties with the various components of the Canada pension system is an important part of my regular constituency work.

By and large these difficulties are of two types. First of all, it is financial, questions about the adequacy and the timeliness of benefits, conditions for entitlement, sudden or unexplained

Government Orders

changes to the level of benefits and other matters of that sort that bother the seniors or those who are dependent on this stream of income for their income security.

The second category of difficulties with elements of the Canadian pension system that members of Parliament are frequently called on to deal with are administrative in nature: the mechanisms for applying for benefits, rules pertaining to the delegation, the splitting or the reassignment of pension benefits or credits, appeals dealing with errors and overpayments sometimes which are caused by the bureaucracy, and finally, matters of security and confidentiality.

It is primarily this latter set of concerns that are addressed by Bill C-54. The bill improves services to clients. It allows for improved co-ordination and more efficient program administration and service delivery. It increases the consistency between the old age security and Canada pension plan programs. It also reduces administrative costs. It minimizes duplication and paper burden to clients and various departments, and it will also help members of Parliament to better assist their constituents.

According to estimates by the Department of Human Resources Development, the proposed amendments to Bill C-54 would benefit about 1.4 million senior citizens with no net cost to the taxpayer. Expected savings from the amendments will total approximately \$10 million annually, largely as a result of more efficient program administration.

I would like to go through in the time that is available some of the aspects of this legislation for the House this evening. For nearly 1.4 million seniors, many of whom are women, at present they must reapply annually to receive the guaranteed income supplement and spouse's allowance benefits. At that time they must make a statement of income even though the income of many does not change significantly from year to year, being limited to old age security and perhaps Canada pension plan benefits.

Payments for the new fiscal year cannot be made until the application is received and approved. As a result, each April up to 100,000 low and middle income pensioners may suffer hardship when benefits are delayed due to late application or a need to verify the information on the application.

This legislation allows the Minister of Human Resources Development to waive the requirement for annual renewal applications for GIS and SPA benefits for any month or months in the following year. The proposed sections of the bill would require the minister in situations where he or she had waived the requirement for an application to give written notice to the pensioner when a subsequent application was required.

(2300)

The minister would have to meet certain time limits in this regard. These changes would avoid an interruption in benefits for those pensioners and would improve service and administration. There might also be implications for benefit overpayments and underpayments.

Generally what this legislation does is eliminate the need for inconvenient and costly reapplication when that is not necessary because for the most part the information is already in the possession of the department.

The second category has to do with reconsiderations and appeals. Clause 16 of the legislation allows a person to satisfy, with a decision or a determination relating to the payment or the amount of the benefit, to make a request to the minister within certain time limits for reconsideration of the decision, after which the minister could confirm or vary it.

A person dissatisfied with the minister's decision could appeal it to the Canada pension plan, old age security review tribunal established under the Canada pension plan. Where the basis of the appeal was an incorrect ministerial decision about the income of the applicant, the beneficiary or spouse of either of these, the appeal can be referred to the Tax Court of Canada. This legislation thereby facilitates portions of the appeal process.

Another category is retroactive payments. Clients often apply for OAS-CPP retirement benefits at the same time. If application is made after age 65 retroactive old age security benefit payments are made but the Canada pension plan provides for an actuarial increase in the value of the benefit. The result is that benefits that begin to be paid after age 65 are treated differently by the two programs.

With clause 3 of the bill, the section on the Old Age Security Act, section 2(a), periods of retroactive payments to the two programs would be harmonized. The period would be set at a maximum of one year, a reduction from the present maximum of five years in the case of old age security benefits. In the case of retroactive payments a streamlining takes place as a result of the bill.

In this area the council on disabilities made an important contribution to the legislation which I acknowledge. In this case the council led the standing committee to adopt an amendment to the bill which provides for retroactive, early retirement benefits for some recipients of CPP disability benefits. The provision is intended to mitigate to some extent the loss of income for a person no longer eligible for a disability benefit and to assist that person to reduce the amount of overpayment which must be returned to the program. This provision was always intended to be optional for the client.

Government Orders

The government never intended to reduce the options available to clients but the council pointed out the wording of this provision in Bill C-54 would be construed as requiring the client to take the early retirement pension.

To address the concern raised by the council, the government moved an amendment accepted in the standing committee. The government listened to the concerns expressed by the council and these concerns are now reflected in the revised wording of this provision of Bill C-54.

There were numerous other areas in which amendments were made to the bill in response to the input by these groups representing Canadians with disabilities and seniors affected by this legislation.

The bill, which streamlines in many ways the administration of this legislation, is vital to seniors and to those people dependent on these programs because of the complexity this legislation by necessity has to be designed to accommodate in so many different circumstances. Seniors, many of whom live in isolated communities, cannot afford to have their payments disrupted by administrative processes very often far beyond their understanding.

(2305)

By working to simplify the legislation and streamline the process for applying, for reconsidering, for splitting, for delegating benefits that apply to seniors and to persons with disabilities through the Canadian pension system, we are helping Canadians facilitate access to this very important aspect of the Canadian safety net.

That is the nature of the changes in Bill C-54. They reflect the government's concern for making this vital component of the Canadian social security system accessible to those who depend on it for their livelihood, for their basic fundamental income security and in that respect enabling seniors in Canada to have a greater assurance and confidence that as they move into their old age they will be able to count on secure and regular support from the Canadian government.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: According to our agreement, the hon. member for Argenteuil—Papineau now has the floor for 12 minutes.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, obviously, I had prepared a 40 minute speech, but given the requests of our whips, I agreed to cut down my time on the floor.

I would like to speak to the House regarding Bill C-54 and I will focus on the act to amend the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan. The official opposition proposed several

amendments to this bill in order to protect seniors from injustice.

First, in Motion No. 1 we proposed the following amendments. In summary, this amendment by the Bloc Québécois aimed to keep the appeals processes for the Canada pension plan and the old age security program separate.

What was the answer we received on May 8 to this first amendment we proposed regarding Bill C-54? The Minister of Human Resources Development went on a violent, undignified and even indecent rampage, calling our amendments bizarre, incomprehensible and absurd. According to the minister, I have a twisted mind and I take a perverted pleasure in complicating the lives of seniors.

The minister wound up with the comment that our amendments were the strangest, most bizarre and most incomprehensible amendments that he has seen in a long time in the House. He also mentioned that if I had truly understood Bill C-54, I would not have proposed such absurd amendments. Unfortunately for the Minister of Human Resources Development, he confused Motion No. 2 with subclause 2 of Motion No. 1.

Bill C-54 integrates the appeals process for the Canada pension plan with that of the old age security program. On May 8, when this amendment was introduced in this House, I reported what the attorney general had said: "The two-tiered appeal process for Old Age Security permits the satisfactory settlement of the few cases there are. The process is simple, fast and informal, and cases are heard in the regions where the appellants live".

Furthermore, the auditor general openly criticized the three-tiered appeals process of the Canada pension plan. So, why propose to integrate the two appeals processes and to use the process under the Canada pension plan, which the auditor general deems to be deficient? Clearly, they are not simplifying the appeals process. In what way will this improve client services?

Lastly, the Pension Appeals Board was authorized to appoint temporary members. At the present time, someone who is not satisfied with a decision made under the Canada Assistance Plan has the right to appeal at three different levels.

First level appeals are to the Minister of Human Resources Development. Second level appeals are heard by review tribunals established under the Act. Finally, third level appeals are heard by the Pension Appeals Board. Why change an appeal process which, according to the Auditor General, works well to replace it with a more complicated one?

(2310)

The Bloc Québécois disagrees with this streamlining of appeals under the Old Age Security Act and the Canada Pension Plan because it is not an improvement.

Government Orders

Let us not forget the importance of this amendment since statistics reveal that in 1993-94, there were 23,046 first level appeals, an increase of 0.5 per cent compared to the previous year. Of that number, 83 per cent concern disability benefits. A total of 27,077 appeals were processed during those years.

On Motions Nos. 4, 13 and 15 I supported my colleague for Mercier since the Bloc Quebecois cannot support the provisions of Bill C-54 intended to change access to certain information since the government can increase the number of departments, agencies or even individuals that will have access to information for the purpose of implementing the acts modified by this bill. Agencies having access to information according to the previous act were: the Departments of Revenue, Finance, Supply and Services, Employment and Immigration Commission, Statistics Canada and provincial authorities.

These agencies can have access to the information as long as it deals solely with the entitlement of beneficiaries or the amount of benefits, or if their disclosure is essential to the legislation's application.

When I supported these amendments, I said that we have to be extremely careful when giving personal information on senior citizens since it could be used for other purposes. We have to protect our senior citizens against potential abuse. The government did not prove that disclosing this privileged information was essential and necessary.

I said also that governments are becoming more and more intrusive. This government has the gall to claim that it is a good thing to include Canada Post on the ground that, through the use of new techniques, it could help accelerate the processing of pension cheques.

We noticed time and time again that the government cannot deal with its own administrative problems, and we recently had the best possible example of that when some seniors had trouble getting their income supplement cheques. We cannot condone government intrusion in the private lives of senior citizens and citizens in general.

This major change, even if used in accordance with the present provisions of the Privacy Act, is an intrusion that the Bloc Quebecois cannot accept. Moreover, we proposed in Motions Nos. 5 and 6, amendments which did not seek to remove Clause 23 entirely, but to amend it. For example, they would have kept the one year delay before collecting overpayments and forced the minister to remit the debt in the cases mentioned. For example, in section 37 the one-year statute of limitation is maintained.

The government is incapable of dealing with these matters within a reasonable time frame. The abolition of this clause, which accordingly does away with the limitation or claim on the overpayment, is an obvious example of the government's loss of control.

I repeat here the remarks of the auditor general in his report to the effect that pension fund overpayments amount to between \$120 million and \$220 million a year. He said: "Past efforts to prevent and detect overpayments have been minimal and largely ineffective". I am quoting the auditor general's report for 1993, at page 486.

The auditor general also indicated that over 90 per cent of appeals concerned applications for disability benefits under the Canada Pension Plan.

(2315)

Does the provision that would permit the minister to stay benefits during the appeal process together with the increase in the number of unjustified appeals by the department not in fact cover up a shameful way to reduce overpayments?

Clearly, at some point or other, many old people will be faced with administrative errors by the government. They may have received money they were not entitled to, without necessarily realizing it. How can seniors repay a significant amount all of a sudden and budget accordingly?

That is why the Bloc Quebecois proposed, in order to remedy this situation, that the one year limitation on overpayments that are not the result of fraudulent acts be imprescriptible so as to force the government to improve management of the program and to not unduly penalize seniors, who could have to pay back significant amounts a number of years after an error was made.

Bill C-54 provides that, in these cases, the minister may "remit". We have proposed there be no discretionary power in the above cases, to protect the interests of seniors. I have also proposed in Motion No. 12 the following amendment, which is of prime importance: "That Bill C-54 be amended by deleting Clause 38", which reads as follows:

"Where a decision is made by a Review Tribunal or the Pension Appeals Board in respect of a benefit, the Minister may stay payment of the benefit until the latest of [three dates]" .

The amendment proposed by the Bloc Quebecois, the official opposition, is intended to not allow the government to stay payments during appeals, because these appeals are the result of the government's inability to manage these programs. I assume the Minister of Human Resources Development also finds this amendment bizarre. How do we tell seniors that they may enjoy their rights, but are not entitled to receive the money they need to live on during the proceedings?

I made a presentation on seniors' incomes when I introduced my motion on May 8. Clearly they are not rich. I conclude here with the question, why must we insist on reducing the deficit on the backs of the most disadvantaged, on the backs of seniors? I repeat my question to the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in the House tonight to speak to Bill C-54, an act to amend several social programs, including the Canada pension plan.

Tonight I would like to speak in some detail about the Canada pension plan, the amendments proposed to it in the bill, and more generally about the policy direction of the Liberal government and the minister on CPP.

The bill is nothing more than administrative housekeeping. It is designed to improve minor flaws in the current system, but it ignores, as the government has ignored, the very severe problems our social programs face.

The Canada pension plan is a nightmare. The unfunded liabilities of the plan rival our national debt. Those liabilities were estimated to be \$491 billion in 1993. That is \$491 billion that must either be taxed from future generations, our children and our grandchildren, or it may mean that seniors will have to forgo some of their benefits. Neither scenario is pleasant.

The Superintendent of Financial Institutions reported in February that CPP will be out of funds in just 20 years. Realistically, we have very little time to act to correct the situation. We have been here a year and a half, yet the Liberal government has offered us only a bill written by the bureaucracy for the bureaucracy.

In the past year CPP ran its first deficit, seemingly a small amount in comparison to the many billions of dollars of benefits paid out. The government dipped into the contingency fund for \$650 million.

(2320)

Suddenly the bureaucracy woke up. Even though the contingency fund is over \$40 billion, the not so astute central planners had invested all the funds in 20-year loans to the provinces with low interest. As anyone can see, this means that only approximately \$2 billion is actually liquid in any given year. Therefore, last year panic set in as human resources development bureaucrats suddenly realized that one-third of the available cash in the contingency fund was going to be used up meeting benefit obligations.

The story does not end here, however. Benefit payouts are projected to increase faster than premiums can be collected. In the next few years we may face a crisis as deficits climb past the point of sustainability. Change must come quickly if we are to preserve the integrity of the social programs for those who depend on them.

Many Canadians are confused about the reasons the Canada pension plan is not financially sustainable. It is really quite simple. Unlike private pension plans or other savings plans, the premiums paid are not invested and then returned to the individ-

ual with interest upon retirement. Rather, the premiums paid are used to fund current beneficiaries, with a small portion going to the contingency fund. This would not be a totally unreasonable situation if the demographics of the population never changed. Canada has an aging population. An increasingly higher percentage of the population depends on CPP for their retirement. Correspondingly, a lower percentage of Canadians are left in the workforce to fund the retirees. This situation will only worsen as the baby boom generation reaches retirement age.

If members think this plan sounds irresponsible, I agree with them. I imagine that most members on that side of the House have no problem with this. After all, the Liberals have done exactly the same thing with their budget. They overspend today, taking on debt that future generations will have to pay back. They force future generations to pay for this generation. Some might even call this financial abuse of children.

The Canada pension plan is no different. Today's working mothers and fathers are directly subsidizing today's retirees, and our children and grandchildren will be forced to subsidize us. Based on the current projections there will be no CPP for my children and grandchildren. It will only exist for this self-serving generation. Serious reforms are necessary and are needed immediately to fix this problem. However, we have a lack of leadership from this government.

There are some good improvements proposed in Bill C-54 for the Canada pension plan. There is some streamlining of the appeals process, a possible reduction in overpayments to recipients. There is simplification in the delegation of authority, simplification of the division, reinstatement and assignment of benefits. These are good and worthy benefits to be approved by this House. It will help Canadians and reduce a few costs, but it fails to deal with the most important aspect of pension reform. It fails to deal with the imminent bankruptcy of the system.

What good are administrative reforms like those in Bill C-54 if the whole system goes bankrupt? It does not make any difference how quickly a pensioner receives his cheque if the amount is zero dollars and zero cents. The government of the day would probably wish its system were not quite so efficient if it is going to be sending out cheques like that. This bill represents a baby step when a giant leap was needed.

The priority of this government should be to put CPP on a firm financial footing. A proposal the government seems to keep floating is that premiums should continually increase to fund deficits in the plan. This is plainly unacceptable to a large majority of Canadians. It is no different from increasing taxes, and Canadians have said they are taxed to the limit.

Another suggestion is to cut benefits. There may be some savings to be found in the myriad of benefits paid out, as I will point out in a minute, but these savings will not fundamentally alter the main problem, which is that the plan is actuarially unsound.

Government Orders

We plainly cannot cut benefits to those retirees who currently depend on them, and it would be cruel to cut them significantly for those who are about to retire. The only persons we can cut future benefits for are those who have enough time left before retirement to make alternate arrangements.

(2325)

I would like to tell of two different constituents of mine who have come to me with stories of problems they have experienced with CPP. The first constituent complained to me about waste in the survivors benefits category, commonly known as widows and orphans benefits. My constituent was concerned that after marrying a widowed woman and adopting her two children the survivors benefits continued to flow. He had to pursue his case through the department all the way up to the minister to get the benefits cut off.

Why is this unacceptable situation continuing to the present day? Clearly if one is no longer a widow or an orphan they should no longer collect a widow's or orphan's benefit. Savings to be found in this area may be in the millions of dollars.

Another constituent complained to me about the overly high benefit payout she is receiving from CPP for her retirement. This constituent had paid in a grand total of \$143 in premiums over her lifetime, yet is receiving monthly benefit cheques of \$25. Although \$25 a month or \$300 a year does not seem to be an amount that will bankrupt the plan, think what overpaying many other Canadians hundreds or thousands of dollars a year does to our balances. It is unsustainable and cannot be justified. We must make the plan actuarially sound and financially stable for those who have to depend on it.

The Reform Party has promised to be a constructive alternative in Parliament, and on this issue, like most others, we have laid out our plan. We believe that our approach must be financially sustainable, fair, promote individual responsibility, and must help relieve government of its massive fiscal problems.

We believe that the registered personal savings plans coupled with registered retirement savings plans are a large part of the solution for Canada's working generation. We laid out our plan in our taxpayers' budget prior to the release of the federal budget. We detailed how Canadians would be encouraged to plan for their own retirement without government interference or financial bungling. We showed how individuals could make choices that best suit their needs and we showed how it could be done without incurring additional liabilities for the government.

Reformers demonstrated leadership in the area of pensions and the Liberals have yet to move on the issue. Yet it is the Liberals who have the power to effect the changes necessary to save these programs. If the Liberals refuse to act then I believe

the Canadian people will choose leaders who will bring the needed reform, and I believe they will choose Reformers to do that job.

In closing, I want to read the comments of another member from another debate on a similar bill from the last Parliament, which only tinkered with the Canada Pension Plan and failed to effect any meaningful change. I quote:

"I simply want to use this opportunity to draw the attention of members and hopefully of the government or a future government to the fact that the reform of the pension plan system has to go beyond just tinkering, fixing some immediate problems. We may have to come to grips with a lower level of pension benefits that will be available as each generation of Canadians reaches retirement age. I would suggest that the problem is that we should be projecting the profile of what our Canadian population will look like 10, 15, 20 years down the road and designing our CPP to meet that problem so that future legislators will not have to scramble to face a much broader problem or large scale insecurity because we at the present time did not exercise our responsibility of stewardship to make sure that there would be enough of a benefit base to satisfy those needs. Similarly, I also find it of concern that the number of real problems that have been identified in the implementation and administration of the Canada Pension Plan are not being fully addressed in this bill."

The comments were made by none other than the author of this present tinkering bill, the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The leadership and changes the Canadian voters are so desperately looking for will have to wait until the next federal election, when Reform will form the government.

(2330)

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

(2345)

And the bells having rung:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, the table informs me we would now normally be voting on third reading of Bill C-54. However, given that most members are under the impression we will be voting first on ways and means Motion No. 29, I think you would find unanimous consent that we commence with voting on ways and means Motion No. 29 and then follow on the order and terminate with third reading stage of Bill C-54.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS**EXCISE TAX ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 319)

YEAS**Members**

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Caron
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond—Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Deshais	DeVillers
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob

Jordan	Keys
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Paradis
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringuette—Maltais
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—198

NAYS**Members**

Ablonczy	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Cummins	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Grey (Beaver River)	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Johnston	Manning
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Schmidt
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—37	

Government Orders

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Bébin
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

(2355)

During the taking of the vote:

Mr. Malhi: Mr. Speaker, I vote with the government.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT BANK OF CANADA ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-91, an act to continue the Federal Business Development Bank under the name Business Development Bank of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: The first question is on Motion No. 1. A vote on Motion No. 1 will also apply to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33.

[Translation]

An affirmative vote on Motion No. 1 will obviate the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 2 and 5. However, a negative vote on Motion No. 1 will necessitate the question being put on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find that there is consent that the members who voted on the previous motion, as well as the hon. member for Bramalea—Gore—Malton, be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. The Liberal members will vote in favour of the motion.

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc members vote against this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform members vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

[English]

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote no on the motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 320)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Caccia

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Calder

Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—145

Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Copp
Culbert
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Petry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Ringuette—Maltais
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Skoke
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young

NAYS

Members

Althouse
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins

Government Orders

Dalphonde-Guiral	Daviault
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazier	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Grey (Beaver River)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jacob	Johnston
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Manning
Marchand	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McLaughlin
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Riis	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams—90

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

(2400)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 carried. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33 inclusive carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 7.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes yes on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 321)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Asselin
Bachand	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphonde-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	McLaughlin
Mercier	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Riis
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne	Venne—53

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	DeVillers
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Harvard	Hayes

Government Orders

Hermanson	Hickey
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Ifitody	Irwin
Jackson	Johnston
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lee
Lincoln	Loney
MacAulay	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McClelland (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Ramsay	Reed
Richardson	Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais	Robillard
Rock	Rompkey
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Silye	Simmons
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams	Wood
Young	Zed—182

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélangier	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find that members who voted on the previous motion should be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc Québécois votes no on this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yes, except for those who may wish to vote otherwise.

[English]

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes no on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 322)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Commis	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Grey (Beaver River)	Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Johnston	Manning
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Schmidt
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	White (Fraser Valley West)
Williams—37	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brushett	Bryden
Bélaïr	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Caron
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond—Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Deshaies	DeVillers
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English

Government Orders

Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Paradis
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringuette—Maltais
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—198

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would again find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote nay on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 323*)

YEAS

Members

Asselin	Bachand
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Guay	Guimond
Jacob	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Marchand	Mercier
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne—49	

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alcock	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak

Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
Cummins
Discepolo
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hermanson
Hill (MacLeod)
Hoepfner
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais
Rock
Schmidt
Serré
Silye
Skoke
Speaker
Stewart (Brant)

Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélaire
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Copps
Culbert
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hayes
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Johnston
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Mahu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Simmons
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)

Stinson
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Williams
Young

Strahl
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood
Zed—186

Government Orders

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélangier
Debien
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 9 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 10.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc Québécois is also against this motion, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yea, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP members vote yes on this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 324)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Cummins
Forseth
Grey (Beaver River)
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Johnston
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Williams—41

Althouse
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Epp
Frazer
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (MacLeod)
Hoepfner
Manning
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Ramsay
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
White (Fraser Valley West)

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bergeron
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Caron
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	Dalphond—Guiral
Davault	de Savoye
Deshaies	DeVillers
Discepolo	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	O'Reilly
Paradis	Paré
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Richardson

Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—194

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

(2405)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 11.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 8 to be applied to the motion now before the House, as well as applied to report stage Motion No. 15.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 322.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 11 lost. I also declare Motion No. 15 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 14.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the vote taken on report stage Motion No. 9 to be applied to the motion now before the House.

I think there would also be unanimous consent to apply the same vote to Motion No. 19 and, in reverse, to Motion No. 25.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motions Nos. 14 and 19.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 323.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 14 and 19 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 20.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to pay particular attention as this is different from what was anticipated. I think you would find consent for the result of the vote on ways and means Motion No. 29 to be applied to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Government Orders

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 319.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 20 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 21.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 10 to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 324.*]

(2410)

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 21 lost.

[*English*]

The next question is on Motion No. 22.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 1 in reverse to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 325*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazier
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)

Althouse
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Davialt
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner

Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Riis
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)

Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
McLaughlin
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—90

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bethel
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peters

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Coppes
Culbert
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarmieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
MacLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Peric
Peterson

Government Orders

Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Richardson
Rideout	Ringuette—Maltais
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan
Simmons	Skoke
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—145	

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bélanger	Canuel
Debien	Regan
St-Laurent	Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 22 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

[Translation]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 7 to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 321.]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 23 lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 24.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as voting on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yeas.

Perhaps I could indicate that I believe you would find consent to apply that result in reverse to report stage Motions Nos. 16 and 18.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members will all vote no, even those who would have liked to support the motion.

Some hon. members: Ah, ah.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no on Motion No. 24, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise. On Motions Nos. 16 and 18 they will vote in reverse as the government whip stated.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, the NDP votes yes and agrees to the application of the other two votes as suggested by the whip of the government party.

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was agreed to on

the following division):

(Division No. 326)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumont
Bellemare	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Caccia	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
DeVillers	Discepolo
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McLaughlin
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien
O'Reilly	Paradis
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringuette—Maltais
Robillard	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Sheridan

Government Orders

Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—149

Skoie
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young

Beaumier
Benoit
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
Cummins
Discepolo
Duhamel
Easter
English
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna
Morrison
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais
Rock

Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Coppes
Culbert
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Grose
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hayes
Hickey
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Johnston
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Meredith
Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rompkey

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond—Guiral
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Davialut
Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—86

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 25.

(The House divided on the Motion No. 25, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 327*)

YEAS

Members

Ablonczy
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes

Government Orders

Schmidt
Serré
Silye
Skoke
Speaker
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Williams
Young

Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Simmons
Solberg
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood
Zed—186

de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Fillion
Frazer
Gauthier (Roberval)
Grey (Beaver River)
Guimond
Harper (Calgary West)
Hart
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jacob
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Marchand
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)

Deshaies
Duceppe
Epp
Forseth
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guay
Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hayes
Hill (Macleod)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Manning
Mayfield
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Paré
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
Williams—86

NAYS

Members

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Brien
Caron
Crête
Davialt
Deshaies
Duceppe
Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay
Jacob
Landry
Laurin
Lebel
Lefebvre
Leroux (Shefford)
Marchand
Ménard
Paré
Plamondon
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—49

Bachand
Bergeron
Bouchard
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Dalphond—Guirail
de Savoye
Dubé
Dumas
Gagnon (Québec)
Godin
Guimond
Lalonde
Langlois
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier
Mercier
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Caccia
Campbell
Chamberlain
Clancy
Comuzzi
Cowling
DeVillers
Dromisky
Dupuy
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jackson
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacLaren
Maheu

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopoulos
Beaumier
Bethel
Blaikie
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Calder
Catterall
Chan
Cohen
Coppes
Culbert
Discepola
Duhamel
Easter
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Irwin
Jordan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélangier
Debien
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 25 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 16.

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 328)***YEAS**

Members

Ablonczy
Bachand
Benoit
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Caron
Crête
Dalphond—Guirail

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bélisle
Chrétien (Frontenac)
Cummins
Davialt

Government Orders

Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Reilly
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Proud
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rompkey
Serré
Simmons
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Ur
Vanclief
Walker
Wells
Wood
Zed—149

Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McLaughlin
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
O'Brien
Paradis
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Rideout
Ringuette—Maltais
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Skoke
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Torsney
Valeri
Verran
Wappel
Whelan
Young

PAIRED—MEMBERS

Bernier (Gaspé)
Bélanger
Debien
St-Laurent

Bertrand
Canuel
Regan
Tobin

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the Motion No. 16 lost. Accordingly Motion No. 17 is also lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 18.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 328.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 18 lost.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in and read the second time.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent for the result of the vote on report stage Motion No. 1 to be applied to the motion for concurrence.

(2415)

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 320.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division at the third reading stage of Bill C-82, an act to amend the Royal Canadian Mint Act.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you find unanimous consent to apply the result taken on report stage Motion No. 1 of Bill C-91 to the motion now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 320.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT (FEDERAL AGENCIES)

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions on Bill C-65, an act to reorganize and dissolve certain federal agencies.

[*Translation*]

The first question is on Motion No. 1. The vote on Motion No. 1 will also apply to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of report stage Motion No. 9 of Bill C-91 to the motion now before the House.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 323.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 lost. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 16 lost.

*Government Orders**[Translation]*

The next question is on Motion No. 13.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of report stage Motion No. 20 of Bill C-91 to the motion now before the House.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[English]

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 319.]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 13 carried.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the division on report stage Motion No. 8 of Bill C-91 to the motion now before the House.

(2420)

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 322.]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of report stage Motion No. 24 of Bill C-91 in reverse to report stage Motion No. 8 now before the House as well as to report stage Motion No. 10. If you were to reverse that again you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of concurrence at report stage of Bill C-65.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 328.]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 8 and 10 lost. Accordingly I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 326.]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

OLD AGE SECURITY ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-54, an act to amend the Old Age Security Act, the Canada pension plan, the Children's Special Allowances Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act, be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on third reading of Bill C-54.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of report stage Motion No. 24 of Bill C-91 to the motion now before the House.

I thank my colleague whips of the other parties, including the New Democratic Party, for their kind assistance tonight.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 326.]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed.)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 12.25 a.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 12.25 a.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 21, 1995

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Hire a Student Week

Mrs. Sheridan 14309

Mining Industry

Mr. Deshaies 14309

Natural Resources

Mr. Rideout 14309

Child Poverty

Mr. Maloney 14309

G-7 Summit

Mr. Blaikie 14310

Calgary Stampede

Mrs. Ablonczy 14310

Safe Grad

Mr. McKinnon 14310

Burma

Mr. Paré 14310

Rogers Surrey

Mr. Forseth 14311

Aboriginal Solidarity Day

Mr. Harper (Churchill) 14311

National Defence

Mrs. Bakopanos 14311

Leader of the Reform Party

Mr. Bodnar 14311

Somalia

Mr. Guimond 14311

Justice

Mr. Thompson 14312

Ethics Counsellor

Mrs. Wayne 14312

Quebec Sovereignty

Mr. Patry 14312

G-7 Summit

Mr. Wells 14312

Thomas Szajko and Jason Shultz

Mr. Hart 14312

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Federalism**

Mr. Bouchard 14313

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 14313

Mr. Bouchard 14313

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 14313

Mr. Bouchard 14313

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 14313

Bovine Somatotropin

Mr. Daviault 14314

Ms. Marleau 14314

Mr. Daviault	14314
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	14314

Government of Canada

Mr. Manning	14314
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	14314
Mr. Manning	14314
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	14314
Mr. Manning	14315
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	14315

Defence Industry

Mr. Ménard	14315
Mr. Manley	14315
Mr. Ménard	14315
Mr. Manley	14315

Highways

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	14316
Mr. Young	14316
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	14316
Mr. Young	14316

French–Language Research Journals

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	14316
Mr. Gerrard	14316
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	14317
Mr. Gerrard	14317

Telecommunications

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	14317
Mr. Dupuy	14317
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	14317

Trade

Mr. Bergeron	14317
Mr. MacLaren	14317
Mr. Bergeron	14317

Mr. MacLaren	14318
Railways	
Mr. Gallaway	14318
Mr. Young	14318
Literacy	
Miss Grey	14318
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	14318
Miss Grey	14318
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	14318
National Film Board	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	14319
Mr. Dupuy	14319
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	14319
Mr. Dupuy	14319
Health Care	
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	14319
Ms. Marleau	14319
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	14319
Ms. Marleau	14319
Income Security	
Mr. Paradis	14319
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	14319
Minimum Wage	
Mrs. Lalonde	14320
Mrs. Robillard	14320
Mrs. Lalonde	14320
Mrs. Robillard	14320
Somalia	
Mr. Frazer	14320
Mr. Mifflin	14320
Mr. Frazer	14320

Mr. Mifflin 14320

Drug Enforcement

Ms. McLaughlin 14320

Mr. Rock 14321

Bosnia

Mr. Charest 14321

Mr. Ouellet 14321

Presence in Gallery

The Speaker 14321

Privilege

Oral Question Period

Mr. Brien 14321

Mr. Dupuy 14321

Mr. Bouchard 14321

The Speaker 14322

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) 14322

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken 14322

Committees of the House

Canadian Heritage

Mr. Godfrey 14322

Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons

Mr. Pagtakhan 14322

Mrs. Hayes 14322

Income Tax Act

Bill C-338. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted. 14322

Mr. White (North Vancouver)	14322
Intervenor Funding Act	
Bill C-339. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted.	14322
Mr. Finlay	14322
Broadcasting Act	
Bill C-340. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	14323
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	14323
Financial Administration Act	
Bill C-341. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	14323
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	14323
Access to Information Act	
Bill C-342. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	14323
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	14323
Criminal Code	
Bill C-343. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	14323
Mr. Thompson	14323
Public harbours and Port Facilities Act	
Bill C-344. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	14323
Mr. Crête	14323
Procedure and House Affairs	
Referendum Act	
Mr. Milliken	14324
Motion	14324
(Motion agreed to.)	14324
Ways and Means	
Notices of Motions	
Mr. Milliken	14324
Petitions	
Income Tax Act	
Mr. Szabo	14324

Eligibility to Unemployment Insurance

Mr. Asselin 14324

Taxpayer Protection Act

Mrs. Hayes 14324

Young Offenders Act

Mrs. Hayes 14324

Human Rights

Mrs. Hayes 14324

Justice

Mrs. Hayes 14325

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Adams 14325

Human Rights

Mr. Adams 14325

Violent Offenders

Mr. Adams 14325

Breast Cancer

Mr. Adams 14325

Human Rights

Mr. Hanrahan 14325

Human Rights

Mrs. Barnes 14325

Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide

Miss Grey 14325

National Unity

Mr. Duhamel 14326

Government Spending

Mr. Abbott 14326

Gun Control	
Mr. Abbott	14326
Justice	
Mr. Abbott	14326
National Unity	
Mr. Hopkins	14326
Phone Sex Services	
Mr. Bonin	14326
Official Languages	
Mr. Frazer	14327
Justice	
Mr. McTeague	14327
Junk Mail	
Mr. McWhinney	14327
Gun Control	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	14327
Official Opposition	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	14327
Young Offenders Act	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	14327
Rail Transport	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	14327
Justice	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	14327
Gun Control	
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	14327
Agriculture	
Mr. Jordan	14327

Human Rights	
Mr. Pillitteri	14328
Mr. Strahl	14328
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Strahl	14328
Rights of the Unborn	
Mr. Strahl	14328
Gun Control	
Mr. Strahl	14328
Government Spending	
Mr. Strahl	14328
Justice	
Mr. Hart	14328
Sexual Assault	
Mr. Hart	14328
Bovine Somatotropin	
Mr. Hart	14328
Criminal Code	
Mr. Riis	14328
Social Programs	
Mr. Riis	14328
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Milliken	14329
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Milliken	14330

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Ways and Means

Customs Act

Ms. Blondin–Andrew	14330
--------------------------	-------

Motion for concurrence	14330
(Motion agreed to.)	14330

Ways and Means

Excise Tax Act

Ms. Blondin–Andrew	14330
Motion for concurrence	14330
Division on motion deferred	14330

Business Development Bank of Canada Act

Bill C–91. Report stage	14330
-------------------------------	-------

Speaker’s Ruling

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu)	14330
---------------------------------------	-------

Motions in Amendment

Mr. McClelland	14331
Motions Nos. 16, 17 and 18	14331
Mr. Schmidt	14331
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	14332
Mr. Rocheleau	14332
Division on motion deferred	14333
Division on Motion No. 18 deferred	14333
Motions Nos. 1, 3, 4, 6 and 26 to 33	14333
Ms. Blondin–Andrew	14333
Motions Nos. 2, 5	14334
Mr. Rocheleau	14334
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	14334
Mr. Rocheleau	14334
Mr. Schmidt	14336
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	14336
Mr. Ménard	14337
Mr. de Savoye	14339
Mr. Lefebvre	14340
Mr. Caron	14341
Mr. Leblanc (Longueuil)	14343
Mr. Lebel	14344

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Registry of Drugs and Implanted Medical Devices

Ms. McLaughlin	14344
Motion	14344
Ms. Fry	14347
Mrs. Picard	14348
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	14349
Mr. Patry	14350

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business Development Bank of Canada Act

Bill C-91. Consideration resumed of motion	14352
Mr. Lebel	14352
Mr. Crête	14353
Mr. Riis	14354
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	14356
Mr. Rocheleau	14356
Motion No. 7	14356
Mr. McClelland	14356
Motions No. 8	14356
Mr. Rocheleau	14356
Motion No. 9	14356
Mr. McClelland	14356
Motions Nos. 10 and 11	14356
Mr. Rocheleau	14356
Motion No. 14	14356
Mr. McClelland	14356
Motion No. 15	14356
Mr. Rocheleau	14357
Motions Nos. 19 and 20	14357
Mr. McClelland	14357
Motions Nos. 21 and 22	14357
Mr. Rocheleau	14357
Motion No. 23	14357
Mr. Manley	14357

Motion No. 24	14357
Mr. McClelland	14357
Motion No. 25	14357
Mr. Rocheleau	14357
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	14359
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	14360
Mr. Riis	14361
Division on Motion No. 7 deferred	14362
Division on Motion No. 8 deferred	14362
Division on Motion No. 9 deferred	14362
Divisions on Motions Nos. 10, 11, 14, 15 and 19 to 25 deferred	14363
Mr. Rocheleau	14363
Motions Nos. 12 and 13	14363
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	14364
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	14364
Motions Nos. 12 and 13 negatived.	14364
Divisions on motions deferred.	14365

Royal Canadian Mint Act

Bill C–82. Report stage	14365
-------------------------------	-------

Speaker’s Ruling

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu)	14365
Motion for concurrence	14365
Mr. Gerrard	14365
(Motion agreed to)	14365
Motion for third reading	14365
Mr. Bélair	14365
Mr. Marchand	14366
Mr. Epp	14371
Motion	14375
Mr. Hermanson	14375
Mr. Marchand	14377
(Amendment negatived)	14377
Division on motion deferred.	14378

Government Organization Act (Federal Agencies)

Bill C–65. Report stage	14378
-------------------------------	-------

Speaker's Ruling

The Deputy Speaker	14378
Motion No. 1	14378
Mr. Rocheleau	14378
Motion No. 3	14378
Mr. Fillion	14378
Motion No. 4	14378
Mr. Bélisle	14378
Motions Nos. 5 and 6	14378
Mr. Bélisle	14378
Motion No. 7	14378
Mr. Godin	14378
Motions Nos. 9 and 12	14378
Mr. Marchand	14378
Motion No. 13	14379
Mr. Bellemare	14379
Motion No. 14	14379
Mr. Marchand	14379
Motion No. 15	14379
Mr. Fillion	14379
Motion No. 16	14379
Mr. Laurin	14379
Mr. Bellemare	14379
Mr. Bélisle	14380
Mr. Epp	14381
Mr. Rocheleau	14382
Mr. English	14382
Mr. Godin	14382
Mr. Laurin	14383
Mr. English	14385
Division on Motion No. 1 deferred	14385
Division on Motion No. 13 deferred	14386
Mr. Epp	14386
Motion No. 2	14386
Mr. Bélisle	14387
Mr. English	14387
Division on Motion No. 2 deferred	14388

Mr. Epp	14388
Motion No. 8	14388
Mr. English	14388
Division on Motion No. 8 deferred	14389
Mr. Epp	14389
Motions Nos. 10 and 11	14389
Mr. English	14390
Division deferred on Motion No. 10	14390

Old Age Security Act

Bill C-54. Motion for third reading	14390
Mr. Rock	14390
Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	14390
Mr. Dumas	14392
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre)	14394

Ways and Means

Excise Tax Act

Consideration resumed of motion	14396
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 198; Nays, 37	14396

Business Development Bank of Canada Act

Bill C-91. Consideration resumed of report stage	14397
Motion No. 1 agreed to on division: Yeas, 145; Nays, 90	14397
Motion No. 7 negatived on division: Yeas, 53; Nays 182	14398
Motion No. 8 negatived on division: Yeas, 37; Nays, 198	14499
Motion No. 9 negatived on division: Yeas, 49; Nays, 186	14400
Motion No. 10 negatived on division: Yeas, 41; Nays, 194	14401
Motion No. 11 negatived on division: Yeas, 37; Nays, 198	14402
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 49; Nays, 186	14402
Motion No. 20 agreed to on division: Yeas, 198; Nays, 37	14403
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 41; Nays, 194	14403
Motion No. 22 negatived on division: Yeas, 90; Nays, 145	14403
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 53; Nays, 182	14404
Motion No. 24 agreed to on division: Yeas, 149; Nays, 86	14404
Motion No. 25 agreed to on division: Yeas, 186; Nays, 49.	14405
Motion No. 16 negatived on division: Yeas, 86; Nays, 149	14406

Motion No. 18 negatived on division: Yeas, 86; Nays, 149	14407
Motion for concurrence and second reading	14407
Mr. Manley	14407
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 145; Nays, 90	14407

Royal Canadian Mint Act

Bill C-82. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	14407
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 145; Nays,90	14407
(Bill read the third time and passed.)	14407

Government Organization Act (Federal Agencies)

Bill C-65. Consideration resumed of report stage	14407
Motion No. 1 negatived on division: Yeas, 49; Nays 186	14407
Motion No. 13 agreed to on division: Yeas, 198; Nays, 37	14408
Motion No. 2 negatived on division: Yeas, 37; Nays, 198	14408
Motion No. 8 negatived on division: Yeas, 86; Nays, 149	14408
Motion for concurrence	14408
Mr. Massé	14408
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 149; Nays, 86	14408

Old Age Security Act

Bill C-54. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	14408
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 149; Nays, 86	14408
(Bill read the third time and passed.)	14408

Appendix