



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133 • NUMBER 258 • 1st SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, November 9, 1995**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

The House of Commons Debates and the Proceedings of Committee evidence are accessible on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 9, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*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 two petitions.

\* \* \*

### INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

**Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1) I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canadian group to the interparliamentary union which represented Canada at the 1995 interparliamentary conference held in Bucharest, Romania, from October 7 to 14, 1995.

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Thursday, October 5, 1995, the committee has considered Bill C-78, an act to provide for the establishment and operation of a program to enable certain persons to receive protection in relation to certain inquiries, investigations or prosecutions. The committee has agreed to report it with amendments.

[*Translation*]

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 16th report of the standing committee

on public accounts. In its sixteenth report, the public accounts committee studied chapter 9 of the auditor general's annual report for 1994 on the overall management of federal science and technology activities, chapter 10 of that same report on the management of departmental science and technology activities, and chapter 11 on the management of scientific personnel in certain federal research establishments.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee is asking the government to table a comprehensive response to the report.

\* \* \*

• (1010)

### CONTRACTORS PROTECTION ACT

**Mr. Jean-Paul Marchand (Québec-Est, BQ):** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-356, an act to protect contractors who disclose government wrongdoing.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we know that a number of private companies do business with the government. Contracting out accounts for close to \$10 billion of business, and we also know that there are a great many irregularities in contracting with the private sector. There are sometimes illegalities and waste. This bill would protect private contractors who decide to disclose government wrongdoing, waste or other irregularities.

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

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### PETITIONS

#### ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am pleased to present two petitions signed by over 100 residents of Hamilton and nearby towns on the subject of euthanasia and assisted suicide.

The petitioners request Parliament to ensure the present provisions of the Criminal Code prohibiting assisted suicide be retained without changes and enforced in order that Parliament not sanction or allow the aiding of suicide or euthanasia.

*Government Orders*

## JUSTICE

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I also have thousands of signatures from across Canada on the subject of crimes of violence. The petitions are part of a petition, begun by Mrs. Priscilla de Villiers, which has already collected over three million signatures.

The petitioners ask Parliament to recognize that crimes of violence against a person are abhorrent to society and ask the government to continue to amend the Criminal Code of Canada, the Bail Reform Act, 1972 and the Parole Act of Canada accordingly.

[Translation]

## EMPLOYMENT CENTRES

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition signed by 356 persons in my riding of Bourassa and the Montreal region, concerning closure of the Canada Employment Centre on Papineau Street, which services my riding of Bourassa North as well as neighbouring ridings.

• (1015)

This is a centre that provides exceptional service to a very large population. Those working in the centre along with unemployed persons and community organizations are therefore petitioning the government not to close this employment centre, and I strongly support this petition. I trust that the government will reconsider its decision and that this centre will be able to continue its operations.

[English]

## JUSTICE

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition, in accordance with Standing Order 36, on behalf of constituents who say that we should be aiming for a just and safe society, that the safety and protection of the public should precede the protection of dangerous criminals and that the rights of victims should precede the rights of criminals. Many things are listed here.

The petitioners are asking for legislation to reform the justice system and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 36, I present a petition on behalf of the citizens of the community of Athabasca.

The petitioners request that Parliament continue to reject euthanasia and physician assisted suicide, that the present provisions of section 241 of the Criminal Code 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.

[Translation]

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** I ask that the other questions be allowed to stand.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## MANGANESE BASED FUEL ADDITIVES ACT

The House resumed from November 8 consideration of the motion that Bill C-94, an act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese based substances, be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure once again to speak to Bill C-94, an act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese based substances.

The purpose of the bill is to ban the import and interprovincial trade of MMT, an octane enhancer. Essentially MMT reduces emissions from motor vehicles. The government claims that MMT damages the onboard devices in new 1996 cars. It is going to be obligatory for cars used in Canada not to use MMT. This was at the prompting of the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association.

The Ethyl corporation that makes MMT and the petroleum products group claim that first, MMT is not a health hazard to Canadians and second, does not damage onboard devices.

If the minister wishes to ban MMT, then she has to prove that MMT is a health hazard to Canadians. The contrary has been proven by the Ministry of Health which has shown that MMT does not damage the health of Canadians. I have heard some spurious allegations by members across the way who have actually claimed that since the health department said what it did, maybe MMT really does harm Canadians. Those are statements made off the top of their heads without any factual basis. If we look at the facts, MMT does not harm the health of Canadians.

Central to the bill is the question, does or does not MMT damage onboard devices? There is ample evidence showing that onboard devices are not damaged by MMT. It is wise to look at the situation in the United States. We say we want a common gasoline for our vehicles, but the United States is bringing back MMT. It is bringing MMT back for a couple of very important reasons: First, it is not a health hazard to people; second, it does

not damage onboard devices; and, third, if it is removed from gasoline nitrous oxide emissions will be increased by more than 20 per cent. Nitrous oxide is a very important component of smog. Smog exacerbates respiratory problems in people who suffer from asthma or chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases.

• (1020)

If MMT is to be banned another substance will have to take its place. That will make gasoline more expensive. It will translate into more expense at the pump and in turn will cost the industry more. It would act as a depressant on the economy, which means fewer jobs.

The minister cannot ban MMT on the basis of health reasons so she is going to try to ban its movement in interprovincial trade and in import and export which, in effect, is a ban on the substance. That is how the minister has managed to get around that.

The real truth behind this is that the Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Association is looking for a scapegoat because its members know their onboard devices malfunction. They want to find some other reason for this and have found a handy peg to hang their hat on by claiming that MMT damages the onboard devices. However the facts prove otherwise.

When looking at the situation in the United States which does not use MMT, we find that onboard devices malfunction at exactly the same rate as they do in cars using MMT. This is very conclusive, suggestive and strong evidence that MMT as a reason for the damage of onboard devices simply does not hold water.

I ask the minister to look at new ways and new energy sources. The transport sector has a 90 per cent plus dependency on fossil fuels. As we all know in the House, fossil fuels are finite and one day they will come to an end.

We must also look globally. By the year 2025, 11 billion plus people will be living on this planet or twice as many that live on it today. Therefore, energy consumption will double or, as many people believe, will increase even more than that.

Another reason is that in developing nations people are actually consuming energy at a far greater rate than they have in previous years. Through industrialization and manufacturing the demands for energy and fossil fuels are increasing.

I ask the minister to work with the minister of science and technology and the Minister of Transport to look at different ways we can work on new and more environmentally sound alternatives to fossil fuels in the future. One alternative is electrically powered cars. We cannot provide energy now at the low cost that we have with fossil fuels but in the future this will be an important alternative for powering vehicles. While we

### *Government Orders*

cannot do it now, we must look to the future and develop the research and technology so that we can do that.

Another interesting concept is the hydrogen fuel cell which works on the electrolysis of hydrogen sulphide or water. Although these systems are too bulky right now to use this might be an alternative form of power for vehicles in the future. Another is photovoltaic cells which take energy from the sun. The Holy Grail of all energy sources is the concept of fusion.

As a country we do not have the finances to engage in extensive projects in this area. By working with our neighbours to the south and some Europeans that are doing some fascinating work on fusion technology, we can provide our scientific expertise to them to try to make this into a reality in the future. While it may not be practical for the transport sector, there are many other energy sectors for which this technology will have to be used.

• (1025)

Although these alternatives cannot replace fossil fuels right now, we do not see enough of working together between ministries. In this instance the Ministry of the Environment has logical partners in the ministry of science and technology and the Ministry of Transport. They are intimately entwined. It would serve Canada well if these ministers got together with their staffs and determined areas where they could work together in an efficient fashion.

I suggest the minister look at some other areas in the transportation sector and work with the Minister of Transport, as I said before. It costs about \$7,000 a year to operate a car, with high social and environmental costs. It is very expensive. Canadians should look at the European model and extract from that more environmentally sound measures on the transportation of people, paying particular attention to bicycles and rail travel.

There is a very important issue in my riding. The E & N railway runs north-south on Vancouver Island. It can be a very potent and environmentally sound mover of goods, services and people. This railway has been lying idle for many years and is highly unproductive. I hope the Minister of the Environment will work with the Minister of Transport to try to make this railway a reality, not in the public domain but in the private domain; ownership being retained in the public domain but management and functioning in the private sector.

Vancouver Island is an area where the population is growing at perhaps the fastest rate in all of Canada. Unfortunately we are seeing the southern California syndrome where we have urban sprawl at its worst. We can look at Vancouver to see what happened there.

With that growth in population will come transport and energy demands. These must be met by looking toward the future by determining ways in which we can provide this transportation

*Government Orders*

without damaging and destroying the pristine environment the island affords.

In conclusion, with respect to MMT our role in the House is to determine the truth. The minister acknowledges the conclusive evidence that first, MMT does not damage people's health. Second, there is conclusive evidence within our own country and even south of the border to show that MMT does not damage onboard devices.

We need to determine the truth. I ask the minister to review the relevant data and rethink this issue. Clearly there is no reason to ban MMT in Canada now. If the minister has to have an independent study to determine once and for all whether MMT actually does damage onboard devices then she ought to do that.

Again I hope the minister would work with the minister of science and technology and the Minister of Transport to look at new and improved ways of meeting the energy needs of Canadians in the future.

I wish to move the following motion to Bill C-94. I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:

"This House declines to give third reading to Bill C-94, an act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese based substances, since among other things the bill does not take measures to compensate for the fact that MMT free gasoline would cause the fuel industry to burn more crude oil, causing greater emissions into the atmosphere while at the same time increasing tailpipe nitrous oxide emissions".

• (1030)

**The Speaker:** The motion is in order. Is the hon. member rising on debate?

**Mr. Caccia:** Mr. Speaker, we are still in the 10-minute phase which would permit a question or a comment.

**The Speaker:** Because the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca moved an amendment we now move to debate on the amendment. There will be no questions or comments. That is how we will proceed.

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, many questions have been raised about the legislation now before the House. In some cases the debate has obscured what really is at stake. I would like therefore to try to answer some of the questions to give members a clear picture of the issue.

First, we have heard about the harm MMT causes to pollution control equipment in vehicles. Does this not have a plus side? Ethyl corporation is the producer of MMT. According to this company the use of MMT allows less intensive refining, thereby reducing emissions from the refineries. Ethyl corporation also maintains that MMT reduces tailpipe emissions of nitrogen oxide by up to 20 per cent and lowers toxic benzene emissions. If so, what is the point of banning such a useful additive?

Let us take the question of refining. It is true that MMT allows less intensive refining. In 1992 a report was prepared for Ethyl Canada. It indicated that if the additive were banned Canadian refineries would emit 40 to 50 tonnes more of nitrogen oxide per annum and 34 to 43 more kilotonnes of carbon dioxide. Those amounts represent 0.0025 per cent of our yearly emissions of nitrogen oxide and 0.01 per cent of our carbon dioxide emissions. Such slight increases are clearly minuscule.

What then about emissions from vehicle tailpipes? The data collected by Ethyl corporation showed an average reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions with MMT of up to 20 per cent. But the figures were for a test fleet of well maintained vehicles, whereas the actual Canadian cars are not on average as well maintained. If we put the findings into the context of the current Canadian cars, another analysis indicates that MMT causes a much smaller reduction in nitrogen oxide emissions, no more than about 5 per cent.

As for toxic benzene emissions, these should not increase as a result of the banning of MMT. Gasoline can be refined to limit its benzene content. This past July the Minister of the Environment announced that she intended to regulate benzene levels in gasoline to a maximum of one per cent per volume. The regulations would also limit any increase in the amount of aromatics in gasoline.

• (1035)

MMT has been used as an octane enhancer in gasoline, but the oil refining industry has various options for replacing it. These options should still limit the benzene content. For example, the refining process could be changed to produce higher octane gasoline constituents. Along with or instead of that, other octane enhancers are available such as ethyl and MTBE.

This raises another question: Are we banning MMT to promote the use of ethanol? The answer to that is no. Ethanol is only one option for replacing the octane now provided by MMT. There are other options available and it is up to the petroleum industry to make that choice.

What about the financial costs? Some wonder whether MMT removal would place a heavy financial burden on the oil industry or consumers. According to the industry's own estimates, the cost would translate to an increase of approximately 0.1 cents to 0.24 cents per litre, a minor amount, especially considering the normal day to day price fluctuations we see at the fuel pump in the order of a few cents per litre.

Other questions have been raised about the studies that provide the basis for the legislation. Why, it is asked, are we accepting the word of the auto industry, which is surely an interested party in the dispute. Why do we not make use of

independent studies? The fact is there have been no independent studies to determine the effect of MMT on emissions control systems. The research has been sponsored either by the auto makers or by Ethyl for the oil producers.

Some would ask why Environment Canada has not sponsored or conducted its own research. The department has sought technical opinions from two outside experts, one of whom was called on by both industries to participate in joint discussions. Both experts agreed that we do not have conclusive data but that MMT tends to affect emissions performance and increase costs.

To go further and conduct a government study of the issue would simply use up taxpayers' dollars and delay the introduction of new pollution control technology into Canada. We cannot afford to do that. Both industries have done their work and studied the issue. It is now time for a decision. Some might ask why that must be a government decision; why not leave it to the industries concerned to arrive at their solution? That is exactly what we have been trying to do for more than two years, but so far that approach has not succeeded.

Senior officials from four federal departments have met with representatives of the oil and auto industries. I would stress this about four federal departments because the previous speaker suggested we should be talking among the different departments and getting answers. This minister has spoken to and worked with four federal departments. More recently the Minister of the Environment attempted personally to negotiate an agreement. All these efforts have failed. We have no alternative but to legislate the necessary changes.

Still another question concerns actions on MMT in the United States. In the last months we have seen moves to reintroduce its use there. Most recently, this past October 20, a United States Court of Appeal decision ordered the Environmental Protection Agency to grant Ethyl corporation registration for the use of its MMT additive in unleaded gasoline.

Why are we banning MMT in Canada when the United States seems to be lifting its almost 20-year old ban on MMT? After all, part of the argument made against MMT is that we must harmonize our emissions control approach with that of the Americans. Are we not in danger of remaining out of step if we pass the legislation?

• (1040)

MMT prospects in the United States remain cloudy. The EPA could appeal the October 20 ruling or attempt other legal action. Major refineries might be reluctant to adopt MMT until uncertainties are resolved about the health effects associated with widespread use of the additive. Furthermore, the auto industry could launch its own challenge.

### *Government Orders*

Even if none of that happens, about one-third of the U.S. gasoline market including California requires reformulated gasoline to meet more stringent air quality requirements. MMT is still not allowed in reformulated gasoline, which can be expected to claim a growing share of the U.S. market in the coming years as the country moves toward cleaner fuel.

California has gone so far as to expressly prohibit the use of MMT as a gasoline additive. This U.S. state is a world leader in emission control strategies. The example it sets is widely followed throughout North America and beyond. We should carefully consider the approach of California. It could well become the benchmark for tomorrow.

Another question asked is what is the rush. Why do we not wait for the doubts to resolve themselves? Why should we intervene now when the issue is still unclear and evolving? The answer is that the issue will never be settled to the entire satisfaction of both the auto and oil industries. Doubts are bound to persist, but there is sufficient evidence now to make an informed decision. The two industries have been unable to do this themselves, even though we gave them plenty of time in which to do it. The voluntary approach has failed so we must be prepared to turn to legislation to achieve a solution.

For those who have raised doubts and questions, I have some questions myself. In a time of budgetary constraints can we justify spending government money to duplicate studies already carried out by the private sector? Can we justify a delay in introducing state of the art emission control technology in Canada? Can we justify the extra expense consumers will bear if MMT continues to be used as an additive in Canada? Would there be considerable cost for industry or consumers if MMT is banned? Would there be a notable harmful environmental impact? Is MMT likely to have a place in the cleaner fuels of the future? After more than two years of discussion is there any likelihood that the industries concerned could reach agreement in the near future on MMT use? Is there any real alternative left except legislation?

I believe the answer to all these questions is self-evident. Equally obvious is that the time has come for Parliament to exercise its obligation and legislate an end to the use of manganese based additives in gasoline. That is what Bill C-94 does. The measure is pro-environmental, pro-consumer, pro-investment and pro-business. It is time for the House to face the facts and pass the legislation.

**Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill C-94.

We introduced the amendment simply to allow time for the topic to be studied and assessed in light of what has happened in the U.S. and to avoid embarrassment for the government and the country.

*Government Orders*

• (1045)

The move to ban MMT at this time clearly has little support in evidence. Everyone on the committee, including the government members, raised substantive doubts on the validity of the evidence.

The presentation of the previous speech we heard was very well done. Nevertheless it was a presentation that again accepted unquestionably the evidence provided by the auto manufacturers in spite of the fact that they refused to table any of those studies for us to look at.

We are told that the minister intervened personally to try to bring about a settlement on this issue. I would question how the minister could intervene personally to negotiate a settlement on this issue when she refused to meet with one of the parties involved. In spite of several attempts by that side, the party in the dispute, the minister refused to meet with them.

The member says she personally intervened to try to bring about a settlement. What hogwash. A settlement cannot be brought about by only meeting with one side. Again she says they have had plenty of time to settle the dispute, that the government has given ample time to do that.

In the 1993 campaign the Liberal party, before it became the government, committed in its red book to ban MMT if an agreement was not reached. In the dispute the motor vehicle manufacturers lost all will to negotiate any kind of agreement because it was there in writing: If an agreement was not reached, the government was prepared to ban MMT.

We again hear how there is no time to let the National Research Council or the Department of the Environment conduct independent tests. There is this urgency because of the technology on the 1996 cars. The 1996 cars are here. They are on the market. They are being sold. The OBD II system is onboard. It is functioning and has not been disconnected. Why are we in such a terrible rush?

Yesterday we heard from the member for Davenport that if these OBD II warning lights were disconnected and the system was malfunctioning, it would somehow contribute greatly to more pollution and would be a health hazard for Canadians. My response to that is: What about the millions and millions of cars on our roads that are pre-1996 and do not have OBD II systems and seem to be functioning quite well? This OBD II technology is not vital to the operation of a car. Whether or not it functions is not how we judge the pollution that is coming from the car. They are simply warning devices. They have no effect on the pollution produced from the tailpipe of that car.

There is not such a great rush and we do have time to do that testing. It is important in the interests of this country to wait. Certainly if MMT is allowed to be used again in the United

States in the coming year, this bill and this movement by our government will truly be embarrassing. Certainly it will be embarrassing to the country to have the Minister of the Environment go down in history as the minister who passed a bill to increase ground level ozone and smog. It is truly ludicrous.

We have introduced the amendment to appeal to the common sense of the House to let the bill rest somewhere at least for a couple of months or a year. Let us do some independent testing to verify the evidence. Let us wait and see what happens in the U.S. so we can truly move toward harmonization of fuel, an objective the Minister of Industry clearly stated in the House as being crucial.

Whatever happens in the U.S. and however small an amount of MMT is or is not allowed in, to ban MMT in Canada is to move away from the goal of harmonization and not toward it. It only makes good common sense to wait until we see what happens and to do independent testing so that we have concrete evidence one way or the other.

• (1050)

Certainly this party supports the banning of MMT if it can be shown in independent testing that it is a problem. Ethyl corporation and the petroleum refining industry stated in committee that they are perfectly willing to withdraw the product from the market if independent evidence shows that it is detrimental. That is certainly a more reasonable position than the one presented by the government.

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments about the auto industry in Canada and point out some facts about it.

In 1994, \$44 billion worth of vehicles and \$20 billion worth of parts were produced in Canada. Producing \$44 billion worth of vehicles in Canada employed 58,000 Canadians. Canadians across the country are involved in the industry. There is a Volvo plant in Halifax, many plants in Quebec and Ontario, and truck manufacturers in British Columbia. The vehicle parts manufacturing industry involves over 750 companies employing 82,000 Canadians.

I am sure that Canadians employed in these companies would like to know the hon. member and his party are supporting their jobs. I get the feeling from what I have heard in the House that their support is only for the oil refining industry and not for the workers of Canada and the Canadian industry. I wonder if the hon. member has any comments.

**Mr. Chatters:** Mr. Speaker, I would love to comment on that because truly we are beginning to see the real motivation for the legislation. It is a political motivation.

I am not responding to any lobby. I met with both sides on the issue. I listened to the evidence from both sides. We did



extensive research into that evidence. The evidence is not there to support banning MMT. It simply is not there.

Certainly to suggest that by not banning MMT it will create a loss of jobs in the auto industry is a red herring. Cars will certainly continue to be built where they are being made today.

I will say one thing. If there are job losses to be incurred because of the issue, they will not be in the auto industry; they will be in the manufacture of MMT. That plant will close down and those jobs will be lost in Canada. They will be gone.

The member has the facts just a little mixed up. We are accused of being overcome by the lobby of Ethyl corporation and that there is some kind of evil corporation from the U.S. which is not even Canadian. Where are the head offices of every member of the Motor Vehicles Manufacturers Association? They are no more Canadian than Ethyl is, quite frankly. If the member is concerned about job losses, let us be realistic and fair. They will not be in the auto industry.

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, again the member for Athabasca is deviating from the information we received in committee.

It was amply discussed there from the information provided by the auto industry that the presence of manganese has a negative effect on the functioning capacity of the oxygen sensors and catalytic converters. The results are clearly identified. The committee was quite keen in investigating the matter. It went into investigating the question of the effect of manganese on sparkplugs. The hon. member saw the pictures that when sparkplugs operate with gasoline containing manganese, the coating of manganese is visible on the sparkplugs.

• (1055)

In addition the MMT manufacturers are in the U.S.A. They are keen to maintain the Canadian market as they have already in Bulgaria, Russia, Taiwan and Argentina. We have now reached a stage in Canada where we have to move away from MMT as the Americans already did in 1978. The American motorist has been using gasoline without MMT since 1978. There is no deviation from that fact and the Reform Party must accept that fact.

The entire North American automotive technology is moving toward an onboard diagnostic system which is intended to improve the emission controls of the engine.

Is this a political decision? Yes, it is a political decision because politicians have to make policy decisions. We have to keep up with rapidly advancing technology. We cannot turn the clocks back to before 1978 and go back to how it was in the United States before the U.S. banned MMT.

We must apply the latest technology for the sake of the consumer. That is why we have the issue of onboard diagnostics which, contrary to what the hon. member for Athabasca said,

### *Government Orders*

would have to be disconnected in Canada if MMT was not removed. The disconnection would be to the disadvantage of the warranty holder, namely the car owner.

These facts emerged from committee. Does the member for Athabasca agree with those observations?

**Mr. Chatters:** Madam Speaker, for some reason the member for Davenport does not seem to remember what went on in committee.

The evidence was very suspect. The pictures of the sparkplugs which he referred to were two different types of sparkplugs. The witnesses told us they were exactly the same sparkplugs run in the same engine and all the rest of it. On the tailpipe emission issue, a government member was clearly confused and had some real doubt as to the authenticity of the data before him and what they were suggested to mean.

Without any question, the evidence is suspect at best and certainly is not enough on which to base the decision to ban MMT. The evidence simply is not there. The bill is an embarrassment to the country and the minister.

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am especially pleased to have the opportunity to take part in the third reading debate on Bill C-94, an act to regulate interprovincial trade in and the importation for commercial purposes of certain manganese based substances.

The primary purpose of the bill which is to be known as the manganese based fuel additives act is to ban the use of MMT, a manganese based compound used as an octane enhancer in Canadian gasolines.

MMT is widely recognized as having an adverse effect on the operation of vehicle emission control components, including sophisticated onboard diagnostic systems, commonly known as OBDS. OBDS are slated to be introduced in virtually all 1996 vehicle models. They will help to control vehicle pollution by monitoring emission system performance and alerting drivers to a malfunction. Several car manufacturers around the world including Ford, Chrysler, General Motors and Toyota have all come to the conclusion after extensive scientific testing that MMT adversely affects onboard diagnostic systems. Many of these corporations have billions of dollars invested in Canada and directly employ tens of thousands of Canadians in manufacturing plants.

• (1100)

To continue using MMT in Canadian gasoline would compromise the ability of Canada's auto industry to design cars that achieve important pollution reductions. Surely it goes without saying that Canada's environment and Canadian consumers have the right to the best emission control technology available. Presently Canada is one of the last countries in the world in

*Government Orders*

which MMT is used in unleaded gasoline. That is a distinction we should not be particularly proud of.

While MMT has been in use in Canada since 1977 as a replacement for lead in unleaded gasoline, it has been banned in the United States since 1977 because of concerns over health effects. I find it ironical that one country, ours, adopted a product at the precisely the same time its neighbour banned it.

Environment Canada, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and virtually every single automobile company around the world all agree that MMT impairs the performance of pollution control equipment found in today's cars and trucks. Study after study shows that MMT adversely affects the onboard diagnostic systems where the pollution control equipment is found. These systems are extremely important for the environment because they ensure the cleaner burning engines of today and tomorrow operate as designed.

Understandably the vehicle industry has indicated it will not accept the risk of increased warranty repair costs associated with MMT in gasoline and would take preventive actions, including disconnecting the OBD systems in whole or in part and possibly reducing vehicle warranty coverage with 1996 vehicles if MMT continues to be used.

The passage of Bill C-94 into law will bring about a successful resolution of the MMT issue in Canada and will ensure that vehicle emission standards remain harmonized in the North American automotive market.

I will now speak on the health hazards associated with manganese based compounds like MMT. AT 1990 hearings of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency into a waiver application submitted by Ethyl Corporation to reallow MMT in unleaded gasoline, a number of experts testified on the toxic effects of manganese compounds.

Ms. Ellen Silbergeld of the environmental defense fund testified at the EPA hearings: "Manganese, like lead, is a toxin in that both its absorption and retention as well as its toxicity increase with time. At present there is insufficient data on the low level chronic effects of the manganese exposure similar to the case that was made for lead in 1925".

The environmental defense fund in its written submission to the EPA states: "We know that manganese at high dose is a demonstrated human neurotoxin with persistent and irreversible pathological effects on brain structure and resulting severe impairments in movement and mental state. We do not know what the long term chronic low dose consequences of human

exposure to manganese are. We do not know a safe level of manganese exposure, particularly for those subgroups that may be at increased risk for neurotoxicity, the young and the aged".

Dr. John Donaldson is one of Canada's top neurotoxicologists. He has conducted ground breaking research in this area. Dr. Donaldson told the EPA in Washington: "One of the major theories in leading edge neuroscience which relate to the environment today is that there are agents, neurotoxins, insidious neurotoxins like manganese, which are age accelerating neurotoxins. I believe that manganese is such an age accelerating neurotoxin and I believe this is the answer to manganese's ability to produce biochemically, pathologically and clinically the picture which is very similar, very similar but not identical, to Parkinson's disease".

On May 1, 1994 Dr. Donaldson wrote to me with an overview of more recent scientific studies that should give us all pause. I put on the record the following examples of recent research provided to me by Dr. Donaldson:

An increasing body of evidence from Sweden, the centre of excellence and occupational health and safety, has demonstrated that chronic exposure to manganese at very low levels can produce impairment of mental function. The evidence suggesting that low levels over a prolonged period can impair memory has strong implications not only for occupational health but perhaps more especially to child mental health, and firmly places manganese in the category of behavioural psychotoxin as well as neurotoxin.

This newly emerging recognition of the low dose effects of manganese is a most effective club with which to stifle industrial critics which argue that manganese is only toxic at enormous levels rarely attained.

Recent evidence by Dr. Donald Calne of the University of British Columbia, a distinguished and internationally acclaimed researcher in Parkinson's disease, considers that manganese in humans is progressive and even a short exposure can lead ultimately to brain damage. Of especial importance was his observations that even a short exposure was as effective as a prolonged one in causing irreparable brain damage. This should dispel claims by critics that at moderate doses manganese has no health risk.

Dr. Calne has also noted that the initial toxicity of manganese can remain masked for several decades following exposure although causing brain cell death at an increased rate which is only detectable by brain imaging techniques. The disease may not appear for periods as long as four decades. A silent killer indeed.

• (1105)

There are a number of options to replace the octane provided by MMT. Available substances include MTBE, ETBE, methanol and ethanol. Ethanol, which is produced from Canadian grains, is an ideal octane enhancer for unleaded gasoline. Since it is manufactured from renewal feedstock it is especially valuable as a non-petroleum fuel component in times of restricted supply. Ethanol and its derivative, ETBE, are the only gasoline additives which are renewable and offer the further security of reducing dependence on foreign energy supplies.

The primary environmental benefit of ethanol is its high content of oxygen. Gasoline contains no oxygen. Adding oxygen has the effect of creating a more favourable air–fuel ratio, which results in a cleaner combustion of the fuel, thereby reducing such harmful emissions as carbon dioxide.

On December 21, 1994 the government announced a new program to encourage the development of biomass derived fuels. It is obvious that the banning of MMT as contained in Bill C–94 dovetails perfectly with this program. In addition to helping improve the environment, the government's support of ethanol investment will benefit agricultural producers and create industrial development. There is no doubt in my mind that the banning of MMT will boost demand for ethanol and help to create new long term markets for corn and grain as feedstock to the ethanol process.

I heartily support Bill C–94 and I strongly encourage all members to do likewise.

**Mr. David Chatters (Athabasca, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have a number of questions.

I cannot remember when I have heard such a gross distortion of facts as we have just heard. Perhaps it is as a result of overexposure to manganese.

Does the member not believe that officials and experts in the Department of Health are competent and reliable? Has she read the blues from when Health Canada appeared as a witness before the committee and on several different occasions clearly stated manganese in fuels does not present any health hazard to Canadians? That is clear. It is written down and there for her to see.

• (1110)

The other comment I have is a return to the red herring of ethanol. The member should check the evidence presented by witnesses. Every manufacturing and refining witness that appeared before us said ethanol is not an alternative, that it will not replace MMT.

**Mrs. Ur:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. Perhaps his judgment is that ethanol is not the only alternative. In my speech I offered other alternatives. It is one of the alternatives that can be offered to this program.

Health is not the issue at the present time. We are looking at the air pollution issue as well. He says we do not take studies into consideration. In the United States they filed with the EPA four times as to qualifications for MMT. Three times they filed under section 211(c) and were denied. This section deals with matters concerning public health in relation to MMT as well the effect of MMT on the performance of emission control devices. They were turned down.

### *Government Orders*

In their good wisdom they looked at section 211(f)(1) within the clean air act. The application was denied because it only related to the health aspects. We must consider what section they applied and when it was accepted or turned down.

There have been other studies conducted. I believe some Reform Party members said NOx emissions would be reduced by 20 per cent. However, these data were collected by Ethyl corporation. Environment Canada has said NOx would be reduced by 5 per cent. We must get our data straight on the issue.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I listened to the hon. member's comments quite closely. I am a little concerned she is still putting forth the idea that ethanol is an alternative to MMT. As my hon. colleague from Athabasca stated, clear evidence was presented to the committee which contradicts what she is trying to say.

Once again in her comments she has said ethanol is one of the alternatives, which is simply not correct. I would like her to retract that statement because ethanol is not an alternative to MMT.

**Mrs. Ur:** Madam Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague. In the past few days or weeks General Motors acknowledged that its cars would be able to use ethanol gas.

In addition I am very proud to say that gas stations have included ethanol pumps in London, Ontario, within the last week or two. They have been in touch with the car manufacturers. Obviously they know there is a requirement for such an option. I am very pleased to say ethanol is making strides in southwestern Ontario, my area.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, as I have listened to the debate over the past few days one thing has become abundantly obvious. We need to do more research. The evidence, as the hon. member said, reflects people on one side saying one thing and people on the other side saying another thing.

I appeal to the government to support the amendment my colleague from Athabasca has made. We should give some time to it. The Americans are studying it. We need to look at it some more. It would be a great disservice to Canadians to quickly rush the bill through the House. There is nothing wrong with accepting the amendment and looking at this matter a little more.

If we look at the evidence presented in committee it becomes quite clear we need to look at this a lot more. I hope the government will listen to reason and support the amendment.

• (1115)

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

I reassure the member the government is not rushing through this issue. The minister gave notice in 1993, two years ago. In my view that is not rushing.

*Government Orders*

Further, I believe the House has been working on it since 1985 to broker a solution. Senior departmental officials from environment, transport, industry and natural resources have all been working with senior representatives from the petroleum companies and the automotive industry. This has not come by night; it has been looked at for several years with one option or another.

With all due respect, I believe there has been sufficient data put together and we have to move forward. We cannot constantly be looking and looking and looking. We have a party in the House that tells us we are wasting money continually. This costs money. I do not say it is wasting money when we do studies, but it costs money. We have adequate information. Let us move forward on the issue. It is time to move. We have to respect the information we have collected.

**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 the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** All those in favour of the amendment 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 45(7), a division on the question now before the House stands deferred until Monday, November 20, at 6 p.m., at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

\* \* \*

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES  
DEVELOPMENT ACT**

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-96, an act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development and to amend

and repeal certain related acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased, along with my colleague from Portage—Interlake, to move second reading of the bill that provides for the formal foundation of the Department of Human Resources. This is the last of the 10 reorganization bills and with its passage the major reorganization of departments that began in 1993 will be complete.

• (1120)

The bill primarily deals with administrative reorganization. As members know, the new department brought together portions of several other departments: the former departments of employment and immigration, health and welfare, secretary of state, and Labour.

At the outset I say the bill makes no significant changes to the statutory elements of the legislation that established these founding departments.

[*Translation*]

The bill does not change the powers of the federal government or the provinces. It gives no new powers. The mandate conferred in the bill is clearly limited to the matters over which Parliament has jurisdiction. That is literally what it says in clause 6.

In other words, the programs and structures included in existing legislation have simply been put together in this new bill.

The Bloc objects to clause 20 because it allows the minister to sign contracts with agencies and institutions other than the provinces. But this is not new. This has not changed.

For instance, the bill includes agreements on older workers with the government of Quebec and the other provinces. Under this agreement, the government purchases annuities from financial institutions.

[*English*]

All the legislation does is allow us to continue to provide assistance for older workers by buying a series of annuities from financial institutions in full co-operation with the provinces. Frankly, the attempt to raise fears and create the impression that this is some form of new intrusion is simply another example of blowing smoke, which we have seen so rampant over the past several weeks.

Why then is the legislation important? Why bring together four or five departments into a singular instrument of government? I think the vision that underlies the reorganization of the department is captured in the name itself, Human Resources Development. It tries to bring together all the different elements, instruments, programs and policies of the federal government into one coherent approach to the fundamental issue

dealing with individual Canadians. In a sense it is a single drawer out of which a number of tools can be brought to try to tackle and focus on the concerns and issues of many Canadians as they go through difficult times of personal, family and community adjustment at a time of incredible changes in society.

This is not a defence of the status quo or what used to be. It is an attempt to try to provide a new, innovative way of doing government. One of the great singular difficulties we have, as we well know, is to get people to begin to think differently about how government can relate to individuals, communities and the country. The old ways simply are not relevant to the kinds of conditions we now face. That is one reason the government has undertaken to provide a new set of instruments, brought together with a single focus of policy. It really gives us a foundation on which the role and participation of the Canadian government can tackle the real deficit problem in the country, which is not just the fiscal deficit but also the human deficit, a deficit as corrosive and undermining to the well-being of individuals as anything we face on the fiscal side.

The singular challenge we face, regardless of political opinion or jurisdiction, is how to give Canadians the ability, the resources and the support they need to manage sometimes very painful and difficult transitions as the economy changes into a globally integrated economy, as we try to cope with the major impacts of new technology and the impacts on the workplace, where job requirements and qualifications change in an instant. This almost revolutionary transitional sweep is affecting not only Canada but every country in the world.

• (1125)

The time has come for all levels of government—federal, provincial, and municipal—not to engage in the old fashioned warfare of whose turf we own, but to find ways of working together, find ways of bringing together our combined resources. The attempts to try to stake out what one jurisdiction should do versus the other oftentimes leave out one major problem. We are still talking about the same people who are interested in their family, their job and their community and simply want government to help, not hinder or in the way but provide the resources they need.

The real fear and the real uncertainty gripping the lives of people is how to cope with unprecedented change and how to make something of it that can be positive and constructive. There are those in our society and I suppose there are people in the chamber who would like to roll back that change. Like King Canute, they would like to stop the waves from coming in. That is bound to frustration.

**Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Madam Speaker, I did not want to interrupt my colleague, but I have just consulted with the official opposition and we have contravened one of the rules in the House.

### *Government Orders*

According to Standing Order 45(6)(a), a division deferred on Thursday is not held on Friday but is instead deferred to the next sitting day at the ordinary hour of adjournment.

The government whip did not consult with or get the consent of our party. Nor did he get the consent of the official opposition in deferring the vote.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I will take that under advisement and get back to the member.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** Madam Speaker, the fundamental purpose and rationale for reorganizing the department is to put us in a position where we can take a holistic view of this transformation, try to put a finder on it that enables us to see the linkages and the crossovers.

We know full well that the problem of child poverty stems oftentimes from relationships in the workplace. We know that poor children also end up with children who have illnesses. Therefore we have to find some way of cross-linking the responses and in so doing be more effective and more efficient both within and between governments and provide the best possible answer in that respect. This means not abandoning basic values but finding new ways of doing things.

We have to recognize, a fundamental and critical issue, is that the old top down centralized hierarchies of governmental organization, which have been really a product of the old industrial age, no longer work effectively. The kind of management that is driven from a command point of view no longer works very effectively. We now must find a much different way of working in a society with individuals and communities, much more in a lateral and horizontal way than in a vertical way. The old manuals that governed inputs and outputs and measured results according to fiscal accounts no longer apply when it comes down to values.

I would like to point out one of the interesting initiatives we were able to co-sponsor with the OECD last spring. The secretary of labor in the United States and I made a motion that rather than have the OECD issue purely economic indicators every year it should begin to also look at social indicators, the impacts on investments in education, investments in welfare and what it tells us in terms of the resulting capacity and competence of individuals to make progress in dealing with the problems.

I am really talking about getting the best use of taxpayers' dollars at a time when we face real restraint and providing a much more effective way of enabling people to respond and make choices themselves and not have choices made for them.

Let me give one small example of how a saving can be made that has an impact both for the individual and for society at large. If we could get the 400,000 people who are almost permanently unemployed through the unemployment insurance

*Government Orders*

ranks and who receive benefits by changing that benefit to a form of employment benefit so they could get one more week of work, we would save the entire system \$50 million, just by that one act alone, an additional week of work.

• (1130)

Think of what it does for the individual who knows that for the first time he or she has an opportunity to springboard back into the workforce as opposed to simply planning a life which is a constant round of getting from one benefit program to another. That is the key element in trying to shift the role of government and the way government operates.

This is not critical of what was done in the past. It was a product of its time. In the 1940s, 1950s and even the 1960s there was a view about how government should work in terms of providing a form of security through welfare payments and social benefits. During those times we were not facing the kind of economic transformation which is going on today. We were not facing the disruption which is now taking place.

People now have a much higher level of skills requirements. We have seen all the reports; I do not have to repeat them. The reports show that those who have some kind of post-secondary education have an 85 per cent to 90 per cent chance of getting a job. Those who have less than high school have about a 30 per cent chance of getting a job.

One cannot simply say it is the individual who has to survive and swim in that sea. I reject that philosophy. Government after all is nothing more than the combined collective representation of all those individuals recognizing there are certain things that have to be done together and not individually. We have to combine resources across the country so that when one area is facing higher unemployment, other areas help support it. That is the fundamental concept of sharing.

The more we fragment the country, the more we divide it, separate it and turn it into a series of fiefdoms, the less capable we are of helping individuals to respond when they have needs because we no longer have the benefit of that sharing. That is why the federal government must continue to play an important role in this area. Those who are the apostles of provincialism, which is to say turn everything over and make all the decisions, will recognize what can happen.

One example is a discussion we are having with the province of British Columbia. It is feeling the pressure from people who are moving in from other provinces. Those in B.C. forget that in the 1980s people from British Columbia were moving to other provinces which were picking up the responsibility. They forget that it was a very important time for there to be a balanced wheel to make sure there was a proper adjudication and sharing of resources.

That is why it is important to help redefine, select and work out how we in the new department of human resources can play that role clearly in a system of partnership. We must also make sure there is a very active and useful delivery of service to individual Canadians nationally.

In the last year in the department of human resources in its combined form, we provided in one way or another a transaction service to one million Canadians. We are the largest service delivery organization in the country. We deal with more Canadians than McDonald's, Air Canada and Sears, Roebuck combined. That is why the question of service becomes so important.

One of the most important elements of the reforms we are introducing is trying to understand how we can provide a much better service related to where the individual is and to get away from the top down command system. I used to say that the departments we brought together had a General Motors or IBM philosophy. I wanted to turn that into a Canadian Tire philosophy where it was based in the local communities with tools and instruments customized and tailored to the needs of those communities.

We are pioneering in this approach. We have made enormous progress in the past year by being able to fundamentally rethink and redo the way in which the department of human resources works. It is an attempt to find the most relevant kind of governmental organization to fit the job system and social system we are going to need as we approach the new century.

As an example, last August we announced a fundamental change in the way in which the service delivery operation of the department would operate. We are going from 450 points of service in the country to 700 points of service. We are providing a much broader network.

• (1135)

Some of my colleagues have been very concerned about how the federal government ensures adequate and effective services in rural areas. This means a much broader extension of the services of the department into areas that did not have services before. People can now access services without having to travel 50 miles or 70 miles to visit an old CEC.

I will give the example of a person in Elgin county where I visited about a month or so ago. In terms of testing out new models, one of our young officers in St. Thomas worked out a system where through the Internet he was able to provide the same access to information and services we used to provide by having somebody come into the St. Thomas office. In a period of three months with that simple change alone he was able to provide service to 4,000 new clients.

If we had had to do it the old way, people would have been in line ups five miles long every single day at that St. Thomas office trying to find information on pensions or employment.

One of the end results is that people can access the job bank in the local grocery stores, high schools, libraries, places where people go, where they carry out their normal business. We can work partnerships at those local levels so people get that same level of service.

We are also working with the disabled community to establish a new job bank for disabled Canadians which is tied in with a large number of corporations. Again the access is provided at the local level and is designed by the users themselves working with the business community. All of a sudden a number of disabled Canadians can put their resumes on the system. Businesses can recognize what those resumes are and they can do the transaction together. It frees up our own officers to do the really important and intense work of counselling and mentoring and providing good advice as to where one can go and how to get there.

One of the major advantages as well is that what used to be the old job centres are now becoming in a sense human resource centres where there is an integration of all the services of the department. Seniors, students and workers under the unemployment insurance system can all come to the same place.

As a result, seniors will have four times as many offices in which they can be serviced than previously. The new technology means that processing UI claims can be reduced to two days when it used to take sometimes 10 days to two weeks. Claims for old age security can be processed in half a day instead of eight days. That means a lot. We can put that in cold statistical terms but for a senior who has been waiting for an application for old age security, to have it within a half a day as opposed to eight or 10 days makes a big difference when they do not have a lot of money to deal with.

We are substantially broadening that network to a variety of points of service. We are using the new technology. We are not afraid of it, like some members are saying, like the Luddites of old who say that we cannot use new information systems. There is not a business, not an organization in the country which is not asking itself questions about how to improve efficiency, productivity and access by using the new systems. That is what we are now doing and implementing. It is a fundamental part of trying to provide better service for those nine million Canadians who use our services.

Not only are we integrating within the programs we offer, we are also undertaking a wide variety of experiments and projects throughout Canada in terms of a guichet unique. We are providing ways in which all three levels of government can work together to provide a common one stop shopping service.

For example, in Alberta there are a series of youth centres. Both the federal and provincial governments now combine to provide a very direct ability to deal with long term unemployed

### *Government Orders*

youth in three of those centres. In early evaluations and in talking to Alberta officials, we are finding a much higher success rate because we combined services and young people can come to one place and get that same kind of service.

Another interesting example is in the province of Quebec, in Alma, the hometown of the Leader of the Opposition. My department, the SQDM, the local municipalities and local clubs are now combined in a single service delivery system.

It is exceedingly strange that we are being attacked by those who say we are intruding but in fact we have a wide variety of those co-operative projects going on in the province of Quebec with the Government of Quebec. The reason we are doing that is because they work better that way. This is at the working level. It is not at the level of the top bureaucrats or politicians who love to talk about the grand design. It is at the working community level. We are dealing directly with the service in towns like Alma, Jonquière, and other places where there are these combined services.

• (1140)

The key to success is that people find it much more effective, much more helpful and much more productive for them as individuals. Is that not what it is about? Is that not what government is about? Those are the kinds of changes we are undertaking.

It also means we will go back and look at many of the old programs which were developed 20 or 30 years ago, some of which I helped to develop when I was a minister back in the early eighties, for example the national training act. We must ask if they work any more.

During this past year we have undertaken very extensive evaluations testing what does and does not work. We have produced a series of 24 different evaluation reports which are publicly available. They provide a very good assessment as to what kind of involvement or participation makes sense in the areas of benefits, youth, et cetera. Based upon those evaluations, which we have already highlighted, we are providing a substantial distillation of our programs from 39 or 40 programs down to five programs, five basic tools.

I will take a moment to articulate this most clearly. These five tools will provide the opportunity for decisions to be made at the local employment centre level instead of having to respond to some program designed and manufactured in Ottawa or the regional office. Decisions can be made right at the community level with the local partners, the provinces, municipalities, businesses and social agencies. They can tailor how those tools can be most effectively used to deal with the unemployment problem in a specific locale.

It is decentralization of a very different kind. There has been a lot of talk and we have read much in the paper about decentralization. So far it has been a somewhat restricted debate as it talks

*Government Orders*

only about decentralization in terms of transferring from the federal government to provincial governments.

Should we not also be talking about how to empower communities and individuals to make more choices? Is that not what we should be looking at in terms of decentralization? Should we not be looking at how governments become partners and facilitators in the local community context? Not only do we find a much more effective way to deal with the unemployment problem in a specific community, but we can also begin to help strengthen and enhance those communities themselves.

Social analysts have made a very good and profound contribution by recognizing that with all the pressures of the global economy and new technologies, one of the consequences has been the unravelling of what they call a civic society. Those intermediate organizations, trade unions, social agencies, community based organizations no longer have the same capacity to respond.

I will give a personal working example. When I was in school, just a few years ago—

**Mr. McCormick:** Very few, yes.

**Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre):** You don't have to snicker.

One of my summer jobs was working on recreation programs for a boy's club, which was associated with the local United Church in inner city Winnipeg. We brought in 40 or 50 volunteers per night to provide student recreation programs at the local level in an area where children did not have much opportunity.

A month or so ago I was talking to a woman who was a contemporary of mine. She had been involved in the program and had become heavily involved in the work of the United Church in offering this program. I asked her whether she still did those programs and she replied: "No, we spend money lobbying people like you". That is an interesting change. Rather than investing their dollars in terms of providing a rooted, community based activity directly designed to meet those problems, they were mobilizing to lobby the government.

• (1145)

Is there a way we can make government a partner in that area? Is there a way government can help the local boys' club or church organization? That is why I want to decentralize the department. It will give far more discretion, far more autonomy and far more accountability at the local level so it can make decisions and work out its business plans. I believe this is a very exciting opportunity.

The other night in Winnipeg there was a major conference put on by the Institute for Advanced Research on children's problems. The institute brought together from across Canada about

20 different agencies which were pioneers in bringing together community based responses to the problems of children and youth at risk. It was a heart warming and encouraging experience. We saw how schools, agencies, local police, local municipalities, the provinces and our department all came together at the same time to provide a range of services. They could make use of the resources. Rather than having single silos or pyramids built all over town, they were now bringing them together.

Their request to us was to have an information network which would link them across Canada so they can share experiences and resources, so they can get common procurement and look at common training for their workers. That is a simple way of hooking them up to the information network.

Look at the connection. One of the reforms we are introducing in our department is the new labour market information system across Canada. Individuals can tap into that system to find jobs whether they are in Gander or in Prince Rupert. If we can provide the same information network to those child centres, all of a sudden we have substantially enhanced their resource with very little cost to us and we have made them much more effective in their local communities. That is the vision the department is trying to put forward.

How do we take this very large department, which has 27,000 employees and a budget of \$60 billion, and really make it an active, involved participant at the community level along with its other partners?

At times I show some frustration at the old debate about which level of bureaucracy will control the money. I am saying the real problem is at the community level. That is where it really counts.

It gives us the opportunity to help to clarify the roles between levels of government. Contrary to the charge that there is a big intrusion, one of the direct results of the department will be to give far more space for provincial governments to begin to make decisions at their level of responsibility and jurisdiction. I firmly believe that. The time has come for us to take a much closer look at the respective roles and to build bridges to bring us together.

That is why we have formally invited the provinces to work with the Government of Canada on the decentralization of the delivery of services so we can tailor them to local labour market needs. That is the key. We cannot do it unilaterally, as some provinces want; we must do it together.

[*Translation*]

As the federal government simplifies its programs and further defines their scope, the roles of both levels of government will be clarified, and major sectors of the labour market will be open to the provinces.



• (1150)

[English]

That is a very major task we have set for ourselves. We have already started a number of discussions with many provinces about how we can do exactly that. One of the most important results of the new legislation we are preparing which will be introduced very shortly will give us the ability to make a much better, more effective clarification of the respective roles and to create far more space for provinces to make their decisions.

Rather than getting into the bare knuckle federalism that some people in the House have advocated, in which they seem to enjoy confrontation, it is time to start building a partnership of federalism. In that wonderful world of Judith Maxwell, one of our important social and economic confreres, said: "Is it not time governments look at the potential of federalism, not its problems, not its disputes, but the potential of federalism?" That is what we are trying to discover and search out as we deal with the new issues, the potential of federalism, the potential we can bring together.

As I said earlier, we have already succeeded in building that in a number of new delivery systems. Let me give an example of the things in the past year we have been able to do working with the provinces in those areas.

One good example is from Newfoundland dealing with a serious problem, as my colleague from St. John's knows well. We established a collaborative approach to deal with youth unemployment. As a result of the student work and service program, 2,700 young people including 1,000 on social assistance were given an opportunity to work for a period of 16 weeks in either the private sector or community agencies. Upon completion of that work they were given a voucher and could then choose to go back to school or use it for self-employment.

A full 97 per cent of those young people on social assistance have used or intend to use those vouchers to go back to school. They worked, they earned it, they have the voucher and now they understand the importance of education. That was done with full collaboration between two levels of government working with youth agencies, schools and colleges in that area.

Does that kind of thing not indicate exactly how collaboration is better than confrontation, division and separation? That is the way to get things done, by working at that level of opportunity.

Let me give another example from British Columbia where certain ministers are claiming we do nothing. There is a major child care project going on, almost \$30 million invested through our strategic initiative. Again, we sat down and worked it out. We asked how we could provide a better service in child care. The province took the lead in the design and implementation and we provided the resource through which it could establish community based child care centres that provide a series of services for

### *Government Orders*

30 or 40 child care activities. They provide a common procurement, common training, respite care for parents who need it.

The evaluations I shared with a minister in British Columbia again demonstrating we have saved the child care system money because there is a common based service. Those individual child care units can provide a better range of services because there are special remedial programs for disabled children which can be shared among a number of units. That collaboration has resulted in better planning within the community level about how children can be looked after at the community level.

This makes sense, rather than getting into the bare knuckles. It is better to realize the real issue is children and how we can work together to provide that kind of service.

Another good example in Quebec is the APPORT program which the province pioneered with the previous government. It has provided a form of assistance and testing those on social assistance so they can go back to school or to work with the use of an income supplement. While the debate about separation was raging, we were negotiating with the Government of Quebec about how we could combine and collaborate jointly fund the APPORT program and extend it to new kinds of clients so that we could find a way of enabling people, rather than staying on social assistance, to find self-sufficiency and independence in their lives and find a job. This is again an example that while the great political battles are waging over here, at the community level we can do something very useful, very effective and very helpful.

• (1155)

That is one level of the kind of partnership we see as the abiding philosophy we want to put forward. Another very important problem all members of the House are concerned about, because we see it every day in our constituencies, is our young people. They have a much tougher time than our generation had. They have far fewer opportunities because of the higher demands for skill and education. They have far less certainty about what the future holds because the future is so much in turbulence and turmoil.

However there are ways we can work together in partnership. One of the areas we are exploring most actively is how to work with the private sector in this area. The most crucial area and where there have been serious problems is when young people finish their formal education. How do they open the door to new kinds of work experiences? How do they make that transition, build that bridge?

Our department has been working on the establishment of a series of human resource sector councils. We now have 19 in place. These bring together employees and employers, unions and management to work out a human resource plan for their own industry: electronics, software, tourism, horticulture, culture. They recognize, again through experience, is by bringing workers and management together they can do much better than having them separated. They also recognize they have very serious gaps in skills in those sectors and they are working to improve them.

*Government Orders*

We have just signed an agreement with the Grocery Products Manufacturers Council two weeks ago, the second largest manufacturing group in Canada with about 300,000 employees. Half its employees do not have the level of education required to meet the new kinds of technologies now coming into that business. Therefore they will start with basic on the job literacy programs. The private sector helps to support this program and the provincial governments provide support for the private sector which is taking the responsibility to manage the program.

Councils could provide very important conclusions in youth internships in which we could provide the opportunity, managed and driven by the private sector, to take responsibility for our young people to make that transition. It means that in schools in all provinces there are young people who work half days through a private sector opportunity and go to school half days. The curriculum and standards have been designed jointly by the private sector council and the local school or provincial agency.

This year 25,000 young Canadians will have the opportunity to be involved in that kind of youth internship program. Again, it is a partnership: government with the private sector; government with the local school boards; government with the provinces. That is the kind of philosophy we have to continually talk about because that is what works.

That is what the department is about, finding what works based on dealing with the real individual needs of Canadians and getting better services to them, but also developing a real set of partnerships that will enable us to reach out and cross over to find the linkages, bridges and connections throughout the country with our fellow governments, the private sector and community style agencies to combine resources and focus our efforts specifically on enabling individual Canadians to make a difference and to make a change.

Therefore I strongly recommend to the House the legislation we have before us. I hope members will see it for what it really is, not based on the old prisms and optics of the past, which is to say this is federal or that is provincial, but on the prisms and optics of the future, which is to say let us redefine government as partners with individuals, partners with communities and as partners with each other. That is the real philosophy that underlies the new Department of Human Resources Development.

• (1200)

With the accord and support of the House, we can get this legislation in place. It would give us the authority to bring together the powers of the old department and provide a

coherent, concise focus on helping Canadians meet the challenges of a new century.

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A little earlier today there was a question raised in the House about whether the vote that was deferred until Monday at 6 p.m. by the deputy government whip was appropriately deferred.

I want to confirm to the House that consultations were held by the whips. Pursuant to Standing Order 45(7), the vote was properly deferred pursuant to the consultations which had taken place as early as Tuesday of this week.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** In response to the point of order by the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville, since we appear to have agreement of the whips of all recognized parties, under Standing Order 45(7), the vote on the amendment for the third reading of Bill C-94 will take place at 6 p.m., Monday, November 20.

**Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Madam Speaker, we have no objection to the vote being held at 6 p.m. rather than 6.30 p.m. It should have been clearly stated when it was presented to the House that consent had been reached by all the whips.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I am sorry, that is not a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the minister who tabled the bill implies that his bill is a model of flexibility, co-ordination, decentralization, and letting the average citizen decide. Unfortunately, that is not the case, since it all depends on whether the minister is prepared to say yes or no to a project, any project.

In the final analysis, the minister will decide what will be decentralized, who will get a grant, who may co-ordinate, because ultimately, the decision will always be his. This bill is the exact opposite of flexible. This bill is unbending, and its author did not listen to Quebec.

Coming ten days after a referendum in which the people of Quebec spoke loud and clear, while giving Canada a brief respite to shape up, this bill is an insult. It is easy for the minister to say: Let us set prerogatives and jurisdictions aside and co-operate, when in this legislation he assumes powers he never had under the constitution, powers he had the colossal nerve to extrapolate from his spending powers and which he today wants to legalize in a bill.

• (1205)

With complete disregard for efficiency in the use of shrinking resources and for the constitution, this bill for the first time clearly gives the federal Minister of Human Resources Develop-

*Government Orders*

ment the power to replace the provinces in many of their jurisdictions, since, and we will see this later on, it literally allows the minister, as it says in the clause, to make decisions on all matters relating to human resources development in Canada, no less.

Far from withdrawing from provincial jurisdictions, the federal government is in fact assuming general responsibility for human resources development. The federal government is assuming the powers it needs, whether the provinces like it or not, although some do, but that is another matter and we will get back to that, but Quebec was not consulted, and when it was, it said in no uncertain terms what it wanted. The federal government is getting ready to change the social safety net, with no regard for the impact this will have on the provinces and especially on the individuals concerned.

This is a new phase, a qualitative leap in the development of Canadian federalism which tries to provide a legislative basis for this invasion by the federal government's spending power. The government has decided unilaterally to provide a legal, specific and positive basis for its spending power, which it often used to spend its way into debt. Today, the debt is being decentralized to the provinces, but the power has been recentralized to Ottawa.

This confirms our worst fears, and we discussed this during the referendum campaign. For instance, instead of announcing a withdrawal of the federal presence from manpower, this bill accentuates that presence by giving the federal government the requisite powers to negotiate and make deals directly with local agencies, without prior consent from the provinces. That is what the minister calls being flexible. Even municipalities may be approached and offered responsibilities under contracts to be concluded directly with the Department of Human Resources Development.

A good example is what happened during the so-called battle of the employment centres. We have yet to hear the epilogue to this story. Bill C-96 throws wide open the door to the delegation of the powers entrusted to the minister or the new employment and insurance commission—I will get back to this—to entities other than provincial governments and public administrations.

In other words, this bill, without any consultations, also opens the door to privatization and contracting out. Again, this is to be done on the minister's say so; if this bill is passed, he will be in a position to adopt any standards he wants and to define expected results. All those involved—including provinces, if he feels like it, organizations, people and financial institutions—will have to be totally flexible in complying with his decisions. This will remain true even though he says he wants to make employment centres responsible for some programs, since these centres will also be accountable to the minister.

• (1210)

If Bill C-96 is passed, it will also put in place the legislative framework allowing the Minister of Human Resources Development to go ahead with his UI reform according to the policy outlines revealed in the past few days. This policy is fully consistent with the bill.

I would like to stress a disturbing fact. This bill, whose only purpose, according to the minister, is to join together previously separate departments or programs, is Kim Campbell's legacy to the Liberals.

It is important to remember that, during her short-lived government, she gathered under the same roof all departments dealing with unemployment insurance, income security for both seniors and young people, literacy, student loans, employment training, and family policies. She did this as part of a major reform of social programs, as she said during the election campaign. Over 50 per cent of the federal government's budget spending is done, decided, directed, and controlled by this new Department of Human Resources Development.

The Tories did not hide the fact that they wanted to carry out a comprehensive reform. Let us not forget that, during the following election campaign, Liberal candidate Chrétien hounded the minister for saying, and we remember this, that this issue was too complex to be debated during an election campaign.

When questioned, the Liberals never suggested that they were only waiting to be elected before doing what Kim Campbell wanted to do. It is important to keep this in mind. It is important to show that when the Liberals came to power, instead of putting the departments back the way they were, they took advantage of the major upheaval ordered by senior officials who are still there. This clearly shows that the Liberal policy is the same as the old Tory policy, which is the same as that proposed in 1985 by the Macdonald Commission set up, as we know, by Mr. Trudeau's Liberal government.

Let us have a look—and I will quote the minister himself—at the new department's jurisdiction. In his budget plan tabled on February 27, 1995, he said that Human Resources Development Canada was in charge of the UI program, the income security program for children and seniors, a major part of family policy, existing federal programs of assistance to the provinces for post-secondary education and social assistance, labour market adjustment, social development and student loans. This accounts for more than 50 per cent of federal expenditures.

The federal government is playing a major role in the daily lives of Canadians without having to consult anyone, when it is literally altering the social and economic picture in Canada. But Quebec should be left to get organized to look after the people let down by the federal government.

*Government Orders*

• (1215)

Quebec is expected to live with the consequences of this government's actions, that is to say, at a time when, as we know, deficits are high, let the middle class bear the brunt of the tax load, target assistance to the most disadvantaged, eventually creating a rather difficult situation, all this without being required in any way to consult the Quebec government, which is the only government representing the people and nation of Quebec.

Must we remind members that a people that is different from others sets up its own social, economic, cultural and political structure that is not necessarily better but different, based on its priorities and its needs. Merely ten days after the October 30 vote, what Bill C-96 is saying is that the central government, through the Minister of Human Resources Development, will go ahead with its plans for reform and keep making decisions affecting the social fabric of Quebec without having to consult anyone.

No wonder it is telling us: "Forget jurisdictions. It does not matter any more". It is taking over, making an unprecedented power grab in areas of responsibility that are not its own, by misusing its spending power to provide direction, decide, take charge.

Let us take a look at some clauses. The people have the right to know. The bill reads, in part: "The powers, duties and functions of the Minister extend to—they can say that again—and include all matters over which Parliament has jurisdiction relating to the development of the human resources of Canada—that is an even wider area than the specific ones I mentioned—not by law assigned to any other Minister, department, board or agency of the Government of Canada, and are to be exercised with the objective of enhancing employment, encouraging equality and promoting social security".

The federal government is trying to take over from the Government of Quebec a very wide and ill defined area of responsibility, human resources development.

It never had that power. True, unemployment insurance legislation was put in place, but that required a constitutional amendment. Unemployment insurance and UI benefits are one thing, but we know that the government never had the power to decide and to provide direction it is now claiming over manpower training. Quite the contrary.

And what about family policy, poverty, literacy, dropouts? The government first used its spending power to interfere, and now it is making this intrusion legal.

Let us move to clause 7.

7. In exercising the powers or performing the duties or functions assigned to the Minister under this or any other Act of Parliament, the Minister may—

(b) cooperate with provincial authorities with a view to the coordination of efforts—

There is no requirement to do so.

• (1220)

Indeed, if you look at clause 20, it reads:

For the purpose of facilitating the formulation, coordination and implementation of any program or policy—the Minister may enter into agreements with a province—agencies of provinces, financial institutions and such other persons or bodies as the Minister considers appropriate.

The minister decides whether or not he wants to hold consultations. He can delegate any power to the Minister of Labour, the commission or any other person or body he chooses.

This is important, because the desire to take over the provinces' responsibility for their own fields of jurisdiction has, as we know, a different impact on Quebec than it does on the other provinces. A debate seems to be taking place outside Quebec concerning the social program reform, or a reform of federalism. Some want to maintain centralization, while others are in favour of decentralization.

We understand that, but we want to say this: those who think that there is a will on this government's part to decentralize should open their eyes and their ears, and they should read these provisions. They will realize that what is in the making is not decentralization but, on the contrary, what one might call recentralization. Indeed, the central government is giving itself the means to directly decide what will happen at the local level.

It is easy for the minister to say: "Yes, citizen A or citizen B will be able to decide to—" That is not the case. The minister is the one who will really make the decision. He is the one who will decide and it will not be possible for a province wishing to integrate its programs to do so. We will let the debate proceed, but we had to make this point.

As for Quebec, it has been fighting Ottawa's centralizing views for a long time, because it conflicts with its own desire to have a well-adjusted or co-ordinated, as René Lévesque used to say, social and economic policy. Let me just mention that, before the Second World War, the Rowell-Sirois commission began preparing the ground—and would later complete the process—to ensure that, in Canada, major budgetary social and economic decisions would all be taken by Ottawa, with the provinces becoming mere flexible subcontractors.

The bill introduced by the human resources development minister is not new but is certainly in line with the recommendations of the Rowell-Sirois commission. However, succeeding governments in Quebec have always fought hard to maintain control over the province's social and economic development.

The war helped the central government, by allowing it to centralize all taxes. Once it had a foot in the door, Ottawa would not back out.

In Quebec, the public, co-operative organizations, as well as grass-roots movements, created a coalition, somewhat like the one which we witnessed during the referendum campaign, and told then premier Duplessis: "Quebec needs its own taxes".

• (1225)

That tax is what allowed the then exuberant Quiet Revolution to be channelled into specific projects.

At the federal-provincial conference on poverty in 1965, René Lévesque, who was to become the first sovereignist premier of Quebec and was then a federalist minister in a Liberal government, gave a very clear explanation of what the position of his federalist Liberal government was at the time.

I quoted him in relation to Bill C-95 but, if you will allow me, I shall repeat the quotes here for the benefit of our audience and for argument's sake. I do so for the simple reason that they show that Quebec has made no progress between 1965 and 1995 in controlling its own future. It has regressed. Quebecers have seen their situation worsen. Concretely—applying it to manpower—the people find themselves face to face with two levels of decision-making, to their disadvantage.

René Lévesque said that it had become imperative to establish a genuine economic and social policy. This policy needed to be integrated, flexible in its mechanisms; it needed to include a social security system centred on the family and be based on the right to assistance on the basis of need. Secondly, he said, for the sake of efficiency and on constitutional grounds, the Quebec government alone could and should, within its own territory, design and implement such a policy. I repeat, for the sake of efficiency first, and on constitutional grounds.

Thirdly, Lévesque said, the social and economic development policy they had formulated would create an integrated social policy—I would interject here that the foregoing is the key phrase—regional development policy, manpower policy, health policy, housing policy and job training policy.

Finally, he said that, as a federalist, the general policy, while he did not necessarily condemn it, did not necessarily correspond, in terms of its spirit and terms of application, to one the Government of Canada might opt for. The people of Quebec would enjoy at least as many if not more benefits than other Canadians might.

For the sake of efficiency, for the sake of determining economic and social policy as a function of needs and priorities, at a time when money is scarce, it is urgent for Quebec's

### *Government Orders*

economic and social policy to be integrated. Nothing, however, could be further from integration than this Bill C-96, which makes the Minister of Human Resources Development the key figure in that organization, as he has so aptly said himself.

In the manpower field in particular, there is unanimity in Quebec, and this has been expressed by another resolution by the Société québécoise de développement de la main-d'oeuvre, which comprises banking co-operatives, school boards, the Conseil du patronat, along with municipal institutions, co-operative businesses—just about everybody, you might say.

The Société québécoise de développement de la main-d'oeuvre, on the proposal of Mr. Béland and with the support of Ghislain Dufour, made a unanimous decision to ask the government—the federal government to be precise—not to put in place a parallel partnership structure or try to interfere with Quebec's jurisdiction over manpower development.

• (1230)

The board also indicated that the Société québécoise de développement de la main-d'oeuvre is and must remain the favoured partnership structure regarding Quebec manpower issues. Must I remind the House that this organization is not a government organization, but one whose members represent private groups. This is the organization through which the manpower policy is implemented. It stresses, almost imploringly, that the federal government is set to put in place another network, adding an extra level of consultation, decision and assessment.

This is not a reflection of the central government's will to eliminate duplication and overlap, but of its will to take over everywhere, pushing the provinces aside and sidelining Quebec. Because it must be borne in mind that the cutbacks announced in relation to the Canada social transfer will result, in 1997-98, in a \$1.9 billion shortfall on top of all the other cuts.

Quebec is going to go through some rough times. Meanwhile, the central government and its HRD minister are letting UI fund surpluses accumulate, so that they can play Santa Claus by going over the Quebec government's head and spend this money in provincial areas of jurisdiction. But contributions to the UI fund come directly from employers and workers.

The minister of employment and consultation herself vigorously denounced his bill. She says that: "Like its labour market partners, the Quebec government denounces Ottawa's intentions to set up its own parallel manpower structures in Quebec. This federal initiative amounts to a flat rejection of the unanimous Quebec consensus, repeatedly expressed, both under the previous administration and under the current one, on the need for Quebec to regain control over all labour adjustment measures, including the related budgets".

*Government Orders*

Lise Bissonnette referred, in several editorials, to this increased desire to interfere, the term is not strong enough because the federal is not simply interfering, it really wants to assume Quebec's power to make its own political and economic decisions. This is not the first attempt by the central government to bypass the Quebec government and manpower corporation.

Former minister Valcourt tried to do the same. Remember who told him off? None other than Liberal minister Bourbeau, also a federalist, who said: "Your commission does offer grants to what it calls co-ordination groups for all sorts of projects, directly or indirectly related to manpower training. These groups include all kinds of associations. Such projects seem relatively pertinent, but others are more questionable".

He then said: "Obviously, this is a new structure used by the federal government to spend money which comes primarily from the UI fund".

He also added: "What is unacceptable with this approach is that it is totally improvised, this at a time when, more than ever, government intervention in the manpower development sector must be planned according to priorities, so as to deal efficiently with issues such as manpower shortage, retraining in growing economic sectors, as well as improvement of skills, and thus benefit from market globalization".

• (1235)

Minister Bourbeau continued by saying: "I find it hard to believe that the federal government would wilfully do things which, under the pretence of initiating a rapprochement with the private sector, would result in the establishment of a network of intermediaries, given that it pledged it would not do such a thing".

I only alluded to manpower training because it is a very sensitive issue at a time when Quebec is, sadly, the champion of poverty, with an unemployment rate still at 11.2 per cent, and with Montreal in 23rd place, out of 26 Canadian cities, in terms of income level. We, Bloc Quebecois members, will do everything possible to ensure that Quebec does not remain in that situation. Less than 10 days after the referendum, instead of listening to us, they impose with an iron hand diktats that do not meet Quebec's economic and social needs and priorities.

Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for La Prairie:

That all words following the word "That" be deleted and replaced with the following:

"this House declines to give second reading to Bill C-96, An Act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development and to amend and repeal certain related Acts, because the principle of the Bill includes no provision requiring the Minister, as part of that person's powers, to award full and entire financial

compensation to any province wishing to exercise, fully and alone, jurisdiction over human resources development".

If the government would only give a sign that it has heard Quebecers' majority vote calling unanimously for major changes, especially with respect to manpower, it could have given a sign. By moving second reading of this utterly offensive bill, the government shows no concern for efficiency and integration, for Quebec's need to co-ordinate all its resources at a difficult time, for the Constitution, for the wishes expressed once again by 100 per cent of Quebecers.

Consideration of this bill will allow us to say that this dialogue of the deaf, which has been going on for so long and which hurts both Quebec and probably Canada, must end. Should Canada, however, end the dialogue by refusing to listen, Quebecers know which way they must go to take control of their own destiny. In the interests of the whole population of Quebec, of the whole Quebec nation, Quebecers have shown the way that they will have no choice but to follow.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The amendment is in order.

The debate is now on the amendment.

• (1240)

[English]

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-96 today.

At first glance one might think that a creation bill such as this is little reason to engage in debate, but there is indeed much we need to discuss. It is not so much what the bill says but the issues that underlie the bill that merit a resounding rejection.

I will examine a recent event that speaks to why I stand before the House to express my rejection of Bill C-96.

As members of the House know, our country is submerged in troubling times. The referendum in Quebec has paralysed the House, the Liberal government and in particular the Minister of Human Resources Development. Promises made in the red book have fallen by the wayside as the government has chosen to do nothing, fearing the consequences of decisive action.

My party stated clearly at the outset of the referendum that we favoured a strong and united Canada. To this end, we made positive contributions to the debate. We outlined a very clear position for a new confederation. Our plan would change Canada for the better and bring our country into the next century healthy, vibrant and able to cope with its new challenges. Unfortunately for Canada, the no campaign launched a strategy based on a do nothing approach. It believed the status quo would work. In short order, however, it became obvious that this strategy was a complete and utter failure.

*Government Orders*

Our Prime Minister had a 10-point lead in the polls and lost it all. In a move motivated by panic and fear he committed a huge virage. After having categorically rejected constitutional changes, after having categorically rejected administrative changes, the Prime Minister capitulated at the last minute and offered up constitutional changes and distinct society. As we all know, this tired rhetoric was soundly rejected by Canadians, not once but twice.

Let me remind the Liberals that one of their titans, Mr. Trudeau, thoroughly and publicly denounced this strategy on Monday of this week.

In light of the Prime Minister's virage, Canadians are expecting great changes from the government. However, in the week that has just passed, do we have any indication of change? I think not. Instead of change, the Minister of Human Resources Development is attempting to sell us this flawed bill, which not only grabs more powers for the federal government but also fails to introduce one single noteworthy measure of administrative change.

I will speak on a number of areas the substance of Bill C-96 eliminates. My comments will touch briefly on these areas: specific concern with some of the bill's provisions; the government's trivial attempt at post-secondary education reforms; the government's non-existent approach to decentralization; the government's brazen attempt at accountability; and the government's invisible strategy for reform of the Canada pension plan. All these issues will show beyond a reasonable doubt that the House has only one option: it must clearly and soundly reject the bill.

In the bill the minister is accorded the power to deal directly with groups and municipalities for the delivery of social programs. This power circumvents the provinces directly and attempts to keep them out of the decision making process. This is disconcerting, as it is the provinces that have constitutional authority for social program delivery. This power contained in clauses 20 and 21 of the bill further demonstrates the government's penchant for power grabbing and invasive behaviour.

• (1245)

The bill also allows for the appointment of a minister for labour. If the government feels the need to increase the size of its cabinet then it should admit so publicly, rather than doing it through the back door like this. The government has an obligation to be forthright in its reasoning. If I were a cynic I might suggest this change amounted to nothing more than the creation of a position at the cabinet table for the no campaign strategist, the hon. member for Saint-Henri—Westmount. I will not imply motive as I am an optimist. Instead I will leave it to Canadians to judge this for themselves.

I would like to steer the discussion toward education. There can be no doubt that education forms the bedrock of a successful nation. Bill C-96 represents the creation of a department which oversees the federal role in education policy. The bill is a stark reminder that the government has no vision for an education policy which will meet the needs of Canada's students into the

21st century. The bill also reminds us that the government has failed in its attempts to create changes to revitalize post-secondary education.

By looking at the trends of globalization and retrenchment, we see not only where the government has failed but, more important, where the Reform Party offers a substantially stronger vision in this regard.

Herman Melville once said that we are not a nation so much as a world. This statement is as incisive as it is intimidating. Unwittingly it speaks volumes of the major shifts taking place today in all aspects of our world. For just as the business world is confronting the pressures of globalization to be more productive and competitive, so too are universities encountering the necessity to provide students with better tools to help Canada remain competitive.

There is at present a growing concern among educators in Canada that students are entering the world market without the requisite education and training to help them meet the needs of their chosen vocation. The skills mismatch. The global job crisis. Reinventing education. All of these are familiar battle cries of observers writing in North American journals warning of this disturbing trend.

Schools need to be relevant to reflect the realities of the modern world and to help train present and future workers who are capable of helping their employers, in whatever field, achieve higher levels of performance and productivity. For example, the challenge facing schools is to prepare future leaders to think critically about the forces and requirements that shape business operations in global markets and in different cross-cultural contexts.

What leadership do we have from the government in the area of internationalization and education? Little to none. The Canadian Bureau of International Education has reported that Canada's performance in this area is the lowest among all G-7 countries. In fact, the bureau found that the United States spends somewhat in the order of 20 times what Canada spends in this regard. We are not talking about increasing aggregate spending, but rather reconfiguring current spending to reflect our strategic needs.

The federal government simply has to be a player in the area of international education. In the short term a Reform government would work to do the following. Strengthen the policy dialogue with provincial governments and higher education institutions through regular and systematic consultation and information exchange at all levels. Increase networking and reinforce collaborative ventures among higher education institutions in priority regions and in priority areas of research. Foster the development of stronger partnerships among higher education institutions, professional associations and public authorities, business and other organizations which have a stake in the quality of higher education and research. Facilitate and encourage key stakeholders, such as the provinces and territories, national standards bodies and associations representing the learning community, industry, business and labour to develop

*Government Orders*

competency based skill tests which are matched to learning outcomes developed by learning organizations.

I want to examine a second trend, namely that of fiscal retrenchment. We are all agreed that the dismal state of public finances in Canada places a tremendous burden on the capacity of government to address any issue. This is particularly true in the case of education. Having said that, we must not let education be circumvented by, as the Smith commission noted in 1991, short term, make shift responses that have postponed temporarily the day of reckoning. I do not propose that we ignore the realities of retrenchment, but that we address our fiscal plight with a strategic mind set.

• (1250)

We must re-examine the way we fund our post-secondary institutions. Specifically we need to re-examine student loans and transfers to provinces for education.

The Department of Human Resources Development, which the bill will create, has done virtually nothing to take a lead role in promoting a new vision for education financing in Canada. Instead it has discussed, tinkered and carelessly cut.

Let us review this disappointing history. The 1994 discussion paper on reforming social security talked vaguely about life long learning. The document was long on rhetoric and short on details. It talked in generalities, as most discussion papers do. We do not need discussion. We need action. We need fresh and creative approaches to confront the plight of our education financing mechanism.

Bill C-28, passed in June 1994, made some modest improvements to the Canada student loans program. It removed financial liability from the government, which is good. However, it represents a stopgap measure for a program that requires fundamental redesign.

Some serious questions need to be answered by the government. For example, while the act made provisions to develop pilot program testing, new financing schemes, such as income contingent loans, it is not likely that anything will happen before 1997. That is four years that Canadians will have waited for the government to act, four years that the government has neglected the need to address questions of access and sustainability.

Another fundamental question that lingers is one of strategic intent. When loan eligibility is controlled by the government, loans do not provide an incentive for students to enter areas of study where there is good occupational demand. Competitiveness and productivity must be linked to education. We must

determine where there is need and focus our energies to promote education in those areas.

The 1995-96 budget announced changes to the fiscal transfer regime by creating the Canada health and social transfer, known as CHST. Through the CHST the government carelessly cut transfers which support education financing and made it increasingly difficult for taxpayers to measure whether provinces are spending the appropriate amounts of money on specific programs.

The government decided that it is better to give education dollars to the provinces with no strings attached than it is to give education dollars to individuals, where it can be ensured that tax dollars are going to support their intended purpose. The logic in this is spectacularly flawed.

Bill C-96 will create a department that for two years has done nothing to make the fundamental changes required of our post-secondary education system. Why should we create a department, when we already know that it has no capacity to act on this issue?

Let us move to decentralization, an issue that has garnered significant attention of late and, in particular, when the Minister of Human Resources Development presented his remarks earlier this morning. Bill C-96 is a centralizing piece of legislation, make no mistake, despite what the hon. minister said in the House today.

Clause 6 of the bill reinforces the existing federal powers for social programs. In fact, it may even create new powers for the federal government. Even if this new power never manifests itself, the bill at a minimum entrenches the status quo of federal intervention into provincial areas of social policy jurisdiction.

I find it cathartic, though I suppose not entirely uncharacteristic, that the government should try to enact legislation which engenders and champions the notion of centralization and of status quo. To do so amidst the decentralization forces pressuring the country to change is profoundly absurd.

• (1255)

Recent events have shown to all that fundamental change is required in our federation. There is almost universal agreement that the federal government needs to rethink its current role as a provider of services and programs. In areas of social policy, we cannot continue to support a system which separates the revenue raising capacity from the expenditure function. In other areas too there is strong evidence to support devolution to the most logical level of government.

In October of this year the Reform Party released its vision for a new confederation. Reform believes that decentralization will



permit future governments to respond more effectively to the needs of ordinary Canadians. It also addresses many of the historic concerns of individuals from all provinces.

Reform's plan includes the following: giving provinces exclusive control over natural resources, job training, municipal affairs, housing, tourism, sports and recreation; giving provinces control over setting their own interprovincial standards for health, welfare and education and replacing federal cash transfers with tax points, allowing provinces to raise their own taxes to finance social programs. This decentralization will lead to a more balanced federation, one in which Ottawa will play a co-operative role rather than a dominating role.

The proposals outlined in the new Confederation speak to the long term. They furnish Canada with a vision. They put flesh on the conceptual bones of a new federalism. This is the kind of leadership that has been conspicuously absent in the federal Liberals.

How can one govern without coherent direction? It is incomprehensible. I am not talking about prescience but about the courage to say, these are my ideas, this is my vision. We have seen none of that from the government. The traditional response to fiscal crisis has been centralization, consolidation and concentration. This instinct increasingly leads to failure. Centralized control and consolidated agencies create more waste, not less.

There are many reasons why Reform speaks for this vision of decentralization. Decentralization will engender greater flexibility, allowing institutions to respond more quickly to changing circumstances and client needs.

Decentralization will create more effective programs and service delivery as the deliverers and providers of government assistance are closer to those whom they serve, which is whom we serve. Decentralization will reduce wasteful overlap and duplication created by concurrent jurisdiction and poorly co-ordinated government programs and services. Decentralization will engender greater fiscal responsibility. For a government that spends the money it raises will inherently be more accountable than the one that spends the money someone else collects. Decentralization in regard to the tax system is most compatible with the tenet of federalism. The essence of a federal form of government is local autonomy. In its designated spheres each unit is free, free to exercise its policy discretion unencumbered.

It is important to remember in this debate on Bill C-96 that decentralization is neither a celebrated buzzword nor a passing political fad. It is a policy movement that has been vigorously championed in Canada since the 1960s. It represents reconfiguring the locus of attention in the federation. Former B.C. Liberal Party leader Gordon Gibson writes in his new book: "Canadians ultimately want less control by Ottawa and more local manage-

### *Government Orders*

ment of their affairs—The basic concept here is 'government closer to home'. Now home is where the heart is in our private lives perhaps, but in government terms home is where the folk have the knowledge and resources to do the job. That single thought takes us a long way".

Adhering to the rule of thumb that the responsibility for addressing problems should lie with the lowest level of government possible does not require that we disavow the notion of federal leadership.

• (1300)

A federal government with fewer employees, fewer departments, and smaller budgets can still have a steering role in Canadian society. There would still be a policy framework setting functions in certain areas, even if it delivered no services. These would include policy areas that transcend the capacities of state and local governments such as international trade, macroeconomic policy and much environmental and regulatory policy; social insurance programs like employment compensation, where paying equal benefits to all citizens requires that rich and poor share differentiated burdens; and investments that are so costly that they require tax increases which might discourage business from locating or staying in a city or province.

Even in these cases Reform believes that programs can be designed to allow for significant flexibility at a provincial or municipal level. The federal government can and must work with provincial governments to define jointly the missions and the outcome. But in so doing it must free lower government to achieve those outcomes as they see fit.

What has been the Liberal response to decentralization? The government has resisted the natural ebb and flow of this federation by operating completely oblivious to its surroundings. We saw this in the recent referendum. The government grossly miscalculated by adhering to a status quo position. Only when it became obvious to the government that its policy was indeed a complete failure did it move to make insincere promises of change. Where is this change now, this vision of a new federalism? Where is its blueprint for a renewed Canada? Where is the leadership to bring forward such a plan?

Given the government's previous attempts at major change, I suggest that we will be waiting a long time before we see substantive and meaningful change.

Let me give one example of how the government is failing to deliver on its promise to reform and decentralize social programs. Consider the current welfare issue in British Columbia. When the province made changes to its own programs by stipulating a residency requirement for welfare qualifications, the federal government stepped in and threatened the province with punitive actions. That is certainly no stranger to Albertans.

*Government Orders*

There is no question that the B.C. government should be permitted to administer its affairs without federal interference. The minister, rather than threatening the province, should back off and leave it free to run its own programs. It is absurd for this minister, who has radically reduced transfers to the provinces, to turn around and intervene in provincial jurisdiction.

The minister continues to refuse to meet with the provinces over the Canada health and social transfer. Now when the provinces try to move forward he stands in their way. This, it would seem, is the Liberal position on co-operative federalism. How terribly predictable and how truly unfortunate.

I want to discuss accountability for a moment. Bill C-96 reminds us once again that the government has embraced a policy that will bring an end to departments submitting annual reports to Parliament. This ignoble policy speaks volumes of the government's attitude toward accountability, despite the sniping from the other side of the House.

Most observers who study Parliament lament the gap that exists between the relatively rudimentary theory of parliamentary accountability and its practice. The theory suggests that there are strong linkages between the representative system that created the elected House of Commons and the executive system of departments headed and controlled by ministers.

Parliamentary control is considered in two key phases, the assigning of responsibility and authority through statutes and appropriations, and accountability through scrutiny in the House and in its committees. I can accept that the reality of modern government is not as neatly ordained as this theory might suggest. But I cannot accept any actions such as those provided for in Bill C-96, which weaken accountability through scrutiny in the House.

Reform supports in principle the current attempt to improve the accessibility of information in the budget estimates. However, by moving to end the annual reporting function before the estimates reform is in place, we are left with an incomplete picture regarding annual departmental activities and expenditures. How can this be? When the bill and others like it are enacted we will have poor estimates and no annual report. This is a disgrace.

• (1305)

At a conference hosted by the Canadian study of parliament group this past weekend the Auditor General of Canada stated that it was time for the government to go beyond rhetoric and embrace true accountability. The government would do well to listen to its own auditor general, because Canadians want information about their government. Canadians deserve to have access to good quality information about their government. For

a department that spends some \$70 billion annually, I think the relatively minor investment that an annual report could engender is a worthwhile expenditure.

In broader accountability terms the government does not have a solid track record. It is for this reason that I make specific reference to accountability in my remarks today. The red book outlined the seemingly ambitious agenda to restore integrity to the institution of Parliament. What has been accomplished since 1993? Not very much. Where are those free votes? Where is the independent ethics counsellor who was supposedly reporting to Parliament directly? Where is our code of conduct? Where is our real MP pension reform? Where is the promise of increasing the role of committees in drafting legislation? How can there be so many unanswered questions?

The Liberal government has made a mockery of parliamentary accountability by showing such brazen disdain and contempt toward its election commitments. It has talked incessantly about transparency, about integrity and about commitment to the Canadian people. In truth, the question is not really how many commitments have already been broken, but when next will the government break another one.

Because of this shameful lack of action the institution of Parliament has suffered. Members from all parties have suffered. Most significantly, the Canadian people have suffered.

**Mr. Richardson:** The only party that suffers in the House is the Reform Party.

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** The government has articulated the precepts of integrity but has failed to deliver the substance of its bravado. Canadians are right to be disappointed.

We were promised a new approach to accountability and ethics. Instead, we have received well rehearsed rhetoric and woeful policy from that side of the House.

I turn my attention now to the issue of pensions. Bill C-96 will create the department responsible for administering the Canada pension plan. Given the importance of the program to all Canadians, it is only fair that we spend some time reviewing what the department has been doing. My review will be brief because in truth the department has done virtually nothing to address what the government has deemed unsustainable.

The government, in refusing to confront the issue, has said to Canadians that it is not concerned about their futures. There is widespread consensus that the Canada pension plan is in trouble. In October of this year the chief actuary for the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions stated: "The CPP's projected costs are considerably higher than previously expected. If the existing schedule of contribution rates is not increased and benefits continue as now legislated, the CPP fund is expected to be exhausted by the year 2015".

*Government Orders*

Other evidence suggests that prevalent fear and concern exists among Canadians regarding CPP. A Bank of Nova Scotia poll released last month stated that 75 per cent of Canadians distrust the security and sustainability of the Canada pension plan. The survey also showed that of those people aged 30 to 49, fully 81 per cent reported that they are not confident about the ability of CPP to provide them with income when they retire. When so many are in agreement that changes are overdue it is incomprehensible why the government has failed to make changes in its promise in 1993 to do just that.

Not long ago the Minister of Human Resources Development responded to my question in the House of Commons by stating: "The best way in which the hon. member can make a contribution is to start putting forward her own proposals on behalf of her party". If the department that Bill C-96 creates will not put forward its ideas to address our enfeebled Canada pension plan, it is only fair that I present Reform's vision for renewing CPP.

• (1310)

Reform believes that the Canada pension plan is under considerable financial strain, a strain which if not addressed will jeopardize the pension benefits of today's seniors, those baby boomers edging toward retirement and our children who are beginning or who will soon enter the workforce. This evaluation of the Canada pension plan is not fearmongering or partisan politicking. It represents the opinions of the governments and of ordinary Canadians.

Through access to information I obtained a briefing note prepared for the Minister of Human Resources Development written by one of his senior policy analysts. She writes of CPP that "the costs of the Canada pension plan are rising faster than the actuarial assumptions predicted". She continued in the note to say that "amendments may be required to Canada pension plan benefits or to restrict the cost of the benefits". The senior policy analyst recommends therefore that the government increase contribution rates for CPP or implement cost cutting measures in the Canada pension plan.

The only proposals for changing CPP the government is considering are cutting seniors' pensions or raising taxes for CPP contributions. We already have evidence that the government prefers the easy yet reckless tax grab option. On November 2 the government announced a payroll tax increase to support a faltering pension system. The Liberal penchant for tax increases, which is already legendary, once again rears its ugly head.

Unlike the government, Reform believes we can renew the Canada pension plan without cutting seniors' pensions and without relying on contribution rate increases. Our plan would gradually convert CPP into individualized, privately invested accounts similar to RRSPs. The total investment income in these

millions of accounts will greatly exceed the total income that is possible under CPP's current restrictive investment parameters. This increase in total investment wealth is key to our plan for making possible a renewed CPP that is generous to all age and income groups.

The first point of our four-point plan to renew the Canada pension plan is a guarantee to seniors. The first step in CPP reform must be to provide a protected status for all benefits being paid to the current generation of seniors. Reform believes that when there are any changes to CPP, no matter what they may be, no matter who proposes them, those changes must never touch any benefits that we as a society have promised our seniors.

If the Liberals implement cuts to seniors' pensions, as suggested in the briefing note to which I referred earlier, we can expect a seniors' uprising like no one has ever seen. Reform will help in every way possible to take that uprising to the House of Commons and even to the front doors of 24 Sussex Drive. We will not allow anyone to tamper with promises we have made to our seniors.

The second point provides for recognition bonds. Because people over a certain age, say around 40, will not be able to build up enough savings in their super RRSPs to compensate fully for the loss of their Canada pension plan benefits, special bonds will be issued guaranteeing the redemption upon retirement of all previously made contributions to CPP. Once we have guaranteed seniors' benefits in point one, this point guarantees benefits for those who are quickly edging toward their retirement but will not be able to fully benefit from their new super RRSPs.

This brings me to my third point, the creation of super RRSPs. Who should Canadians trust to manage their retirement savings, themselves or a government saddled with a \$560 billion debt? Instead of contributing to the Canada pension plan to provide for their retirement, individuals would contribute into what we call super RRSPs. The conversion process from CPP to super RRSPs would gradually reduce the financial demands on the CPP system while keeping payroll deductions at reasonable levels. The excess revenues would be diverted into each worker's RRSP.

• (1315)

The fourth point of our plan for renewing the Canada pension plan is to improve benefits for elderly widows. The avaricious benefits given to elderly widows of deceased CPP contributors would gradually be replaced by a system under which full ownership of the spouse's super RRSP would be transferred to the widow without tax implications.

Here are constructive ideas for addressing an issue about which most Canadians feel deeply. We have initiated the debate. Reform is prepared to discuss real options and is open to innovative ideas.

*Government Orders*

Reform has a vision. Where is the Liberal vision? Where are the Liberals as we navigate the rough waters of complex policy?

**An hon. member:** Right in front of you.

**Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast):** It is clear they have missed the boat. They have no ideas, no vision and no stomach for white water. At a time when Canadians need leadership the most, the government has failed to deliver. How truly sad. We should give the hon. member on the other side of the House a bull horn.

I have spoken at length about my concerns regarding Bill C-96. In light of what I have said my conclusions are self-evident. I cannot and will not support the bill.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, there is considerable mischievousness going on here today. I want to correct a couple of flagrant errors.

The Prime Minister said in the House on a number of occasions that the pensions of seniors, those who have them now, would not be cut. He did indicate it may be necessary to look at the amount being contributed at this time for future pensioners.

For the Reform to suggest that is what the Liberals are doing, that is what the Prime Minister is doing, shows it has not been listening. It is unfortunate it would stoop to that. Reform members are trying to put their party and their leader in front of Canadians. That is what that kind of remark does. That is what it suggests.

It is not unlike the remarks made during the referendum campaign. I have here over 30 some quotes from newspapers throughout the country condemning their behaviour, indicating quite clearly they were playing politics. They were putting their party, their leader in front of Canada. I would be delighted to share those comments with them if necessary.

For that member to suggest pensioners will trust Reformers, Reform policy to protect them is really dreaming in technicolour. I doubt it very much.

With respect to the official opposition I shall try to prove the bill is an administrative bill. It is putting the pieces together so that the job can be done. It is the kind of bill that will still require co-operation and partnership, those very elements required in order to make Canada work.

There are no new powers in the bill. My colleagues in the official opposition know it.

[*Translation*]

Clause 20 of Bill C-96 raises concerns for the Government of Quebec as well as for certain members of this House. It is the one authorizing the minister to enter into agreements with provinces and financial or other institutions.

Some members are concerned more specifically that this clause gives the minister too broad a discretionary power for entering into agreements with local organizations, which might lead to encroachment on provincial areas of jurisdiction.

To clarify the situation, it might be worthwhile to examine the exact wording of clause 20. This clause states very clearly that these agreements are expressly intended to facilitate the carrying out of programs, and I quote, “—relating to the powers, duties and functions referred to in section 6—”

This clause sets out the mandate of the department and, let me repeat, without introducing new elements and without creating new powers. This is, obviously, what limits the discretionary powers which could be conferred upon the minister.

• (1320)

These powers are restricted by the very mandate of the department, which the bill clearly defines as restricted to all matters over which Parliament has jurisdiction. Moreover, it has been repeated on numerous occasions in this House that Bill C-96 assigns no new powers to the minister. The bill makes no change in federal areas of jurisdiction, no change whatsoever, nor in those of provincial governments. In this connection, the bill makes no change whatsoever in the present situation. Clause 20 does not, therefore, in any way authorize the minister to encroach upon areas of provincial jurisdiction. Is that clear, now?

The purpose of clause 20 is very simple. It allows the department to sign contracts with other organizations, which is normal. The department could not continue to function without that power. HRDC has signed hundreds of contracts and agreements with a broad range of Quebec groups, I might add, including agreements with the Government of Quebec, which are important to Quebec workers seeking to obtain training and get back into the work force.

The existing legislation already allows this, the bill merely picks these agreements up again. Nothing is changed. In 1994-95 alone, HRDC signed more than 50,000 contracts relating to manpower in Quebec, representing in all \$695 million in program financing and income support.

These contracts break down as follows: 9,600 contracts with non-profit organizations; 9,300 contracts with businesses in the private sector; 2,800 contracts with public sector institutions such as municipalities; 3,200 contracts with the Government of Quebec and 25,000 contracts under the program for independent students, which provides income support for unemployed workers while they are receiving training.

I am sure that, all things considered, no one would suggest cancelling the agreements made possible under clause 20. Think of the consequences. It would mean the end of shared-cost agreements to help welfare recipients back on their feet. It would mean the end of funding for groups like the world famous Cirque du Soleil in Quebec City, which has carried out HRDC

training and job creation programs since 1987, programs that really make a difference in the lives of people who need help.

It would mean the end of our partnership with two Quebec government departments which support youth training and job search programs through the Relais des jeunes adultes du sud-ouest de Montréal. It would mean the end of our partnership with the Société québécoise de développement de la main-d'oeuvre, which helps new businesses get established through the Société d'aide au développement des collectivités de Sorel-Tracy Inc.

It would mean the end of our agreement with the SQDM to help workers affected by the closing of the Hyundai Plant in Bromont, last March. It would mean the end of our agreement with the local Human Resources Canada Centre and the Société de développement économique in Jonquière on the collection and exchange of labour market information. It would mean the end of agreements on one-stop services, like the agreement involving HRDC, the industrial commissioner and the Office de tourisme de Témiscamingue on providing services to promote industrial, rural and tourism development.

It would mean the end of the partnership in Gaspé between HRDC, the SQDM, the Fédération québécoise des rivières à saumon du Québec and other groups that are working on upgrading the skills of salmon fishing guides. It would mean the end of the Older Workers Adjustment Program, a federal-provincial agreement that provides \$54 million in assistance to displaced workers in Quebec.

In fact, the Older Workers Adjustment Program is a prime example of why it is so important for the minister to be able to enter into agreements, not just with other governments but also with financial institutions, for instance.

• (1325)

Thanks to the Older Workers Adjustment Program, the federal government purchases annuities on behalf of older workers. During the past three years and up to now, we have spent more than \$111 million on purchasing these annuities and have helped nearly 5,000 older workers to face the future with a measure of security.

We would not be able to continue this practice without clause 20, which simply gives us the power to keep helping these workers.

These agreements and thousands like them in communities in all Canadian provinces are what clause 20 is all about. We have no intention of using clause 20 to bypass the provinces or get involved in areas of provincial jurisdiction. No intention at all.

### *Government Orders*

For example, clause 20 gives us the power to enter into agreements with financial institutions providing student loans under the Canada student loans program, which is bigger and more flexible. As it is clearly entitled to, the Quebec government chose to withdraw from this program in favour of block funding.

Clause 20 will preserve this kind of flexibility, which fully respects each province's powers and priorities.

The department's ability to conclude this kind of agreement will become even more important as the department continues to streamline operations and decentralize programs.

For example, the minister is testing various ways of ensuring local integration by establishing decision making and service development at the local level. We must move away from the highly centralized and compartmentalized programs imposed by the central administration and give local authorities a much greater latitude in making decisions. It is then easier to develop an integrated range of programs and services meeting the needs of the various communities.

This will be impossible if we cannot enter into agreements with the people and organizations with whom we must work. Impossible.

It would be impossible to build on the real progress we are making in integrating more effectively the federal government's resources with those of our partners. Local CRHCs are already learning to form more effective partnerships with schools, colleges, businesses, unions, and community organizations.

In fact, many programs are now designed to integrate public and private sector resources. For example, the department has created 16 sectoral councils to co-ordinate the management of human resources needs in the private sector. These councils now affect nearly 36 per cent of Canada's labour force, and many other councils are being created.

In each of these councils, both labour and management in a given industrial sector work together to develop a master plan with respect to their human resources needs. This co-operation constitutes the basis for some truly innovative partnerships. Under the internship program for example, sectorial councils developed training courses to allow young people to gain experience in areas as varied as electronics, horticulture, tourism and knowledge based industries.

In this partnership, businesses and unions set criteria and develop curricula together. Then, they make arrangements with local high school, community colleges and cégeps. In fact, they themselves give the hands-on portion so that the young people get an adequate mix of academic and practical training.

*Government Orders*

By integrating governmental and private sector resources this way, we end up with a more effective and efficient program. In fact, not only do our private sector partners manage the program, they also invest in it.

This kind of forward-looking initiative attracts a great deal of interest. Other countries are looking into possible scenarios to involve the private sector and local communities in developing internship programs.

Without clause 20 of Bill C-96, all these innovative initiatives would simply boil down to nothing because there would be no mechanism to govern all the administrative arrangements involved.

• (1330)

There is nothing catastrophic about clause 20. There is no need to read between the lines. Clause 20 is straightforward.

I know that some believe that it goes further, that it will give the minister the power to dismiss concerns expressed by provincial governments. The minister has already given these people the assurance that provincial governments will continue to be consulted, as they were in the past, about the kinds of agreements that HRDC will be making.

He even went as far as stating that he would not enter into any agreement without the prior consent of the appropriate provincial government, if that is what the province wants.

I do not know what more those who oppose clause 20 could ask for. Instead of trying to find in Bill C-96 examples of usurpation of power which simply do not exist, we should get on with the real tasks of creating partnerships, co-operating, and providing jobs to Canadians. This is indeed the purpose of Bill C-96 and clause 20.

We all know that co-operation between the federal and provincial governments could be improved in matters of labour, as well as in any other sector.

Federal-provincial agreements and partnerships would help find better ways to fulfil our respective mandates. There is no doubt about that. The issue must be carefully examined, and this is why the minister sent a direct invitation to the provinces to start discussing it.

However, if we really want these discussions to be productive, we must pass this bill now, in order to continue shaping a new department and a new era of flexible federalism.

We must pass Bill C-96 to continue providing effective services to all Canadians.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to the remarks by the hon. member for St. Boniface, and note that sometimes the more we talk, the less we understand each other.

The hon. member suggests that this clause 20 will lend much more flexibility and better harmony between levels of government. The clause must be read; it states “—the Minister may enter into agreements with a province”—may, not must—“or group of provinces, agencies of provinces, financial institutions and such other persons or bodies as the Minister considers appropriate”.

In order to keep it short, I would just like to ask my hon. colleague from St. Boniface if he recalls that post-secondary education, for example, as well as social assistance, are exclusively provincial jurisdictions? If he does recall that, is he aware of everything the federal government has done to date, not just this one, but all those before it over the past twenty years, to intervene via their financial powers in these two areas, in areas over which provinces have exclusive jurisdiction? Is he aware of this?

**Mr. Duhamel:** Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question.

Yes, I am very much aware. I understand that, in the past, the situation was less than perfect, and I believe that we have tried to improve the situation, and have improved it. I believe that this bill is exactly what it claims to be, that is to say an administrative bill, one which confers no additional powers upon the minister or the department or the provinces or anyone else.

I believe that there is a guarantee, not only in the bill but also by the minister himself, that he has no intention whatsoever of encroaching upon provincial responsibilities or trying to interfere in their areas of jurisdiction. I believe that this is a firm commitment, an honest one, an honourable one, and one that will be respected.

• (1335)

I understand that there may be differences of opinion, but I would like to start by inviting my colleagues to make concrete proposals so that we may work together better to improve the condition of all Canadians, including of course the men and women of Quebec, where employment is concerned.

We all know what human beings want above all is a job, a challenging job, one that pays enough to keep them and their families. The challenge is to make concrete suggestions; we could sit down together. Let us make sure that the government of Quebec comes to meet with us, or we could go to meet with them if that suited better, if it were easier, in order to reach agreement.

Secondly, apart from what I have just proposed, if there are questions—and obviously there are—which are bothering us, raising doubts about certain possibilities, if you like, if we might just put them aside and discuss them in the appropriate forum. For example, there are issues on federal-provincial affairs, links, reports, agreements between the two levels of government. There are mechanisms for discussion. I would invite my colleague to encourage his colleagues to do every-

*Government Orders*

thing possible to allow us to work for the people, whether they live in Quebec or elsewhere. That is my wish.

**Mr. Dubé:** Madam Speaker, I could not resist asking the hon. member for St. Boniface whether, considering his comments and the tone of his reply, he himself would support the resolution adopted unanimously by the Quebec National Assembly under Liberal Premier Daniel Johnson, who this year was the president of the No committee during the referendum campaign?

This resolution is similar in every respect to another resolution adopted by the Société québécoise de la main-d'oeuvre, whose membership includes the Conseil du patronat du Québec and various institutions and labour federations. The Conseil du patronat is headed by Mr. Dufour, another supporter of the no side, who demanded the patriation of tax points for occupational training. The resolution asked the federal government to agree to relinquish these tax points and let Quebec act as it saw fit, as the people—he used the word people—as the vast majority of the people of Quebec want. Would the hon. member support this demand?

**Mr. Duhamel:** Madam Speaker, personally I am prepared to consider any option. I am not the minister responsible for this particular matter or for the department, so I will not get into an area with which I am not sufficiently familiar. I think the hon. member will understand my position.

However, I do feel it is essential to put these matters on the table, to discuss them and to come up with flexible solutions that respond to the needs of the people, not only those of Quebec but of all the other provinces and territories of Canada. That would be my approach.

Theoretically, there is nothing that cannot be put on the table or discussed in a frank and forthright way. We should look for flexible solutions that respond to the needs of all Canadians. That is about all I have to say. It would hardly be fair to expect us to do otherwise, and I am not particularly keen on taking a position on certain issues when I am not sufficiently familiar with the subject to suggest a solution.

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would have a question for the hon. member for St. Boniface.

During the recent referendum in Quebec, a certain regional party at the federal level did not get involved. Yet, it did not lose any chance to try to score political points. What does the hon. member think of that?

**Mr. Duhamel:** Madam Speaker, I can understand. I am a federalist obviously and I was on the no side. Naturally, I would have done my very best to keep Quebec within Canada.

• (1340)

I have great respect for Quebec and Quebecers. Of course, as a representative of a francophone minority outside Quebec, I am biased, I am prejudiced, so to speak. Quebec is an important reference point. As far as I am concerned, Quebec is an inspiration for francophones outside Quebec. It provides a certain infrastructure that is very useful.

I wanted my colleagues to know that. I have a deep-rooted attachment to Quebec.

Regarding the involvement of political parties, I appreciated what mine did, but I did not like at all what the Reform Party did. I found this form of involvement to be dishonest and excessive. It seemed to me that what came first for the Reformers was their party and their leader, and not the country. This observation is not mine alone; thirty or so editorial writers said so.

On the other hand, I appreciated Mr. Charest's involvement. Pardon me, I should not mention members by name. I should say the involvement of the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party.

As for the other parties, all I have to say is that many people were playing politics with our country. I often wondered if the public interest, that of our fellow citizens, really came first for them. I came to the conclusion that it did not always come first.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Madam Speaker, as the official opposition's critic on training and youth, I am pleased to take part in the debate at second reading on Bill C-96, an act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development and to amend and repeal certain related acts.

This is an extremely important bill because it amends several acts, codes and regulations, in addition to repealing four important acts, namely the Employment and Immigration Department and Commission Act, the Department of Labour Act, the Department of National Health and Welfare Act, and the Department of State Act.

If its only purpose was to make these changes, which, according to the Minister of Human Resources Development, simply make official the structures in place since the Liberals returned to power in 1993, we would be entitled to ask why it took so long to make official something that is already in place. It took two years, Madam Speaker.

Later we will see that the impact of Bill C-96 is more significant than what the minister and even the hon. member for St. Boniface who just spoke first suggested. In fact, it changes the balance of power between the provinces and the federal government in favour of the latter, as this government is wont to do.

The most surprising thing in all this is that the government waited until after the referendum to move for second reading of this bill in the House, which involves a debate. As we know,

*Government Orders*

there is no real debate at the first reading stage when a minister introduces a bill in the House.

Why did they wait two years and why was there no debate in the House between June and now? If it was good for both Canada and Quebec, I think it would have been in the government's political interest to debate this bill even during the referendum campaign. This could have helped Quebecers better understand the government's intentions in some important areas.

I simply want to remind you that, if we forget about debt servicing, the Department of Human Resources Development will manage over 40 per cent of federal budget spending. This is considerable; it is by far the most important federal department.

Under these circumstances, one wonders why this is the case. I happen to think, and so do many Quebecers, that it is because there was a lot at stake, including the cuts affecting social programs. But the issue is not merely related to cuts: there is also a question of power involved.

• (1345)

Contrary to what the member for St. Boniface just said, our understanding of Bill C-96 is that, with this measure, the Minister of Human Resources Development is giving himself new powers which he did not have before. These are powers which he tried to exercise in an illegal context, through the spending power of the federal government.

We must constantly remind some people of that, because they do not always understand what we mean. This spending power is provided in the constitution and, surely, the federal government can use it on certain occasions, such as during a major conflict or crisis. However, it is contrary to the constitution to use that spending power on a permanent basis. It should only be used on an ad hoc basis. The bill before us is an attempt by the government to legalize its action, by using the spending power as a model.

Let me read the press release of the Quebec minister of state for joint action and employment minister. This will give you an idea of the Quebec government's reaction when it found out about this morning's debate.

It reads as follows: "While Quebec accepted the invitation sent by the Minister of Human Resources Development to participate in a meeting on human resources management, the federal Minister of Human Resources Development nevertheless intends to proceed, this very day, with second reading of Bill C-96. That decision sends quite a message to Quebec, considering the unanimous opposition to a bill which confirms the federal government's intentions to systematically bypass Quebec's jurisdiction and institutions to maintain, and even

increase, duplication regarding manpower related measures in our province". This is the reaction of Mrs. Louise Harel, Quebec minister of state for joint action, Minister of Employment, and Minister of Immigration and Cultural Communities.

"Bill C-96 amounts to a flat rejection of the unanimous Quebec consensus to the effect that the federal government must completely withdraw from the manpower sector and give related budgets back to the province". The minister added that "Ottawa's tactic was formally denounced by all labour market partners represented on the board of directors of the Société québécoise de développement de la main-d'oeuvre by way of a resolution passed on October 2.

"By initiating second reading of Bill C-96, Ottawa has confirmed that it intends to pursue its centralist manpower policy and ignore the specific needs of the Quebec labour market, thus dismissing the consensus in Quebec on manpower issues which stresses the need to fight unemployment effectively by allowing for the differences in the various labour markets across Quebec and promoting the involvement of the socio-economic players in every region and community.

"Only a proactive labour market policy that is consistent, integrated and adapted to our situation can help us fight unemployment effectively, with durable results.

"Ottawa wields Bill C-96 like a sword of Damocles. Opportunities to implement such a policy are essential to the development of employment in Quebec", concluded Ms. Harel.

Since I am reading, I might as well quote the attached document. This document was not drafted by the Parti Québécois government but by the board of directors of the Société québécoise de la main-d'oeuvre. It reads as follows:

"Whereas Bill C-96, an act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development, which in clauses 6 and 20 gives the Minister of Human Resources Development the power to enter into agreements with a province or group of provinces, agencies of provinces, financial institutions and such other persons or bodies as the minister considers appropriate, with the objective of enhancing employment, encouraging equality and promoting social security, moved by Gérald Larose, seconded by Claude Béland, president of the Mouvement Desjardins, and resolved unanimously: That the board of directors of the Société québécoise du développement de la main-d'oeuvre take the position adopted at the Conférence permanente sur l'adaptation de la main-d'oeuvre in November 1990;

"That Quebec must have sole responsibility for manpower adjustment and manpower training policies within its territory and patriate, as appropriate, the moneys allocated by the federal government to these programs in Quebec".



*Government Orders*

• (1350)

“Under the Constitution as it stands today and to improve client services, Quebec will control and administer all services connected with employment and manpower development and all related programs funded by unemployment insurance contributions within Quebec’s territory and will consequently receive the budgets commensurate with this responsibility.

“The board of directors asks the federal government, pending finalization of negotiations on the patriation of budgets, to refrain from setting up parallel partnership structures or taking steps to encroach on areas under Quebec’s jurisdiction, since the Société québécoise de développement de la main-d’oeuvre is the dedicated structure for joint manpower programs in Quebec”.

Nevertheless—and I could also quote a resolution adopted unanimously under Daniel Johnson’s Liberal government which was along the same lines, in other words, patriation of tax points for manpower training in Quebec—nevertheless, in spite of a very close vote in the referendum and following promises for change, not by just anyone, by the Prime Minister of Canada, they said: “We will consider your desire for change”. Nevertheless, ten days later, the Minister of Human Resources Development is embarking on phase two, namely the second reading of Bill C-96, which, according to Quebec political observers, is the most centralizing ever.

This morning, we listened to the minister and the member for St. Boniface talking about decentralization; they said that decentralization no longer necessarily meant cooperating with provinces in areas which are nonetheless under exclusive provincial jurisdiction; it no longer means this, it means that the federal minister has the authority to negotiate agreements with any organization, even municipal governments, and individual stakeholders. Does this take into account a people’s desire for change as expressed to the federal government? Does this heed the results of the referendum? To the contrary. Nothing has changed.

The government keeps on going as if nothing had happened, following the same logic, using the same rhetoric, the same words as the green book—I am not allowed to show it—the same green book the minister tabled a year and a half ago after extensive consultations. Wherever he went in Quebec, he was told, not only by the Société québécoise de la main-d’oeuvre, but also by a multitude of stakeholders, and this is the consensus in Quebec: “Mister Minister of Human Resources Development, listen to us, please”. In Quebec, we want to control education. We want our government, the Quebec government, to be in charge of manpower training, as provided by the constitution, by the way.

We want to run our own affairs. What is the minister doing? Like a steamroller, he keeps on going, making a mockery of decentralization, saying that there will be further decentralization. The federal government will deal directly with local communities, individuals and local stakeholders. He mentioned

a club in his parish, in his Winnipeg riding, and said that the federal government will be able to help.

I have no problem with that. It may work for the other provinces, the member for St. Boniface may not see anything wrong with it, but all Quebec stakeholders are against it. They want no part of it. We have said it time and time again, especially since the Bélanger-Campeau Commission, in 1990. Nevertheless, the minister is sticking to his gun. For him, decentralization means keeping all the powers for himself, and hogging 40 per cent of the federal budget, excluding the debt, to deal with unemployment problems. Of course, people who hear that and are not familiar with government operation, may say: “Here is a man who is genuinely interested in creating jobs, here is a man who wants to train individuals”. Of course, these are good intentions, but this is not his jurisdiction. This is not his field.

• (1355)

This government keeps repeating that we must cut spending, but continues to spend in areas outside of its jurisdiction and cuts transfer payments to provinces, so much so that they, in turn, have to cut services such as hospital care. We know about that in Quebec. We have to cut because the federal government reduced transfer payments.

It seems like the Minister of Human Resources Development and government members have not grasped the meaning of the referendum results.

I was listening this morning as the minister boasted about a youth program he implemented as a pilot project in Newfoundland. He was explaining that finally, after quitting school to go looking for work, 97 per cent of the young people had decided to come back to school. According to him that was quite an accomplishment. It is easy to understand that if young people cannot find jobs, they will go back to school but in fact, what they wanted was to find jobs.

They maintain the training programs, but they are carried out directly from Ottawa and entrusted to civil servants. I have some experience in that area; let me tell you about a specific incident.

In my riding, two or three organizations asked me to help them get some federal funds, since we are still part of that system, by finding or creating some employment programs. The minister said that if we supported the no, he would be happy to give a positive reply to those requests. He said it and then the parliamentary secretary had to come to his rescue.

When I saw, on Tuesday this week, only one week after the referendum, that the independent member for Beauce had announced in his riding a special project for an employment center, so that training could be provided directly by businesses, and that he was boasting to have been successful at that, I remind the House that the independent member for Beauce was the chairman of the no committee in that riding. Is this the federal government’s new way of decentralizing management: giving things to people who are on the right side or support federalists? Is this the way of governing that they want to show Quebecers? If Quebecers had known this is how things work, a lot more would have said yes.

*S. O. 31*

In the end, when you hear so much double talk— That reminds me, for instance, of the Minister of Human Development Resources, a disciple of Mr. Trudeau, who was saying this morning that he was flexible. That reminds me of Prime Minister Trudeau who said in a message that he sent recently: “Considering my legendary flexibility”. If this kind of bill, of attitude had been debated before the referendum, the result—

Mr. Speaker, I see that you are inviting me to sit down because question period is coming soon, so I will conclude, and if I have a few minutes left, I will complete my statement later.

I am simply saying that if Quebecers had known that, perhaps we would be talking about something else today.

[English]

**The Speaker:** It being 2 p.m. we will now proceed to Statements by Members.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### FLORENCE CHRISTIE

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Florence Christie of Vancouver has just been given the Canada Volunteer Award Certificate of Merit for her work for Canadians suffering from lupus.

She was diagnosed with the disease in 1980. Despite great sacrifice to her own health she has maintained constant contact and support with 50 support groups in British Columbia. In the past year she has answered over 600 telephone calls from lupus patients and has compiled and mailed some 1,300 information packages for the B.C. Lupus Society.

Her message is one of hope and inspiration that despite a severe debilitating illness one can continue to work effectively and live in dignity. The award to Mrs. Christie is one in which British Columbians and all Canadians can take pride.

\* \* \*

### HOUSEHOLDERS

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, one of the cornerstones of renewed federalism must be giving the people of Canada a greater say in the running of the country. Although the Liberals are not too interested in this concept, we in the Reform Party have been trying on our own to truly represent our constituents.

The best means we have available at this time are our householders. In each of my first six householders I have asked 10 questions covering a wide variety of subjects. For the past two weeks I have been collecting results from my latest survey. To date I have over 3,800 responses with hundreds coming in daily.

Liberal members might be interested to learn that their employment equity bill did not fair too well. Only 16 per cent of respondents are in favour of Bill C-64. By comparison, 31 per cent favour the legalization of marijuana and 54 per cent favour the legalization of prostitution.

It is amazing what MPs can learn when they actually listen to their constituents.

\* \* \*

### CANADA POST

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, over the past several days, mailboxes in my city of Saint John have received a flyer from a Quebec company which was distributed by Canada Post.

The flyer is a mail order form advertising explicit pornographic videos. Included in the flyer is a detailed description and name of each of the 20 films. I will not repeat these words and descriptions as they are very explicit and deeply offensive.

I have had many calls to my riding office from people who are totally outraged by having this kind of filth arrive at their front door by Canada Post. People feel that it is an invasion of their privacy and they want something done about it.

What is the government's policy on delivering such material? Whatever the policy is, it should be revisited. I strongly urge the minister responsible for Canada Post to put an end to delivering pornography.

\* \* \*

### VERY REVEREND LASZLO TOKES

**Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Very Reverend Laszlo Tokes, moderator of the Hungarian Presbyterian Church in Transylvania, is visiting Canada from November 7 to 15.

The Romanian revolution in December 1989 was sparked by Reverend Tokes. He is a champion of human rights for minorities. He will address in general the human rights problems facing all Romanian minorities, especially those of the nearly three million Hungarians in Transylvania: the loss of Hungarian language schools and universities, the prohibition of the use of the language itself and the eradication of fundamental Hungarian culture.

The Very Reverend Laszlo Tokes is a man of God. He is a man of peace who stood unarmed against the brutal Ceausescu regime and sparked a revolution. His continued battle in fighting for human rights and minority rights is one which we all encourage and support.

\* \* \*

#### STATUS OF WOMEN

**Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been 25 years since the Royal Commission on the Status of Women tabled its report in this House, making numerous recommendations to improve the educational levels for women.

Since then we have made significant progress. For example, 25 years ago less than 3 per cent of women held university degrees. Today 10 per cent of Canadian women are university graduates and 52 per cent of full time university students are women.

The need for education is gender neutral. Education for women and for men is fundamental to economic advancement, to personal fulfilment and to the opportunity to participate to their full potential in Canadian society.

Federal and provincial initiatives have improved the educational status of women. Our goal is to ensure equality in education and training for Canadian women and girls, thus paving the road to a truly equitable society.

\* \* \*

#### DRAYTON FESTIVAL

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to speak about a little known area called Drayton.

Terms such as sold out season and financial success are not usually used when referring to a relatively new performing arts theatre. However, after five successful seasons the Drayton festival is accustomed to breaking the rules.

Nestled in the picturesque village of Drayton, Ontario, the festival has fast become a Canadian success story. During the 1993–94 season the festival made Canadian theatrical history by selling out every available seat before opening night. This year some 60,000 theatre goers enjoyed an evening at this fine theatre.

Under the direction and guidance of artistic director Alex Mustakas, the talented cast and crew create a theatrical experience which is second to none.

I invite all Canadians to visit Drayton and take in a performance. However, I warn them to be prepared to be dazzled by an evening of music and laughter.

*S. O. 31*

#### FEDERAL TRANSFER PAYMENTS

**Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the federal Liberal government claims that it wants standards for health care, education and social programs, but federal standards are meaningless without adequate core funding. The federal Liberals have cut back over \$7 billion or 25 per cent of the budgets for health care, education and social services, yet they have cut back only 8 per cent on other government programs.

• (1405)

The implications on provincial governments are devastating, particularly Saskatchewan. The province of Saskatchewan will lose \$200 million in federal transfer payments in 1996.

The impact of these cutbacks means savage reductions in social programs in some provinces, forcing Canadians to relocate. They go to where better jobs and better social programs exist, putting extreme pressure on those very provinces.

Weak national standards and the absence of adequate core funding means that provinces like Ontario and Alberta can punish those that need the help most. Pitting one province against another is wrong. So is a lack of funding for national standards.

\* \* \*

#### PRISONERS WEEK

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, prisoners week is an affront to all victims of crime. Yesterday I received by mail a pamphlet produced and paid for by Correctional Services Canada. The pamphlet urges us all to celebrate and pray for the plight of prisoners, to give them special recognition between November 19 and 26.

Talk about your priorities. Why should I recognize a rapist and a murderer? The solicitor general should be appalled that Canadian taxpayers are asked to pay for this glorification of murderers, thieves and rapists. The solicitor general should think about the security of Canadians as he sets aside a whole week glorifying those who would go so far as even to threaten the life of our Prime Minister.

Maybe the solicitor general has forgotten just who we have in our prisons. He is asking us to dedicate a week to people like Robert Paul Thompson, a killer of his wife; Clifford Olson, a killer of our children; and Paul Bernardo, a killer and rapist of our daughters.

This is outrageous, unacceptable and disgraceful. I challenge this government to scrap this week and let us get our priorities right for a change.

*S. O. 31*

[Translation]

### UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois wish to point out that today is the 50th anniversary of the ratification of the UN Charter.

Fifty years ago, delegates from many countries gathered in San Francisco to rebuild international relations on a new foundation. This was no easy task, as all the countries involved had to redefine their approach to issues such as health, the environment, human rights, refugee assistance, and peacekeeping.

On this anniversary, we all feel honoured by the presence in our gallery of peacekeepers who, in recent years, have acted with courage, selflessness and compassion to promote human rights and democracy around the world. Today more than ever, they are playing a crucial role in dealing with the social and political tension and upheaval that prevail in several countries.

On behalf of all members of the Bloc Québécois, I thank them for their outstanding commitment, that all the people in Quebec and Canada can be proud of.

\* \* \*

[English]

### REMEMBRANCE DAY

**Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this Saturday, in the 11th month, on the 11th day, at the 11th hour, Canadians will pay tribute to the million and a half men and women who went to war to fight for this great country we live in. We come together on November 11 to pay a special tribute to those who courageously lost their lives in the first world war, the second world war and the Korean war.

This year we mark the 50th anniversary of the end of the second world war and the return of peace.

We should also recognize the new challenges faced by the Canadian Armed Forces in the post war period as peacekeepers and pay a special tribute to those who have lost their lives in this role.

We are what we are today, we have what we have because of the people we honour on Remembrance Day. November 11 must be for Canadians a day not only of remembrance and recognition, but of dedication to the hard and patient work of keeping peace.

I thank all veterans and peacekeepers for protecting Canada and its citizens and for allowing us to live in a country of peace and prosperity.

### ASTRONAUT CHRIS HADFIELD

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Saturday morning our Canadian astronaut, Major Chris Hadfield, who is a crew member of the space shuttle Atlantis, will launch into space for an eight day mission. This graduate of White Oaks Secondary School in Oakville will become the fourth Canadian to go into space.

Watching him there will be 13 excited White Oaks Secondary School students, six students from the Milton District High School and 28 air cadets from the Blue Thunder Squadron in Milton. They are travelling to NASA to witness in person this special shuttle launch.

Major Hadfield will be the first Canadian to fly aboard the shuttle and will be the first Canadian to use the Canadarm.

On behalf of all Canadians, please join me in wishing Major Hadfield a safe and successful mission.

\* \* \*

• (1410)

[Translation]

### THE ECONOMIST

**Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in its latest issue, the prestigious magazine *The Economist* gives its interpretation of the results of the October 30 referendum in Quebec. Looking at the sociopolitical situation and the relations between Quebec and the rest of Canada, *The Economist* readily predicts a victory for the independentists next time.

Even foreign observers are not fooled by the stalling tactics tearing English Canada apart. *The Economist* also said that the referendum, far from representing an affirmation of Canadian unity, does not resolve anything. The real issues undermining the current federal system remain unanswered. That is why *The Economist*, like the members of the Bloc, predict that English Canada will be unable to accommodate Quebec's aspirations.

\* \* \*

[English]

### TELEVOTING

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, voters of Nanaimo—Cowichan will have a more meaningful say in how they are governed thanks to a recently installed televoting system in my riding.

Rather than insult my voters by only asking them what they think once every four or five years, this ongoing project in participatory democracy will register voters in my riding enabling them to vote electronically on various issues.

From November 27 to December 10, voters in my riding will be asked whether a binding national referendum on capital punishment should be held.

Members opposite appear to shun direct democracy in favour of top down party directed policy. We in Reform want to listen to what the public has to say.

We believe that the average voter wants to have a say more often than every four or five years. With the televoting system, the people of Nanaimo—Cowichan will be helping to lead the way into the future.

\* \* \*

#### VETERANS WEEK

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this week, Veterans Week, we stop to remember our fellow Canadians who so bravely fought and those who died to protect our freedom.

I participated in a remembrance ceremony a few Sundays ago, a day before the Quebec referendum. I thought of those Canadians who fought and died for our freedom and of what they might be thinking of Canada today, how they would still be very proud to be Canadians and how distressed they would feel at the plight of our unity given all that they had fought and died for.

Our contributions around the world have been highly commended, yet the cost of protecting democracy and peace has been very high.

Each of us has our own reasons for remembering. Only by remembering can we give meaning to the sacrifices that have been made. Only by remembering can we strive to maintain peace. Only by working together as a nation can we preserve the Canada that so many have fought and died to protect, a Canada that is envied the world over.

Let us not forget.

\* \* \*

#### VETERANS WEEK

**Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, 77 years ago this weekend the first world war came to an end and Canadian veterans were able to come home.

Fifty years ago this summer, the second world war ended. Forty-one years ago, Canadians began to return from the Korean war. For the past 38 years, Canadians have served in UN peacekeeping missions from which they have returned to a grateful nation.

The week of November 4 to 12 has been proclaimed Veterans Week. This is an occasion for all Canadians to pay tribute to the courage and sacrifice of those who served their country.

#### Oral Questions

It is time for us to listen to the stories of our veterans which they have to tell and to learn from their experiences. It is time for us to rededicate ourselves to the values of freedom and democracy our veterans fought to preserve.

Above all, it is an occasion to honour some very remarkable Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### POVERTY

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Quebec and Canada are living through hard times and face a growing problem of poverty. When the number of people on welfare is increasing to record highs, the population is entitled to expect energetic employment measures from the government.

The Canadian economy is faced with a major structural problem, one which requires immediate action from the government. Elected as it was on promises of job creation—job, jobs, jobs—this government has not shown any imaginative solutions except to centralize power in Ottawa and attack those who are already the worst off. The sole response the government offers is an empty legislative menu. Nothing for employment, nothing for social problems, nothing for the economy. Enough of this. The population demands that the government finally start governing.

---

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1415)

[Translation]

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CANADIAN UNITY

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs referred to the cabinet's phoney committee as being essential to the survival of Canada. Yesterday, he was corrected by his colleague at the Department of Justice, who said: "We do not expect to find a formula to save the country".

Would the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs agree that what his colleague at the Department of Justice said confirms that the sole purpose of the government's phoney committee is to play for time and that Quebecers, and Canadians as well, for that matter, have nothing to gain from this committee?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may start by correcting the hon. member for Roberval. A phoney committee is like the regional political

*Oral Questions*

commissions set up by the Parti Québécois, where the members all belonged to the same party and the money of Quebecers was used to make partisan propaganda. They were definitely phoney.

We have set up a committee that will try to deal or suggest how to deal with the problems that exist in our country today. We all need this kind of committee.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs just scored in his own goal, as they say. A committee whose members all belong to the same political party, funded with taxpayers money and likely to accomplish nothing. That is the kind of committee he chairs.

But seriously, this morning in New Zealand, the Prime Minister said that his government's first priority was not to make changes for Quebecers but to create jobs. At the same time he said the cabinet committee did not intend to reopen the debate on the constitution.

Would the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, who yesterday said repeatedly during Question Period that the committee's mission was to save the country, agree that in the light of the correction made by his Prime Minister, Quebecers and Canadians should expect nothing either from him or his committee?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the official opposition is spouting nonsense about a committee that was set up to deal with the problems we have now in this country.

Prime Minister Chrétien made it quite clear that the important problems in this country today are economic problems, and he also said that the Parti Québécois was wasting its time, after it lost the referendum, on reopening constitutional issues and refused to deal with the real problems, which are job creation and unemployment.

More than 60 per cent of Quebecers said in a recent poll that they wanted the Parti Québécois and the Bloc Québécois to take care of the economy and job creation and stop wasting their time, their money and their future on discussing a problem that has already been settled.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in addition to being a poor hockey player, the minister does not know how to skate. Let me explain.

Yesterday, the minister said that the committee would be used to save the country from the separatists who wanted to break it up. That is what he said yesterday. Today, after the Prime Minister's correction, he tells us that his committee will look into creating jobs and promoting economic development.

Is the minister telling us that this government, which for more than two years has said it will deal with the country's real problems, is he telling us that they have no recipe and that it

takes a committee to suggest how the Prime Minister can get the country out of this mess?

• (1420)

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to continue in hockey parlance, the hon. member for Roberval lost by default because they decided to leave the game. They lost the referendum and, instead of tackling the real problems, they decided their only objective is to destroy Canada. All their energy is spent not on dealing with the economic and other problems of this country but on destroying the country. That is why they have nothing to offer in the way of real solutions we should be developing for the future of Quebec and Canada.

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

You will notice that it is after the Liberals were called to order by Pierre Elliott Trudeau that this panic-stricken government began to dilute its already vague promises of change to Quebecers and quickly set up a phoney committee which will prove useless.

Considering that the Minister of Justice said yesterday that the cabinet committee would not save Canada, and given that the Prime Minister said this morning that the committee does not intend to reopen the 1982 constitution, does the minister not realize that he will preside a phoney committee which will be useless in terms fulfilling the promises made by the Prime Minister regarding the constitution?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will repeat for the tenth time that the Prime Minister clearly indicated in his speeches that he was going to look after the issues of distinct society and right of veto. He asked a number of ministers to develop strategies, get a better understanding of the referendum results, and make appropriate changes for Quebec and Canada. This is what we are doing.

As regards Mr. Trudeau's comments, the hon. member should also remember that he clearly said that the Leader of the Opposition had made a mockery of the truth, to use a diplomatic expression. This is exactly what he said in his press conference.

**The Speaker:** Dear colleagues, we are now on thin ice. Therefore, I would ask hon. members to choose their words carefully.

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, given that his phoney committee was set up in a mad rush, that the names of its members were released only 24 hours later, and that each of its members seems to have a different opinion as to its mandate, will the minister admit that his phoney committee was only set up to buy time until Christmas, when the House will

recess and the Prime Minister will no longer have to answer embarrassing questions on the commitments he made during the referendum campaign?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I see that the official opposition has now adopted the term "phoney". Its members are asking phoney questions.

They are obviously much more concerned about what goes on outside, than about the important issues discussed in this House. The important issue now is clearly to try to solve the problems as they exist. We are trying to do that by constitutional and others means.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### CANADIAN UNITY

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the cabinet's national unity dream team is becoming a nightmare. Nobody knows who they are going to consult with, nobody knows when they are supposed to report, and worst of all, nobody has a clue what the committee is supposed to be doing.

The labour minister thinks they are going to be discussing constitutional change. The justice minister says they will be looking at Mulroney type constitutional talks, and the Prime Minister said the cabinet committee will not be delving into constitutional matters.

I ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, if he can hear me, does this committee have clear terms of reference from the Prime Minister and, if it does, will he table them in this House?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this committee has clear terms of reference. They will not be produced in the House because this is a task force which consists of ministers. Ad hoc committees normally have mandates and memberships that are kept confidential. They are kept confidential for one good reason: they are the means by which advice and recommendations are given to the Prime Minister. That has been the custom of cabinets throughout history.

The mandate of this committee is clear. We are going to look at the promises of the Prime Minister and how they can be implemented. That is clear. They were in the speech given by the Prime Minister. We know what they are. We are looking at non-constitutional means of improving the way in which the government operates. We have already done it through program review last year. A lot of measures were indicated in the budget.

#### Oral Questions

The leader of the third party should acknowledge that the terms of reference and objectives are clear. The membership is known. We are trying at present to establish a proper diagnostic and to find the right means of solving the problems.

#### SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**The Speaker:** We seem to be having a small problem with the sound. We are going to interrupt question period. We will return after we find out what the problem is. We will still have 35 minutes of this question period.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 2.27 p.m.)

#### SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 2.45 p.m.

**The Speaker:** Question period will continue until 3.21 p.m.

Because of the noise we could not hear too well, so I am going to permit the leader of the Reform Party to restate the question, hopefully without too much of a preamble, and we will take up from there.

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN UNITY

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, before we were so rudely interrupted we were asking the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs for the terms of reference of this cabinet unity committee.

It is simply unacceptable for the minister to plead cabinet secrecy or solidarity on releasing the terms of reference of a committee that is dealing with the whole subject of national unity.

I ask him again. Does this committee have clear terms of reference, and could he table those terms of reference in the House?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is yes and to the second question is no.

**The Speaker:** We ought to have this kind of break every day.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I need to warm up.

Maybe we could look at the membership of this committee. The intergovernmental affairs minister has said that this committee has regional balance to ensure the views of all Canadians

*Oral Questions*

will be represented. How is that possible when seven out of the nine committee members are from central Canada, when the west's only representative is a junior minister who won her seat by 11 votes and when British Columbia, the third most populous province in the country, is not even represented on the committee?

About the only positive thing that can be said about this committee is that the Deputy Prime Minister is not a member.

If this committee is supposed to effectively represent every region of the country, why does the west have only one seat and British Columbia no seat at all?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not the custom to comment on the membership of committees. In this case there is clearly a regional balance. Unless we split people in two we unfortunately cannot have a balance that corresponds exactly to the percentage of the population.

Also, when the member unfairly talks about the number of votes, we should all remember the Parti Québécois was elected by barely three-quarters of one per cent of the popular vote. That means nothing. To repeat, in a democracy the people who have the most votes get the prize.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, could I put one simple question.

British Columbia is the most populous province in western Canada and the third most populous province in the country. It has a crucial role to play on this issue of national unity and it has a different perspective from many other provinces in the country.

Will the minister tell us why the province of British Columbia does not have representation on the cabinet national unity committee?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the question reveals a wrong understanding of the country and a wrong understanding of the parliamentary system.

• (1450)

In our parliamentary system, with representative democracy, people are elected to express their views and their feelings about national interests in the federal Parliament. This is exactly what exists.

The country is not homogeneous. People who come from Alberta are quite able to represent people who come from other areas of the country. They are not tied down to their part of the country.

It is quite improper for the leader of the third party to assume that members of the House are only representative of a small part of the country. No. They represent national interests.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**THE CONSTITUTION**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Justice candidly admitted that constitutional problems and Quebec's place in Canada constituted new concerns for the government, after the Prime Minister had promised changes to Quebecers just days before the referendum.

In light of the Minister of Justice's statement yesterday, will the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs admit that the federal strategy, which has consisted for two years now in denying the existence of a constitutional problem in the country, has failed miserably?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if in fact one looks at the past two years, it will be seen that the amount of popular support for the Liberal government in the first two years of our mandate has been higher than for any government since confederation.

So, clearly, we have had a level of popular support based on our accomplishments, because we have begun to address Canada's economic problems, while the Parti Québécois and its little brother the Bloc Québécois have not focussed their concerns on this in the least. That is what must be done.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as usual, the Minister selects his examples and neglects to mention that if there is one place where the government has a fairly high unpopularity rating it is Quebec, totally the opposite of the other provinces.

By choosing the present member for St. Maurice as leader of their party in 1990, the Liberals thought they had solved the Quebec situation for once and for all.

Is the fact that this government convinced Canadians that there was no longer any constitutional problem not obvious proof that the Liberal government, before deceiving Quebec, deceived the rest of Canada?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what Canadians, Quebecers included, want and what they have reaffirmed for Quebec in a recent survey, is that government focus on their economic problems.



*Oral Questions*

The Liberal government, the government of Canada, has addressed these problems and cleaned its house in the last budget. I would strongly suggest to the opposition that it ensure that its big brother, the Parti Québécois, does the same in Quebec because, like Canadians, Quebecers want their economic problems to be addressed, and the unemployment and employment problems in their province solved.

\* \* \*

[English]

**RWANDA**

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that the Belgian government wants to interview Canadian peacekeeping hero, Romeo D'Allaire, for his involvement in the death of 10 Belgian peacekeepers he was in charge of during the UN mission in Rwanda. UN Ambassador Bob Fowler has known about this for a week, yet Canadians have heard nothing.

My question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Why has the Canadian government not said something about this and told the Canadian public about this very serious event?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in the House will agree with me when I say that Major General D'Allaire served the country with great distinction at a very difficult time in Rwanda.

As we saw with the events in Somalia a few years ago, it is quite possible for certain allegations to be made about an individual's conduct from time to time. In this case, as with that case, I think it is best that we look at the facts and see exactly what those charges are before we jump to any conclusions.

• (1455)

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that is a very difficult answer to accept, considering the seriousness of the event.

Let us remember that former prime minister Kim Campbell has said that Mr. Fowler tended to downplay events during the Somalia affair. Is it possible that the government was not fully briefed by the UN ambassador about the seriousness of these charges?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about charges as if these were matters that were laid in some court.

I understand there were certain allegations made in some quarters by one of our allies as a result of certain activities in Rwanda. We are looking into those allegations.

[Translation]

**PURCHASE OF HELICOPTERS**

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the defence minister.

Yesterday, the Liberal government announced that a new contract for the purchase of new search and rescue helicopters will soon be awarded, to replace part of the previous EH-101 contract that the Liberal Party cancelled as soon as it took office.

Since the government has yet to reach an agreement over the penalties following the cancellation of the EH-101 helicopters contract with the Agusta, why has it not excluded this company from the bidding process?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the discussions with respect to compensation are being conducted by my colleague, the minister of government services. He may wish to comment further if the hon. gentleman wishes any information on that score.

I announced yesterday that we were to send out a solicitation of interest and then call for proposals from private industry to acquire up to 15 search and rescue helicopters. That process is not incompatible with the process now being conducted by my colleague, the minister of government services.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since the Liberals condemned Agusta when the first contract was signed and requested an inquiry into this whole matter, how can the minister of defence explain that he has not deemed it appropriate to completely exclude Agusta from the new bidding process?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is another attempt at revisionism in history.

In the 1993 election campaign the Liberal Party campaigned against the acquisition of the EH-101 helicopter because we felt that deal was too rich for the pocketbooks of Canadian taxpayers. Upon a subsequent examination once we came into office we had those original feelings confirmed. It is for that reason that we have decided to proceed with the search and rescue helicopters.

We have decided to have an open competition, which will allow any bidder who has the particular equipment and can meet the specifications to have an opportunity to take part in this initiative.

\* \* \*

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I raised two incidents of alleged misconduct and cover-up by the senior management team surrounding the Minister of National Defence.

*Oral Questions*

Today I want to ask the minister about his policy on significant incident reports. I have learned from the information commissioner that these reports are now only retained for six months and then they are destroyed. Significant incident reports are the documents the Somalia inquiry is based on.

Why has the minister changed the policy in order to have these reports destroyed after only six months?

**Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again there is a distortion of the facts.

We have been working with the information commissioner with respect to providing the documents that have been requested under access to information. It is very onerous for us right now because of the Somalia inquiry and all the attendant curiosity that has gone on. We are working with the information commissioner. I believe the information commissioner will agree that we are certainly trying to meet the expectations he has and conform to the law.

With respect to the matter the hon. member raised referring to allegations he made yesterday against two top general officers, I wish to tell him that Lieutenant-General Boyle, who he named on the floor of the House, has served notice in writing to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation of his intent to seek legal opinion and perhaps proceed in action against the CBC if there is no retraction on that story.

• (1500)

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, again the minister did not answer the question I posed.

Does the minister realize the destruction of significant incident reports after six months could prevent situations like the Somali affair from ever becoming public?

What will the minister do to correct the problem?

**Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again the hon. member is attacking procedures in the Department of National Defence. In many cases the attacks are without much information. He attacks members of the armed forces of various ranks. He attacks the military police and their ability to do their jobs. He attacks general officers as he did in the House yesterday.

I would like to know from his leader, the hon. member for Calgary Southwest, how the member from the Reform Party, the opposition critic, can go outside the House and malign 87 general officers by calling them bandits, which means they have committed criminal offences, and sit in the House as a critic for the Reform Party.

[*Translation*]

**PURCHASE OF HELICOPTERS**

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the defence minister.

Despite serious accusations of corruption made against the Agusta company in Europe and despite several requests for an inquiry made by the Minister of Human Resources Development when he was in opposition, the government continues to negotiate with the Italian firm the settlement of penalties totalling hundreds of millions of dollars for breach of contract with respect to the EH-101.

Could the fact that the government refuses to dismiss Agusta mean that it intends to award the contract for 15 new helicopters to this company instead of paying these penalties totalling hundreds of millions of dollars? Is the defence minister preparing a sweet deal?

[*English*]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making reference to a contract the Government of Canada cancelled shortly after taking office.

I remind the hon. member as well as others that we successfully concluded the termination costs with Loral, thereby resolving that matter with that contractor.

Negotiations have proceeded with the EH-101. I am happy to report that after some very diligent, vigorous work by my deputy minister and senior assistant deputy minister an agreement in principle has been reached. I would like to provide all details to the House, which I will in several months. At that time members of the House, in particular the critics, will then have an opportunity to see whether the Government of Canada has done its job effectively in meeting the termination costs with that company.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, I would like to ask the minister if he intends to make public this agreement in principle as soon as possible.

Knowing that the former NATO secretary general, Willy Claes, was forced to resign from his position after being accused of accepting bribes from the Italian firm Agusta when Belgium purchased EH-101s, how can the government insist on dealing with a company whose selling methods are suspicious to say the least? In talking to the media yesterday, the minister himself mentioned Boeing, Bell, Sikorsky, Eurocopter and Agusta-Westland as possible suppliers for this contract.

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the similarities between the Minister of National Defence and me are rather apparent.

The hon. member must realize there is such a thing as confidentiality between the contractor, who has a variety of subcontractors, and the government of Canada.

• (1505)

Negotiations have been ongoing for close to two years. They have been vigorous, they have been enthusiastic and at times they have been extremely difficult. We have now reached an agreement in principle. I will be happy to provide all of the details to the House at the most opportune time.

On the grounds of confidentiality, until certain matters have come to a final conclusion, I am precluded by law, by the contract and the agreement in principle to provide that information today. However, I hope I can provide it as soon as humanly possible.

\* \* \*

#### DISASTER ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last spring many communities in western Manitoba received a significant amount of damage due to flooding. People are concerned about receiving and recovering the appropriate costs resulting from the damage.

Could the minister responsible for emergency preparedness please explain how the disaster assistance agreement between the federal and provincial governments will help these people?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the disaster and financial assistance agreements were established so that provincial and territorial governments could receive assistance in the case of natural disasters.

In the case of the Manitoba flooding this spring, the normal rules were put in place and the procedures followed. Similar things have happened in Saskatchewan recently.

I understand the minister responsible in the Manitoba government has been saying that for some reason the federal government has been changing the rules and regulations and that somehow the people of Manitoba have been deprived of their rightful share under these programs. That is totally and absolutely false.

#### Oral Questions

#### HEALTH CARE

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Quebec health minister today made an ominous announcement: seven hospitals in Montreal will be closing.

While our Minister of Health fools around with her pet national forum on health, thousands of Canadians will suffer. Will the minister admit health care reform in Canada is long overdue?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is acknowledged the health care system must change. All provinces are bringing about a number of changes because the way we practise health care has changed. There are new technologies. The hon. member knows that.

The minister of health for Quebec is doing the same things others have done across the country; that is, ensuring that the dollars spent on health care go to the new technologies, to the new ways of doing things.

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal minister has solutions. There is a very innovative neuromuscular clinic in the riding of York Centre, the Magee clinic. The minister will shut it down. Has she warned her colleagues from the Toronto area to expect the irate phone calls from their constituents?

As she penalizes, punishes and pushes out innovation, will she explain that to her colleagues?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would think that after two years in the House the hon. member would understand the jurisdictions within health and that the actual management of the health care system is at the provincial level. That is part of the flexibility of the Canada Health Act. The provinces manage the health care system.

The federal government has the Canada Health Act, which imposes the five principles which are tied to the transfer of moneys. That is what is happening.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### HELICOPTER PURCHASE

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

The persistent refusal of the minister to exclude Agusta from the bidding process for new helicopters is particularly hard to understand, because the man sitting on the minister's left, the current Minister of Human Resources Development, asked for a judicial inquiry when the Conservative government signed the first contract with that firm.

*Oral Questions*

• (1510)

Can the minister tell the House whether his unacceptable refusal to exclude Agusta from the bidding process is linked to pressures brought to bear on the government by Agusta's lobbyists, namely Daniel Despina, a former director of communications for the Liberal Party of Canada, and James Pacey, a former special adviser to Pierre Elliott Trudeau?

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, sometimes, questions as worded are not too—I would like to ask you, when you put questions like that—

[*English*]

—you cannot impute motive in any way. I caution the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm. I will permit the hon. minister of public works to answer the question.

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the preamble of the hon. member's questions. His allegations contained in the body of his questions are absolutely false.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** I did not think mentioning Pierre Elliott Trudeau was a crime, Mr. Speaker.

Here is my supplementary. In view of the cloud of suspicion hanging over Agusta and the charges of bribery that have been laid against that firm in Belgium, would it not be wise for the minister, before going any further, to set up the inquiry requested by his colleague the Minister of Human Resources Development on April 13, 1993?

[*English*]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member just does not get it. The contract he refers to was cancelled by the government upon coming into office.

As a result, we have entered negotiations with the two main contractors for termination costs. We have been successful with the first one. We have come to an agreement in principle with regard to the second one. I hope to be able to provide all of the details so the hon. member once and for all will be able to understand that these kinds of allegations and this kind of mud he has been playing in for quite some time are utterly false, just like the allegations he makes here again today.

**SYDNEY TAR PONDS**

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the worst environmental disaster in Canada still festers in the backyard of the minister of public works in Sydney, Nova Scotia.

In February the environment minister mimicked her boss by saying don't worry, be happy, the Sydney tar ponds PCB clean-up is proceeding. It is not; it is broke.

Will the environment minister commit to a federal inquiry to determine why \$55 million was wasted over 10 years with no results, who was responsible, how long the people of Sydney have to live near this sewer and who got rich during the deal?

**The Speaker:** Usually we have a question and we may tack on a partial question, but four is going a bit out of the way. Would the hon. minister address the first two questions.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not accept in any way the premises, insinuations or innuendoes of any part of the hon. member's questions.

On behalf of the Minister of the Environment, I will take those parts of the question that are in order as notice and endeavour to get the hon. member an answer as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that is sort of what we heard last February. They are not misleading premises, they are fact.

The environment minister has done absolutely nothing for the environment in the two years since she has been in the portfolio. What we have here is yet another dredging scandal, only this time it is in Sydney, Nova Scotia, not in Hamilton harbour, and we have a city with the highest cancer rate in the North America.

I would like to ask the Minister of the Environment will there be any further federal involvement into this disaster, or will the people of Sydney, Nova Scotia be involved in future discussions related to the clean-up of the tar ponds?

This is not about patronage, so I ask the Minister of the Environment, not the minister of public works.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from time to time has shown that the link between himself and facts is sometimes tenuous.

• (1515)

Having said that, I realize the concerns of people in that community about a safe environment are important. They are important to the government and to the members of Parliament

from that area. Therefore, I will take the question as notice and provide a full answer as quickly as possible.

\* \* \*

### MEDICARE

**Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Albertans are increasingly anxious about the erosion of medicare, resulting from the proliferation of private clinics in Alberta charging facility fees for medically insured services.

Can the minister assure Albertans that medicare will be protected from attempts to create a two-tier system where access and quality of service are based on the amount of cash in one's wallet?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure members of the House, on both sides, will be happy to know that I met with the minister of health for Alberta on Monday in Winnipeg in order to discuss ways to eliminate facility fees that were being charged for medically necessary services in private clinics.

The minister of health for Alberta gave me her personal assurances that Alberta would be eliminating facility fees in private clinics. I applaud the minister of health for her initiative.

Until that time, we will be deducting approximately \$420,000 a month from transfers to the province of Alberta.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### PURCHASE OF HELICOPTERS

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of defence.

Yesterday, the federal government announced a competition for the acquisition of 15 rescue helicopters, with no Canadian content requirement in the specifications. Considering that the Canadian aerospace industry is concentrated in the Montreal area, how can the minister justify this change of heart on the part of the federal government, given that, two months ago, he awarded without tender a \$2 billion contract for armoured personnel carriers to Ontario but that he is now taking a different approach for the helicopter contract?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I find it quite interesting that Bloc members condemn the government for yesterday's announcement to buy search and rescue helicopters, while many critics, analysts and others in Quebec actually congratulated us for it.

### Oral Questions

Just this morning, I read the following in *Le Devoir*: "Yesterday's announcement is good news. As for the price of the helicopters, it should not exceed \$40 million per aircraft, three times less than the EH-101".

[English]

That is on the one hand. On the second point that the hon. member raised with respect to why there was a sole source contract for the armoured personnel carriers and a competition on this equipment, we have in Canada, with General Motors' diesel division in London, the only Canadian manufacturer. It is well known. It has a worldwide product mandate for the making of armoured vehicles. It was quite logical to have the contract awarded and negotiated with that company. Many companies in Quebec will benefit because many of the suppliers are located in the province of Quebec.

When it comes to the helicopters, we do not have that same kind of capability, although there may be some offshoots for various companies that may compete. Therefore, it makes sense to get the best deal by having an open competition and invite people from around the world to bid.

\* \* \*

### SOCIAL PROGRAMS

**Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the recent welfare war between British Columbia and the federal government suggests that the minister and the government have no vision for federalism, certainly not a new one.

The issue is not whether B.C. or the government is right but that provinces should have the authority to make their own decisions in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

When will the government get off B.C.'s back and begin co-operative work with all provinces to give them exclusive powers in jurisdictions that are constitutionally theirs?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the hon. member has not been following in a careful way what has been developing over the last several months.

As a consequence of the announcement of a new transfer program to the provinces, which will give them far more flexibility, the provincial premiers last summer set up the Council of Social Service Ministers to begin developing a common provincial approach. Once that was completed they would then sit down with us and undertake the negotiations. We welcomed that initiative. We thought it was a very positive way to proceed.

• (1520)

Unfortunately the British Columbia government sort of skipped out on that process, short-circuited it and decided

*Business of the House*

unilaterally to do something different without consulting their provincial colleagues, without staying within the process and therefore has created a problem.

As I said before, the law is the law. I find it exceedingly strange that when members of the Reform Party are constantly demanding in this House that we ensure that individuals live up to the spirit and the letter of the law, they do not want a province to live up to the spirit and letter of the law.

\* \* \*

**EDUCATION**

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

StatsCanada has recently confirmed that young Canadians with lower educational qualifications have suffered very badly in the job market over the last five years. The statistics confirm that without a post-secondary education the doors for employment have been slammed shut for young Canadians. We know that education is the pathway to the future for young people, yet the government has been cutting billions of dollars from transfers to post-secondary education to the provinces.

How can the minister justify these cuts to the tens of thousands of young Canadians who are seeing their opportunities choked off by the government's actions?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer in two specific ways.

First, this summer we introduced a brand new student financial assistance program that substantially refinanced the ability of young people to go back to school. For the first time ever we introduced a major grant program that would allow young people with high income needs, such as disabled students and women going to graduate school, to get specific direct grants. It is the first time the federal government has ever offered that kind of assistance.

Second, this year we introduced a youth internship program. By working with the private sector, it allows young people to work half time in the business workplace environment and half time to go to school. We have signed agreements with a number of human resource sector councils in the private sector.

This year alone up to 25,000 young people will be enrolled in that program, showing how successful it is to be able to get the private sector to work with us in partnership in helping young people.

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, this is a rather special day for the House because we have special guests in not only the Speaker's gallery but also in the opposition gallery.

[*Translation*]

Fifty years ago today, Canada became a member of the United Nations. On this occasion, I would like to salute the Canadian men and women who personify our commitment to the UN.

[*English*]

Seated in the gallery today are peacekeepers of the Canadian Armed Forces and Mounted Police who have served in Cyprus, Egypt, El Salvador, Haiti, the Golan Heights, Kuwait, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia.

These men and women represent the 100,000 Canadians who have served in peacekeeping missions since Parliament ratified the United Nations charter. They are in our galleries to my left and they are joined today with their spouses.

Today this House, the representatives of the people of Canada, salute our peacekeepers, nos Casques bleus, past and present on behalf of all Canadians.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, I hope you will take a few minutes to receive the members of our peacekeeping forces, all three forces and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, at a very small reception which will be held in room 216-N immediately after question period.

\* \* \*

• (1525)

[*Translation*]

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** As you might suspect, Mr. Speaker, as we usually do on Thursday, I want to ask my hon. colleague, the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, to give us the agenda for the next few days.

[*English*]

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to provide the weekly business statement.

We will continue today, tomorrow and on November 20 with the second reading debate of Bill C-96, on the human resources development departmental reorganization. This will be followed by report stage and third reading of Bill C-83, respecting the environmental auditor general.

*Remembrance Day*

The business of the House would then be called in the following order: Bill C-78, Bill C-52 and Bill C-58.

Finally, I would like to designate November 21 and November 22 as opposition days.

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the House leader of the government.

First, could the hon. House leader indicate whether the government intends to introduce any substantial legislation into the House between now and December 15, if the House continues in operation?

Second, could the hon. House leader indicate whether the very important reports that have been promised regarding old age assistance, Canada pension plan, unemployment insurance are going to be tabled in the House? Will the paper on aging come to the House? Will a position be presented on the GST? That was promised at least two years ago.

Finally, would the hon.—

**Mr. Robichaud:** Order.

**The Speaker:** We allow these interventions if they are short questions. I would appeal to all hon. members, should there be any more interventions like this, that the questions be very precise and as short as possible.

I will permit the hon. House leader to answer.

**Mr. Gray:** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the second part of the hon. member's question, the material on the subjects he has mentioned will be brought forward in due course in a way that is consistent with the red book, the throne speech and the budgets of the government.

With respect to the first part of the hon. member's question, the answer is definitely yes.

**The Speaker:** I would encourage the hon. House leader of the Reform Party to perhaps have a meeting with the hon. House leader of the government.

**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It was our understanding there was to be a statement made at this time in reference to Armistice Day. I believe if you were to seek it you would find that was the agreement of the House.

If such is the case perhaps we could proceed with that prior to going to Government Orders.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** As I understand it, the chief government whip is correct. We will proceed beginning with the hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs.

\* \* \*

• (1530)

**REMEMBRANCE DAY**

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Secretary of State (Veterans), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to those Canadians

who gave their lives for freedom and democracy in serving their country in two world wars, the Korean war and in peacekeeping missions.

On Saturday in ceremonies across the country and in cemeteries around the world where soldiers rest in peace, Canadians will pay tribute to our war dead. This has been a cherished tradition on November 11 ever since the end of the first world war on that date in 1918.

Through the course of this century Canadians have responded to the call of duty again and again. They have shown their strength, courage and conviction in defence of democracy and in the interest of peace. As the years pass and the veterans of these earlier wars age and pass away, it is up to each new generation of Canadians to continue the memory of their sacrifice and courage.

It is up to each new generation of young Canadians to reflect that the men and women who gave their lives were young themselves. They fought for liberty with the strength and idealism of their youth. Many others sacrificed their youth in the terrible ordeal of war.

The Prime Minister has declared November 4 to 12 veterans week. We have used this week as an occasion to honour those who made the ultimate sacrifice and those men and women who came back from the war and kept on contributing to Canada.

These veterans come from all regions of Canada. They serve their country with pride and distinction. They left behind in the cemeteries of Europe, Southeast Asia, North Africa and the Pacific comrades who died for their country without a thought of whether they come from the east or the west or whether they fought for this province or that. They fought and died for Canadians. All Canadians in every province share the legacy of peace and freedom they left for us.

On Saturday the country will unite to remember her war dead. Let every Canadian remember and cherish the memories of those who have sacrificed so much. Let us put aside our partisan differences and our conflicting visions of tomorrow. Let us pay tribute to those who gave us the freedom we have to choose our destiny, the freedom we share with Canadians.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Bloc Québécois, which forms the official opposition in this House, I am pleased to rise this afternoon in honour of Remembrance Day. Tradition dictates that, every November 11, we take a few moments to remember those who have served in the two world wars and in the Korean war.

Of course, we must also remember those who served in the numerous UN peacekeeping missions. Remembrance Day is especially significant this year since last spring marked the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. Today, we want to thank all those who served at the front, the sailors and airmen and women from all regions of Canada, the members of the merchant

*Remembrance Day*

navy, the nurses, and all the men and women who risked or gave their lives to overcome tyranny.

We must never forget that over 100,000 young Canadians and Quebecers lost their lives in the two major global conflicts, while hundreds of others died in Korea and in various peacekeeping missions. Unfortunately, many bloody conflicts are still raging throughout the world. Let us think about all those who are responsible for keeping the peace in the world, in particular the Canadian peacekeepers.

• (1535)

One of the main roles of the Canadian Forces at the international level is to participate in peacekeeping operations. This is an invaluable asset and international achievement for Canada.

On behalf of all Bloc members, I wish to congratulate all members of the various Legion branches. We sincerely thank them for honouring the memory of the young Canadians and Quebecers who left everything behind and went overseas to fight for peace and freedom.

Today we remember the selfless sacrifices made by those to whom we owe this legacy of freedom and democracy.

The heavy human casualties and the great suffering of all those affected by these endless wars are beyond comprehension.

As the Leader of the Official Opposition said in marking the 50th anniversary of the end of the second world war, who can describe the terrible pain of the mothers and fathers whose son was killed in the prime of his life? And what about the widows and orphans, the brothers and sisters forever deprived of a loved one who left one day for a faraway country to meet his destiny as a sacrificed hero?

Like those who gave their lives, all these brave people also fought so that there would be no more wars and that future generations would be spared the attendant atrocities, suffering and upheaval.

This was, however, the price we had to pay for our commitment to peace and democracy. It is precisely because our young soldiers shared these values that they felt compelled to defend them overseas.

We must therefore sincerely thank again all those who died and, of course, all those who survived these tragedies.

Let us pay them a vibrant tribute and honour their memory.

[English]

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember and pay tribute to those brave Canadians who served their country and those who lost their lives or suffered injuries or loss in the terrible wars of this

century. On behalf of our party, our constituencies, our constituents and all Canadians who remember, we offer our profound respect and deepest thanks.

[Translation]

That reminds me that there are no French Canadians or English Canadians in cemeteries in Europe, only Canadians. I pray that this fact unites us in peacetime as in wartime.

[English]

At the same time we remember and pay tribute to the current members of our armed forces, many of whom have served or are serving as peacekeepers in the troubled places of the world. Again on behalf of our constituents and on behalf of all Canadians who cherish peace, we offer our profound respect and our deepest thanks.

November 11 is called Remembrance Day. Our children rightly ask what precisely it is we are asked to remember. If we ask the living, the loved ones and friends of those who served and fell in the wars, they will say we remember our loved ones and friends who gave their lives for freedom and democracy, and they will be right. However, if we could ask those who served and fell what they would like us to remember, I believe they would tell us to remember the great lesson their loss teaches us: that freedom and democracy cannot be preserved without self-sacrifice.

If each of us every day, year after year, makes the small sacrifices of time, energy and self-interest necessary to preserve our freedoms, that is enough. But if we neglect to make those small daily sacrifices then someday, somewhere down the road, a vast multitude of people like those we honour on Remembrance Day must make the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf.

• (1540)

Today I say let us make our tributes and on November 11 let us lay our wreaths. But, above all, each day after that let us practise the great lesson that freedom and democracy cannot be preserved without self-sacrifice on our part. Such practice would be the highest tribute we could pay to those who fought and fell as well as to those who stand on guard for Canada today.

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me to join my colleagues on behalf of the New Democratic Party in remembering those who died and suffered during the past great wars. This year marks the 50th anniversary of the end of the last great war, both in Europe and Southeast Asia.

It is also a personal gratitude that I have the great honour to express today in the House to the Parliament of Canada. Coming from Holland, where many of my relatives had part in the



resistance against the fascism that swept through Europe, on their behalf and on behalf of my former countrymen in the Netherlands I wish to express our great gratitude and appreciation to those young Canadian men and women who liberated us from the shadow of fascism.

Having been born in the Dutch East Indies and a few months after my birth being incarcerated in a Japanese prisoner of war camp with my mother and my older brother, and my father eventually being taken a prisoner of war and incarcerated in a prisoner of war camp in Japan, I wish to express my personal gratitude to those men and women of the allied forces who liberated us. If it were not for them I would not be alive today. It is a very personal matter for me to stand in the House and express our deepest gratitude to those men and women who sacrificed their lives to save others.

As we remember them, let us also remember why the young Canadian men and women went forward in their great act of sacrifice. It was to preserve democracy and freedom as we know them. It was to fight against the intolerance that had swept through Europe and Asia at the time. As we remember their deeds, it is important for us to also reaffirm ourselves to the ideals of democracy, freedom and tolerance. Without tolerance, democracy and freedom cannot exist.

As we live through today's age of rapid social and technological changes, which create psychological insecurities, the ugly head of intolerance rises now and then. As we remember the dead, let us also remember the great purpose of freedom, democracy and tolerance.

On behalf of my colleagues, myself, my family and the people of the Netherlands, I thank those great Canadian men and women who did so much.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the many Canadians who sacrificed so much for the peace and freedom we all enjoy today.

The first world war ended at 11 a.m. on November 11, 1918. We reflect each Remembrance Day on that time and on that date. World War I left close to 70,000 Canadians dead and almost twice as many wounded. The second world war took the lives of 45,000 Canadians. Canadians also gave their lives during the Korean war and our armed forces answered when the United Nations called for action to put an end to Iraq's aggression against Kuwait. Canadians have never backed down or run away in the face of such aggression. Our troops have put their lives on the line when international peace and security has been at risk.

• (1545)

I, like my colleague of the New Democratic Party, am personally aware of World War II because I had two brothers who served in Holland.

### *Remembrance Day*

As a child at that time I remember how we used to work and save our pennies to buy Canadian stamps, how we used to take our toothpaste tubes to school. Some of the boys used to bring their little metal toys and turn them in. All of us have memories, but I have happy memories because my brothers returned home safe and sound.

Canadians know that to ensure world peace the laws that govern relationships among nations must be respected and enforced. That is why we have almost 2,000 members of the Canadian military serving throughout the world in peace and humanitarian operations.

This year we commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the end of the second world war and on Remembrance Day and this Veterans' Week let us commit, each and every one of us, to honouring those who risked so much on our behalf through concrete action. In Holland during VE Day celebrations Canadian veterans were treated like royalty for their role in the liberation of that country.

Here at home we must continue to remember and show our gratitude to those who risked everything so that we would have the country we have today with our rights and freedoms. That is why we have to protect the programs vital to the well-being of so many veterans.

Today I say thank you to those who fought for the freedoms we enjoy. I say thank you to those who continue to wear the uniform of Canada for their extraordinary service to all of us.

Let us not forget the price that has been paid so that we could live in peace, individually and collectively. Let us be vigilant about maintaining that peace.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** We now resume debate on Bill C-96. The hon. member for Lévis still has four minutes in his statement, which will be followed by a period of questions and comments.

**Mr. Boudria:** Once again, Mr. Speaker, I thought there had been discussions among the parties so that this period of comments would be followed by a moment of silence. I am informed, at least, that it was the case in past years, and I had thought that these discussions had taken place today as well.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I must admit that I am not aware of the discussions, but I still believe that since Remembrance Day is coming soon, on Saturday, November 11, it would be quite appropriate to stand up and have a moment of silence.

[*English*]

I ask you all to rise for a minute of silence.

[*Editor's Note: The House stood in silence.*]

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES  
DEVELOPMENT ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-96, an act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development and to amend and repeal certain related acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as you indicated earlier, I was not completely done with my remarks on Bill C-96. I would like to use the three or four minutes remaining to raise two major points.

I heard comments the minister and the hon. member for St. Boniface made to the effect that the official opposition was worrying for nothing, that it need not worry about clause 20 because, even though the minister was giving himself greater powers—these are certainly not duties or functions; we are talking mostly about powers here—he did not intend to encroach on provincial powers or responsibilities.

My father used to say: “To predict the future or to know how someone will perform in the future, just look at their performance for the past few months or years”.

The Minister of Human Resources Development has been in office for two years now and we can clearly see two things. There are many things, but I will focus on these two. First, we will recall that among the many budgetary provisions contained in Bill C-17, there was one concerning cuts to the unemployment insurance program, which I would briefly summarize as follows: longer qualifying period, lower amounts and shorter benefit period. Let us bear this in mind.

The impact of these provisions was felt throughout Canada, but since I am from Quebec, let me point out that the labour minister mentioned again just recently how many more Quebecers were forced on welfare as a result.

The minister, in his speech this morning, spoke about young people, and said that, all things considered, there were not that many more unemployed young people. That is true, but in Quebec, at least, there are many more people on welfare, including young people. It think that has to be pointed out.

Furthermore, as the training and youth critic for my party, I would like to remind the House of what we heard in committee, which was that, in Bill C-28, the minister and the parliamentary secretary were giving themselves the right to designate the appropriate authority, when the previous act gave that right to the governor in council, meaning the provincial governments.

Why? Because, in the Constitution, this is an area of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

Moreover, in section 14(7), the minister dealt with the opting-out privilege which the government of Quebec has always requested and which it was able to use, but now there were some new conditions. Now, each element of the student financial assistance program had to meet the requirements of the federal government's financial assistance program. The minister was giving himself the right to determine how similar the two programs were. I just wanted to remind the House of all of this before concluding my remarks.

And finally, I want to thank the hon. member for Mercier, who is sitting right behind me, for her excellent work as deputy chairperson of the human resources development committee. As the official opposition critic, she spoke today more specifically to the people of Quebec, asking them to watch out, because Prime Minister Jean Chrétien was about to make them face the music, as he promised to do in answer to a question put to him in the House not so long ago.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before the question and comment period, I would like to remind all members that they cannot refer to hon. members by their names, but that they have to use the name of their ridings or their title. I know it is sometimes easy to forget, but I wanted to remind the House because this is an important point within our parliamentary rules.

[*English*]

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as always when the hon. member speaks I pay a great deal of attention.

• (1555)

I have had the pleasure to work with the hon. member on the human resources committee and so I clearly understand the philosophical disposition he has toward matters related to human resources development.

I find it quite ironic that the Bloc Québécois would accuse the federal government of engaging in an exercise of political power grabbing when in this piece of legislation we are trying to empower not only the federal government but provincial partners and local stakeholders to give us an opportunity to better serve the people of Canada, whether they are in la belle province de Québec or outside.

I also bring to the hon. member's attention that we as a federal government have a role to play in matters he outlined during his speech. One is the Unemployment Insurance Act which dates back to 1941 and gives a role to the federal government to engage in a process whereby we will give income support to the people of Canada and also a set of tools so they can re-enter the workforce.

*Government Orders*

I have a different view of what is going on in the relationship between the federal government, provincial governments and local communities. Over the years we have demonstrated that as a federal government we engage very much in co-operative, flexible federalism—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** I hear some rumbling on the Reform Party side which is quite obvious. It has nothing to say and so it just moans and groans.

Despite the differences that exist, some of them political in nature, some philosophical, we have engaged in many innovative partnerships between Human Resources Development Canada and Quebec agencies. HRDC, Human Resources Development Canada—I am talking to the Reform Party so it gets its acronyms right—in partnerships with two Quebec government departments is supporting job search training for youth through le Relais des jeunes adultes du Sud-Ouest de Montréal; 65 per cent of the participants so far have found work.

In partnership with the Société québécoise de développement de la main-d'oeuvre HRDC provides financial assistance to help new entrepreneurs to get into business through la Société d'aide au développement des collectivités de Sorel-Tracy Inc.

In partnership with SQDM, HRDC helped workers affected by a Hyundai plant closing in Bromont last March; 80 per cent of those workers found work or took further vocational training.

The CEC and la Société du développement économique de Jonquière have established a partnership to compile and share labour market information.

There is a single window service joining HRDC, le commissaire industriel and l'Office de tourisme in Témiscamingue to deliver services in industrial, rural and tourism development. The list is absolutely endless.

I tell the hon. member in a very clear and concise manner that Canada works. Does it work perfectly? No. Can it use some improvements? Of course. We can achieve positive change in federal, provincial and community relationships as we redefine. This is a very important exercise in the redefinition of the relationship between the individual, the community and the state.

It is within this framework that we must continue to work together to achieve those positive ends that will facilitate the process of getting people off unemployment rolls and on to payrolls.

I know the hon. member shares this vision because he, like me, wants to get people off welfare, off unemployment and into safe, secure jobs.

• (1600)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, I can see the hon. parliamentary secretary is more skilful with comments than with questions. But he did ask a question, and he said in his preamble that we seem to have a different perception of the facts, and I agree.

He is quite right, his point of view and mine are quite different. In my opinion, decentralization means that, in areas under provincial jurisdiction, the federal government should enter into agreements with the provinces. But they think decentralization means that Ottawa rakes in the money through the UI plan. Incidentally, the federal government has not put any money into the UI fund since 1991, but it is keeping control of the fund and goes so far as to imply that it is being generous, when in fact that money comes from the employees and the employers of Canada, including Quebec.

The parliamentary secretary should know that the federal government got involved in the UI fund through a constitutional agreement and then with the approval of the provinces. It was aware at the time that this is an area under provincial jurisdiction. That agreement allowed the federal government to establish the unemployment insurance commission.

Now, because the federal government manages the UI fund, it is using the power of money to do things, and it made a string of announcements. There may be one he does not know. One week after the referendum, the hon. member for Beauce made an announcement concerning the Minister of Human Resources Development. As you know, cuts in the employment centres had been announced right and left. The employment centre located in the riding of the hon. member for Beauce was going to be transferred to the neighbouring Frontenac riding.

The hon. member for Beauce made representations, obviously accepted to chair the no committee and announced, one week after the referendum, that the Minister of Human Resources Development had agreed to keep a number of employees in the Beauce constituency rather than transferring them all as previously expected. Furthermore, there would be a special project in this constituency. Within this kind of decentralization, an independent member—instead of a province—would be able to create a consultation or support centre to help industries train their own employees. We, the official opposition, are against this kind of decentralization.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my hon. colleague's comments on this very important topic.

*Government Orders*

I note with interest the comments of the parliamentary secretary that Canada works, that his government has been bringing forward a flexible and co-operative approach and therefore he does not understand what the problem would be. I can tell him the problem is that his government is not flexible and has not been very co-operative with the provinces. That is the big reason we have the problems in Canada today.

It is interesting to note that this afternoon during question period, the hon. Minister of Health indicated how co-operative she is. She got up and bragged that she is going to be penalizing Alberta to the extent of over \$400,000 a month in cutbacks in the transfer payments. That is how co-operative the government is with the provinces. Is it any wonder we have problems with the province of Quebec as well.

It is very interesting to note that the Reform Party on the other hand has put forward a positive agenda for change and has devolved manpower training to the provinces. That is what we look to for innovative ways to make Confederation work.

Perhaps the hon. member would care to comment on what his experience has been in how co-operative the Liberal government has been over the past two years. Is there further merit in the devolution of powers to the provinces if we are going to make Confederation work?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Let me remind everyone that the 10-minute question and comment period has almost lapsed. The response should be in 60 seconds or less.

• (1605)

[Translation]

**Mr. Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that I listened with great interest to the remarks made by my colleague from the Reform Party. It makes me realize that, even though the members opposite, on the government side, would have us believe that they only have problems with Quebec, they do have problems elsewhere as well.

Now, regarding Quebec's position, it is quite clear. In a resolution adopted unanimously by the National Assembly under the Liberal government of Mr. Daniel Johnson, chairman of the no committee, Quebec has stated that it wants to be given exclusive jurisdiction over manpower, for example, as well as tax points equivalent to what the federal government is spending in this area at the present time in this province.

Quebec has been asking for that for a long time.

[English]

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House has a straightforward goal. It provides the legal mandate and structure for Human Resources Development Canada.

As the debate has already shown, we are not simply discussing technical legislation; we are in fact talking about a vision. That vision is one of Canadians and communities meeting the challenges of a new economy. It is a vision of a federal government that works as a partner within Canadian communities. It is a vision based on jobs, growth and results.

This is not a vision of the future; it is a reality today. At a time when people ask how governments can get closer to the people they serve, HRDC is showing the way. This is true in every province and every territory. I know it is certainly true in the riding I represent in the House of Commons, York North.

York North is one of the most dynamic areas in Canada. There are new families, new businesses and new opportunities everywhere in the riding. However, growth does not simply happen. We have to build for success. This is what we are achieving in York North.

We are doing it through the York North technology strategy. This strategy was developed by working together with municipal governments, businesses, community organizations and area residents. It will prepare the people and communities in my riding for the 21st century. It will help them make the most of today's technology and will allow them to turn change into opportunity. It will equip people with tools which will help them compete in the economy we see emerging all around us.

The government has been there to help. We have been able to use the department's flexible and effective programs to translate this strategy into concrete, innovative projects. We have been able to match the energy of community leaders in the York region with the tools of Human Resources Development Canada.

One example is our new York region strategic alliance. The Regional Municipality of York, Seneca College and local employers have joined with the federal government to foster jobs and growth in this region. We are pooling resources and skills. We are sharing overhead and information. We are finding projects which will offer a real bang for the buck in terms of job creation.

Strategic alliance's first project is taking place in the city of Vaughan. It is a pilot survey which will develop a database on local business opportunities and resources. This information will be available to employers around the world via the Internet. It will help employers who are considering Vaughan as a place to do business. It will help those already there who are considering expansion.

Human Resources Development Canada was approached to help out with this initiative. Recognizing the importance of upgrading skills and modernizing the economy, our government supported this initiative.

• (1610)

Today, current unemployment insurance recipients are acquiring new skills that will help them return to the workforce on a more permanent basis. They are creating the database. They are doing the research. They are entering data and writing reports. They are learning and acquiring marketable skills. They are achieving and contributing to the well-being of the Canadian economy.

We see strategic alliance as a solid investment in the future of our economy. I use the word investment with good reason. We expect two results from this project that will continue long after the Human Resources Development Canada funding is over.

The first is that each of these employees will have better skills to bring to new employers. They will have received active help from unemployment insurance, not just temporary income. They will be back on the job, not back on the UI treadmill. The second is that the city of Vaughan and then all of York region will have an effective pool of resources and tools to create and attract jobs. That is only one of the many excellent examples of how HRDC works with communities.

Just over a month ago I announced the establishment of the technology enterprise centre in the city of Vaughan. It was a very important day for the city. Vaughan is a young community in many ways. Many of my constituents are young people and parents who are concerned about the future. They know the economy demands more from all of us. They are prepared to meet that challenge. They need a government that will help them and their children acquire the skills the new economy demands.

The technology enterprise centre is one way to provide essential skills. The project is sponsored by the Vaughan economic and technology development department. When the project is in full swing, 60 participants will have learned entrepreneurial skills, skills that are important in creating jobs for themselves and also creating jobs for other Canadians.

Those entrepreneurial skills will have a particular focus: the high technology sector. The centre will work with unemployed residents between the ages of 19 and 34 who have a background in technology or research. It will help them gain the skills to start their own high tech businesses, or work for one of the many enterprises already established in Vaughan. This promises to be an intensive program with a realistic basis. After all, we know that companies such as Microsoft started in garages. Who knows where the next leaders of this innovative technology based revolution will come from?

Community leaders in the private sector and at the city of Vaughan knew we have people who want to create opportunities. They were willing to contribute computer equipment to support

### *Government Orders*

this idea. They were willing to secure corporate sponsors to keep this idea going. They needed a partner to help get this off the ground. Once again our government was there to help.

We are deeply committed to the employment needs of youth. We recognize the importance of entrepreneurship in our high technology industries. Thanks to the support of our government based targeted labour market initiative, this is a chance to test a great idea with a great deal of potential.

The federal government earmarked funding for the technology enterprise centre. This is one more example of this government's commitment to listen to communities. We work with their priorities; we focus on creating results. This is fundamental to the new way of governing and governance in this country.

It is extremely important for us to reach out to the communities, to reach out to individuals and to help them along. More important, it is really about people investing in people, helping people help themselves, creating the entrepreneurial environment where jobs are created and to give young people the opportunity to acquire the skills required to meet the challenges of the new economy.

• (1615)

Statistics show us that 45 per cent of all new jobs created between 1990 and the year 2000 will require more than 16 years of training and education. Never before have education and training played such a vital role in our children's future. In order to face this challenge head on, the public, private and educational sectors must band together to give our children the tools they need to succeed.

Last fall, together with Mr. Colin Morrison of the Career Foundation and Philipp Tafelmacher, president of Tetra-Pak, I introduced the York Region Compact, a partnership for learning. This unique co-operative education program focuses on matching students with local companies based on the student's career goals, skills, and the requirements of the organizations.

This spring I announced federal support for training young people in the automotive repair and service sector. As a result of an internship partnership forged between the Canadian Automotive Repair Service Knowledge Network, CARS, whose head office is located in Richmond Hill, and Human Resources Development Canada, labour and the private sector working together, over 1,000 young people will receive hands on experience in this expanding industry with one of the major automakers, whether it be Chrysler, Ford or General Motors.

What is important is that we are in fact training young people for jobs with a future. Why are we focusing on CARS? Why are we focusing on environmental technology, computers and tourism? It is because these are jobs with a future. We want to give

*Government Orders*

young people the skills required to obtain a job in a very competitive marketplace where jobs are long lasting and high paying.

This government has created over 500,000 jobs so far, and the majority are full time, high paying jobs. It is a highly paid, highly skilled, high value added society that we want to create so that the quality of life for Canadians can be maintained.

I am very proud to be a partner in initiatives such as the ones I have outlined. However, we could never have set these projects in motion without first being a community with the foresight to develop such a plan for the future.

The North York technology strategy is about a community that is committed to working together. It is about people, employers, community organizations, and governments that are prepared to combine their efforts and work together for results that will benefit us for a long time to come.

If I had the time I could discuss so many other examples of similar kinds of human resource development co-operation programs I have seen. One excellent example is the self-employment assistance program that has helped 34,000 people across Canada start businesses. Those businesses have created 68,000 jobs. In North York literally hundreds of people have benefited from this program.

The same is true about our support of young people. In April 1994 our government unveiled the youth employment and learning strategy. This strategy is a cumulative result of many years of consultation, policy development, symposia, and town hall meetings with Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

This Liberal government recognizes that our youth is a very important resource, and as such should be treated with a great deal of dignity and priority. That is why this year, during a time of fiscal restraint, the overall budget for youth employment services was increased by \$43 million, to \$236 million. We understand that investing in young people is an excellent investment for the future of this country.

• (1620)

An important element of the youth employment and learning strategy is the national summer job action plan, which I announced in the city of Vaughan this spring. This year the student summer job action program created 44,500 jobs nationwide. When we include the spinoffs from the Canada Employment Centres for students, we created almost 250,000 jobs for our young people.

Youth Service Canada and the youth internship program are viable, very interesting, and positive measures for young people. Youth Service Canada gives young people a chance to

develop skills and confidence while serving their community. Participants receive a \$2,000 voucher to be used for tuition or to start a business. To date, Youth Service Canada has given more than 3,500 young Canadians a head start on their career path.

The youth internship program provides a combination of training on the job and in class, with a balance of both specific and basic employment. Some 27,000 young people have benefited from this program since its inception.

The government invests in results. We are committed to innovation, co-operation and flexibility. We know that people and communities understand their priorities. We know they are willing to make a real commitment to meeting these priorities, and we are willing to work with them in a way that meets their needs.

At the same time we are adapting more than the services we provide. We are improving the way in which these services are delivered. In order to serve our clients better we have developed an integrated, affordable, highly flexible and decentralized service delivery network. This network incorporates new strategies and new tools for getting employment services and programs into the hands of the people who need them. While it maintains a face to face service that clients need it adds new technology features which enhance and expand service delivery.

The use of new technology will be a key feature of the new service delivery network. Through electronic information kiosks, on line database and telephone access systems, the department hopes to extend its reach to clients and all Canadians. New technology will enhance the capacity of our staff to deliver information and services. Through built in flexibility, our staff is responding to what Canadians want and keeping pace with rapid changes in the job market. These initiatives and improvements are really the point of Bill C-96, which creates a department that will work with Canadians.

Everywhere I go throughout the country, whether it is in the Atlantic provinces, British Columbia, Alberta or the province of Ontario, I find that people are responding positively to the new way of delivering services. They are responding positively to the new way of bringing people together. I am quite excited by the revolution that is occurring in every single province, in every city, in every community of this great land. People are coming together, finding out what their priorities are. They have a federal government that facilitates this meeting of people and bringing an idea to fruition, facilitates the ability to be accountable and to deliver services that make sense.

The federal government is reclaiming relevance at the community level. Any hard working member of Parliament who has the ability to lead their community, the ability to facilitate the meeting of people, and who has the deep desire to bring about

positive change in their community can do so, because we have built into this legislation the type of flexibility that will bring their dreams and the dreams of Canadians from coast to coast to reality.

• (1625)

It is not now the time to throw up your hands and say that Canada is not worth it. It is time to roll up your sleeves and make your community work.

[Translation]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is rather surprising to hear such a statement only two weeks after the referendum results.

It is true that the yes side got 49,4 p. 100 of the vote, but if there is one issue on which a referendum today would lead to a landslide victory, it is the return of powers to Quebec regarding manpower training.

Again this week, Mr. Gérald A. Ponton, chairman of the Association des manufacturiers du Québec—not a member of the Parti Québécois, not a member of the Bloc Québécois, but the chairman of the Association des manufacturiers du Québec—clearly stated that there is a consensus in Quebec, that it was reiterated during the referendum campaign, that if the federal government wants to give us clear evidence of the will for reform it expressed during the week prior to the referendum, it should give the Government of Quebec the responsibility for all manpower training.

It is very surprising to hear the member state that the present government wants to have concrete results to show how effective it is. From September 1994 to September 1995, the number of welfare recipients increased by 20,000, mostly because the unemployment insurance rules were tightened up by this government that wanted to create, in the unemployment fund, an artificial surplus that will amount to about \$5 billion for this year. When the government makes decisions like this one that leads people to apply for welfare, I think we see very concrete results that do not reflect very well on the present government.

In his speech, the member used the term “decentralize”. That must be one of these words that does not mean the same thing in Canada and in Quebec. In every management book I studied, decentralization means mandating somebody to assume the whole responsibility of some undertaking. Everything there is in the bill presented by the Minister of Human Resources Development is to be found in clause 6 which reads as follows:

The powers, duties and functions of the Minister extend to and include all matters over which Parliament has jurisdiction relating to the development of the human resources of Canada not by law assigned to any other Minister, department, board or agency of the Government of Canada—

### *Government Orders*

This bill does not mention provincial responsibilities, contrary to Bill C-95 which at least, in the health area, contained clauses ensuring that the federal government would not encroach upon provincial jurisdiction. In this bill, nothing is said about that.

When you look at all those elements, it seems fair to ask the government if this bill, tabled before the outcome of the referendum, should not have died on the Order Paper, because it shows clearly that the federal government has no intention whatsoever of making real changes. It wants to make cosmetic changes only. The way to show they want change would be to amend the bill so that manpower training can become an exclusive jurisdiction for Quebec.

[English]

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** Mr. Speaker, I am often quite puzzled by some of the questions the Bloc Québécois asks in the House of Commons.

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** It does not take much to puzzle you.

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** I wonder if a member from British Columbia who came to a neighbouring riding and was able to draw only six people has the right to even express an opinion.

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Nobody has the right except you. You are the only one with rights here.

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** I want to tell the hon. member that there was no question, as he may recall, on the June offer the Minister of Human Resources Development made to the provincial minister of employment, basically asking to sit down and perhaps come up with some different arrangements for a local economic development strategy for the province of Quebec and indeed any other province that would like to participate.

• (1630)

I find that quite ironic, considering that the government, in co-operation with the people of Canada, has been able to create a climate where there have been over 500,000 full time, high paying jobs created since the October 1993 election.

We have made offers to the provinces on the issue of the labour market. The hon. member knows that. As a matter of fact, we have continually made offers and it has taken a long time for the minister from Quebec responsible for employment to even have the decency to respond to the offers made by the Minister of Human Resources Development.

If the hon. member is asking if can we make some changes to the way the federal government and the provinces relate, I submit that changes should be made not only with the provinces but with the way in which we deal with communities and individuals. The hon. member knows that governing and gover-

*Government Orders*

nance is an evolving process. Changes have occurred throughout the past two years. I cited earlier in my comments, in response to the member for Lévis, a number of initiatives that are working quite well.

When I was in Pierrefonds, Quebec, avec ton cher collègue du Parti québécois, le ministre de l'Éducation, Mr. Garon, we were there working together, ensemble, to make sure that by pooling the resources available, 1,000 young people, in co-operation with the Sectoral Council of Cars and Chrysler Canada, would get jobs.

When you speak to young Quebecers, when you speak to young Albertans, when you speak to young British Columbians, their dream is to get a job, to have the type of security that the government is providing.

Are we open to leading the way in these consultations toward change? Of course we are. It is unfair for any member of the opposition to say that no progress has been made because the numbers speak for themselves.

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I was interested that the parliamentary secretary in his vision of the new Canada said that the federal government works as a partner. Some partner. This is a partner that just finished removing \$7 billion from the social spending envelope. What kind of a partner is that?

All the words that the government keeps coming up with are nothing more than the platitudes of speech writers. Would he care to enlighten us as to who wrote his speech?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I want to remind my colleagues on all sides of the House to please make their interventions through the Chair.

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** Mr. Speaker, you can rest assured it was not a member of the Reform Party. Speeches have to make sense and I would never go to them for any advice on that.

The hon. member knows because he has visited my community that it is working quite well. It is doing that with a Liberal member on the government side.

This is what Reform Party members do a lot. They sit here and complain about cuts. When they ran in the 1993 election, they were going to cut approximately \$15 billion from social spending. Since then, they have come up with a super RRSP for seniors that would actually reduce benefits for our seniors.

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Baloney.

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** There you are, Reform. It takes away maternity benefits. This is the type of cave age Reformers we have in this House. They seem to throw numbers and figures around. You should even check your super RSP—

• (1635)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order, please. I know that there are strongly held views in most debates, if not all of them,

but there is a proper way to conduct debates and going through the Chair is most helpful.

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** Mr. Speaker, I will do that. There are correct views and there are wrong views. I believe that the hon. member is expressing wrong views.

When we look at the budget which Reformers proposed, in relation to the super RSP, they have something called recognition bonds within that framework. The unfortunate thing is that they are reinventing the Canada pension plan, the OAS and the GIS. The only thing they do not know about the bonds is how they are going to pay for them. Everything else works quite well, according to them.

I ask for a very simple thing from them. When Reform Party members speak in the House of Commons they really should take a bit more care, a bit more time, to analyse clearly and study the issues and not to present to Canadians plans which simply do not make sense. Canadians want plans that work. Canadians want plans that result in job creation. Canadians want plans that create jobs and economic growth. That is what the government has been able to do in the past two years. I know that members of the Reform Party are really not happy with that.

**Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this is getting more interesting as we go. I find it enlightening when we are told our plans do not work. I have been here for over two years and I have yet to hear of a plan coming from the government.

The bill we are speaking about is Bill C-96, which we oppose. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am sharing my time with my colleague from Kootenay East.

I would like to comment on the presentations which have been made this afternoon. One of our Liberal colleagues called on us to work together. Perhaps we could work together, reasonably closely, if the goal that the Liberal government has and the goal which the Reform Party has were at least close. I am going to demonstrate why we have these emotional debates. What we hear is rhetoric. We do not see concrete examples. We do not see anything substantive coming from the government which fits into Canadian society today.

I hear that the bill will empower the government—

**Mr. Bevilacqua:** People.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** No, it was government. That was the word.

Since October 1993 the government has had a majority. We are now, over two years later, talking about Bill C-96 which will empower the government. I have to wonder what has happened in the last two years. Has the government been thinking that maybe it should be empowered? It already is empowered. Has it been thinking about what it will do now that it has been elected by surprise? Exactly what has the government been thinking for the last two years?



This legislation will only go into that place over there, it will sit and go through committee, and it will be into year three if not year four before the government will say it is empowered. We have to wonder what the logic is.

**Mr. Abbott:** Elect them again.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** I guess that is what they are looking for. They can go into the next election and say: "This is what we wanted to do for those first five years and we are really going to do it in the second five years". That is unacceptable.

Well done is better than well said. The government should think about that. All it is doing is talking. Meanwhile people are waiting. Maybe it is just not all talk. Maybe there are some things the government has done.

• (1640)

Since being elected it has overspent in the last two years \$80 billion plus. Congratulations. Add the interest on top and the figure is close to putting \$100 billion more debt on the backs of our children. The Liberal members sit there sanctimoniously talking about how well they are doing.

People listening to this have to be really disgusted with this kind of talk about how they are empowered, how they have done things, how they are doing things. What they have done is put us deeper in debt.

When I talk about the social programs, the question has to be asked: How is the government going to address social programs when it is blowing the budget every year and adding more debt? The fact is that the premiums have to go up and the benefits have to come down. If the government keeps spending and spending into oblivion it is going to cost big time. Government members sit there spouting this rhetoric, like they are going to do something. They have done something all right.

Let us talk about the member who has just finished speaking. "Canada works. Canadians feel that Canada works". As I recall, during the last election campaign, I said that Canada was not working very well. The people said: "Yes, we agree with you. Canada is not working very well". Where does Canada work? Where Liberals sit, where their Liberal ridings are, is that where Canada works? It does not work in my riding.

The Liberals have a straightforward goal. They are talking about a vision and a new economy. Yes, they are creating a new economy. Congratulations. We are back to the \$80 billion over two years again. They are creating a new economy all right. We are going down hill fast. If they had anything serious to do with the economy they would not set ridiculous financial targets like

### *Government Orders*

having a deficit which is 3 per cent of the gross domestic product after three years.

What the Liberals are really saying is after three years we will be overspending every year by \$26 billion. What kind of logic is that in a day and age when we have \$565 billion of debt? What kind of responsibility is that of a majority government to the young kids in this country? I have to address these things sometimes.

The comment was made that 500,000 jobs have been created. Where do we get this figure of 500,000 jobs from? Where does this number come from? I followed up on one of these comments that was made in Atlantic Canada where the government had said it had created 40,000 jobs in ACOA. As it happens the challenge was put out to prove it.

The government backed off and said: "We say it is 40,000 jobs, we know". Show us how. How did the government figure that out. With a survey of a half dozen or so companies extrapolated came out to 40,000 people if this and this and this happened. It is hogwash. When the government throws out numbers like 500,000 new jobs it is hogwash. It cannot prove it.

The government talked about 100,000 jobs in infrastructure. It only cost us \$6 billion, and if there are 100,000 jobs, most of them are temporary. Who will pick up the bill for \$6 billion? Congratulations. To get their names on the stats for the unemployed they have spent \$6 billion of the taxpayers' money. I would not pat myself on the back if I were a Liberal. I would be ashamed.

• (1645)

This bill transfers powers from the former ministry of employment and immigration. I guess it is necessary to transfer the powers. The Liberals took over from the Conservatives. There is going to be a name change, move people around and that sort of thing. However, let us look at the job they have done.

After 30 years of big government, both Liberal and Conservative, we have ended up with less security instead of more because they mortgaged our future. There is less security today than there was before in the social programs. Now the Liberals come into the House and say they have a real novel idea. They are going to fix it. That is novel, after 30 years of being at the trough.

Pensions by and large are unfunded today.

**An hon. member:** Not theirs.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Except the MPs pension. They are all on that. If they will protect and pension it is that one. Fully 1 per cent of our population is waiting for significant surgery. Tuition is rising and literacy is falling. These are not

*Government Orders*

negative comments; this is reality. I caution Liberal members to stop coming into this House and putting platitudes to the Speaker expecting people to buy them. They do not.

Is my time running out? I knew this would happen. I cannot even give a good lesson to these people without running out of time.

**Mr. Abbott:** They would not learn anyway.

**Mr. White (Fraser Valley West):** Have I got a minute? Rats. I am out of time.

**Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my Reform colleagues and I were elected on a platform of real change. It was change that would revolutionize the power and prosperity of Confederation, change that would put an end to the burden of constitutional wrangling which has plagued this land for generations, change that would release Canadians from the oppressive weight of deficit spending. These sentiments were echoed all across the country, particularly as we led up to the referendum on October 30. Canadians are not happy with the way their government operates and they want it fixed no matter where they are in Canada.

Today we are addressing Bill C-96, an act to establish the Department of Human Resources Development. One would hope that a responsible government would listen to the wants of the electorate and do everything in its power to accommodate them. However, this bill perpetuates the centralized grip that Ottawa maintains on programs which would be administered much more effectively at the local level.

Each province and region in Canada is distinctly different from the other. Demographically speaking, there are more differences between the provinces than there are similarities. Each province has identifiable characteristics which are unique to its own situation. These differences supersede language, culture and self-determination demanding economic prosperity through natural resources, employment, education, training, social services and housing. The Ottawa bureaucracy has historically implemented a unilateral blanket of policies which falls short of fulfilling the individual needs of the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, if you were going to purchase a helmet, would you purchase a generic helmet or would you purchase a helmet that was customized to your size and function? You would not purchase a cycling helmet to play hockey. Why? Because it is not suitable. While a cycling helmet is quite effective for cycling, it is not effective in protecting your health and livelihood even if you are a referee in a hockey game.

• (1650)

The same can be said for human resources development programs. It is imperative that social programs meet the special-

ized needs of a given province or municipality. Who better to determine that criterion than the province itself or the people in the communities?

This bill pays lip service to decentralization. For example, clause 20 of the bill gives the minister the power to enter into negotiations with groups, including provinces and municipalities, for the administration of services under the Department of Human Resources Development. Although in theory this practice can be seen as a movement toward privatization, in reality it continues to exist unchanged as a centralized body subject to the exclusive decision making practices of the minister. It is lip service.

The parliamentary secretary for HRD earlier in debate said that the federal government works as a partner. The minister is the decision maker for that partner. It is that partner which has removed \$7 billion from this social envelope to which I say, with friends like this, who needs enemies?

Since the time of Confederation the federal government scribed, debated and implemented laws which were perceived to be in the best interests of the nation. Over the past 128 years Canada has emerged as a nation comprised of diverse communities to which the archaic macro political practices of the past no longer apply.

Canada needs legislation which is flexible enough to accommodate Canadians from Corner Brook to Cranbrook and everywhere in between. It is time to end the centralized purse string control which Ottawa has over the Canadian taxpayer and over the functions that are covered by this act.

Tax dollars are squandered in order to sustain the massive national central bureaucracy which is not in touch with the needs and wants of Canadians in Corner Brook and Cranbrook. The constituents in my riding, like all other ridings across this great land, pay taxes for essential services. Let us look at this sum as though it were just one dollar.

That dollar is sent to Ottawa where the cost of the massive bureaucracy does little more than deplete the amount of that tax dollar. By the time it is sent to the province through transfer payments, that dollar probably is worth about 80 cents. A similar vacuous process takes place at the provincial level where duplication of bureaucratic intervention does little else than spend tax dollars without cause or consequence, the resulting factor being that the original tax dollar collected from Joe Public is returned to the community as only 60 cents. This is one of the many reasons our country is in such a sorry financial state.

There are considerable benefits to downloading the collection and implementation of essential service taxes from the federal level to the local level. Look at the simplification of collecting, administering and dispensing benefits and essential services at

the level at which the services are received rather than meddling at the federal level.

The most obvious advantage is the omission of expensive and extraneous bureaucratic intervention. The administration of taxes at a local level would ensure the transparency and accountability that Canadians have come to demand from their public institutions. Closed door deals and political patronage are not welcome.

This bill proposes there is room for the commercialization or privatization of these services by allowing the minister or his appointed representatives to enter into negotiations with the provinces and other parties. But surprise, surprise, the final decision will be at the discretion of the minister, not the public. This is a problem because the minister receives advice from the federal bureaucracy interested in its own self-preservation.

Reform is calling for the decentralization of federal powers in these areas. Decentralization means that the provinces, regions and municipalities decide based on their own needs when, why and especially how the funds are to be administered. Downloading gives Canadians a higher return on their tax investment while empowering them to be able to decide how their tax dollars are going to be spent.

This concept is obviously scary to the establishment. Traditional federal institutions will be quite opposed to relinquishing any power. So too is the federal Liberal government whose mandate is based on the inflexible centralized power which has existed since Confederation.

• (1655)

Bill C-96 does nothing to remedy the problems which are evident to everyone except this Liberal government. Canadians are calling for real change, not minuscule housekeeping activities.

Bill C-96 as I have stated, continues centralization in spite of the cosmetics. There is a lot of lip service in the bill to the idea of decentralization and changing where the decisions are going to be made.

Reform by contrast offers protection to pensioners for OAS and for CPP which is completely unfunded and which will run out of funds within a very specified period of time. Reform looks to decentralization and the efficiencies that would occur from that decentralization putting power back in the hands of Canadians where it should be. This government continues to tell the lie that the government will do it. Its spending habits are such that the government can no longer be counted on to do it.

The country at this point is in a unique position to make changes. Canadians are demanding change, but more important, Canadians are demanding change now. Vacuous housekeeping

### *Government Orders*

like this one do absolutely nothing to give the change Canadians are asking for.

Canadians want a decentralized power structure which empowers citizens, not politicians. Canadians do not want Bill C-96 and neither does the Reform Party. We saw Canadians come together in strength in Montreal. We saw an outpouring of healthy Canadian nationalism. What they did not want was status quo legislation like Bill C-96.

Canadians are looking for leadership. I say to the Liberals: You can lead or you can follow, but if you are not going to lead, get out of the way.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):**  
Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to the member's speech.

With respect, I must say his message is somewhat convoluted. On one hand he says that this is a housekeeping bill. He referred to it as status quo legislation and then talked about the Liberals trying to centralize power with the bill. Now, if the bill does not do anything, as the member suggested, how could it further centralize power? There is something there that whoever wrote that speech should try to straighten out. There is an obvious contradiction.

Let us assume for one minute that the member was confused about the bill being housekeeping and status quo legislation and it is about centralizing power which he talked about initially. The member is going to have to answer another question. If the Liberals want to centralize power, as they have traditionally wanted to do according to the member—which of course is factually incorrect as we all know, those of us who are objective like you, Mr. Speaker, being the independent person you are in the House you will understand this—then surely we have not done a very good job of centralizing.

We live in what is either the most decentralized federation or second most, depending on those who consider Switzerland to be more decentralized than Canada or Canada more decentralized than Switzerland. If we have centralized all that much and it is still the least centralized country in the world, it seems to me we have not done a very good job of centralizing.

Would the member explain these contradictions in his speech because with respect, I believe they do not make a heck of a lot of sense. We cannot have centralized all these things and still end up with a country that is very decentralized.

The member also talked about the finances of the nation which he says we have not sufficiently addressed. Perhaps the member is reading from material that was prepared some time ago. Surely, he would know that no less than the people at *Fortune* magazine, which is a rather prestigious publication, recently said that Canada was now a good place to invest because it had finally addressed the issue of the deficit and was progressing to clean its fiscal house and put things in order. That

*Government Orders*

is another contradiction. Maybe the member can explain to us why he believes all these things that are different from reality.

• (1700)

**Mr. Abbott:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to answer those questions. As the member will probably recall, today we will be going to the world money markets to borrow \$100 million. What is it for? Is it for human resource development or medicare? No, we are going to the world markets today to borrow \$100 million to pay the interest on the money we have already borrowed. If that is not bogus I do not know what in the world is.

The reality is that while the member may be correct, and I am prepared to accept what he has said about *Fortune* magazine's saying this is a good place to invest, and truly in Canada with the resources and the people we have it is a good place to invest, but I remind him the bond rating agencies have downgraded the Canadian/U.S. denominated debt and we have been put on watch on our Canada bonds.

If we are in such good shape, I wonder if they too are concerned, as we are, about the fact that today we will borrow \$100 million to pay interest on money we have already borrowed.

Dealing with the issues the member raised I find, as my leader has from time to time, that perhaps if we speak a little slower and perhaps get to smaller words sometimes we can manage to get our message to the people on the other side.

I was talking about the fact that this bill is a continuation of the process of the centralization we have had in Ottawa since 1968, since the time of Trudeau, when the giant sucking noise Canadians heard was all of the money, all of the power, all of the decision making being drawn into Ottawa. This bill does absolutely nothing to change that situation. It is the continuation of the centralized decision making process.

I say to the member who, after all, has a responsibility to the affairs of the House, the House has continued since we reconvened in the middle of September to do nothing but housekeeping things. Rather than coming forward with this kind of a bill, why are we not getting the reports that have been promised from HRD on UI, on pension? Why are we not getting those things? I suggest it is because the government is devoid of any ability to bring us those things.

[Translation]

**Mr. Martin Cauchon (Outremont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very proud today to have this opportunity to speak in the House of Commons, this impressive forum of democracy, to support the Minister of Human Resources Development and his parliamentary secretary here on my left, on Bill C-96.

The purpose of this bill is basically to establish and give a clear mandate to a department that, as we know, is fundamentally important to Canadian society and plays an equally important role in the daily lives of our citizens, not only in Quebec but in Canada as well.

In fact, Bill C-96 ensures that the minister and his team can continue to help people in need, both in Quebec and the rest of Canada, and in all the regions, whether we are talking about the Gaspé or Abitibi-Témiscamingue. In fact, it is a tool that allows the federal government to intervene in an intelligent way to provide assistance where needed.

• (1705)

It makes me really sad to see that, even when we are discussing an issue as important as the reform of the human resources department, the official opposition cannot refrain from playing pure party politics.

During the referendum campaign just concluded, we heard all sorts of statements which completely distorted the facts and which, in my opinion, were nothing but an insult to people's intelligence.

Earlier, the member for Lévis concluded his speech by saying something which the official opposition keeps repeating all the time. Alluding to comments presumably made in this House, he said something about facing the music. It is unfortunate for Canadians that the official opposition cannot set aside its partisan attitude and stop trying to distort the facts and the statements made in this democratic place.

I am not surprised to hear members of the official opposition say that the ultimate purpose of Bill C-96 is to make sure that the federal government continues to interfere in fields of provincial jurisdiction. I am not surprised because this is yet another tactic to avoid debating the real issue, as well as an attempt to fool the public.

This is unfortunate, because today, what we are saying on the Liberal side is that the referendum was democratically held, that people voted no, but also voted for change.

In today's context, changes must involve the federal government and all the provinces working hand in hand. Essentially, we are talking about multilateral relations. It is in working together that we will be able to respond to the desire for change expressed by the people in Quebec, a desire which is felt not only in Quebec, but across Canada.

Unfortunately, with the government we have now in Quebec, and with the official opposition we have in Ottawa, it is very difficult to see how we can work towards a common goal, an ultimate goal, which, in the end, is in the best interests of the people, because they do not want the Canadian federation to work.

*Government Orders*

Indeed, it is not by withdrawing from multilateral discussions, as the Parti Québécois government did in Quebec, that advances will be made in improving Canadian federalism. It is not by withdrawing from multilateral discussions on the environment that it will be able to better defend Quebecers' interests so that Quebec can continue to be part of the federation, and continue to be an extremely strong province in a prosperous and united Canada.

It is not by refusing to sit down at a conference table with the other provincial premiers that the system will be changed. In the end, it is the people in Quebec who are suffering from this refusal to co-operate.

There is nothing complicated in this bill. It is aimed at giving tools to the federal government, at reorganizing a department, and yet, the official opposition is acting prematurely. The opposition is talking about interference. It is a bit early to start talking about interference. Before talking about interference, one must wait to see the kind of reforms the minister and his team will be able to bring about.

● (1710)

Judging on past experiences, if the past is any indication of the future, I think the minister has every reason to be proud of the changes he is proposing, and I think people in Quebec and Canada have a right to expect promising and positive changes which meet the expectations not only of Quebecers but of all Canadians.

When I speak about changes the minister should be proud of, members will recall that, at the beginning of the year, before the finance minister's budget was tabled, the official opposition said loud and clear that they wanted the Canada Assistance Plan to be eliminated and transformed into a much more flexible plan, giving more leeway to provinces.

Responding to that reality, that legitimate request, the human resources development minister, in co-operation with the finance minister, replaced the Canada Assistance Plan with the Canada social transfer.

What is the Canada social transfer? It is a tool which will allow the federal government to transfer funds to the provinces so that they can operate in the social field and do so with much more flexibility.

Let me read a few lines. It says that the social transfer is mainly designed to help the provinces provide the level of benefits and social assistance that they wanted to provide but could not because of inflexible rules. That is done.

Someone mentioned earlier that the past is an indication of what the future holds. It is clear that the Canada social transfer is far from being the monster that the official opposition has made it out to be. It is essentially a structure in which all the provinces have more leeway.

What is the Canada social transfer about? It makes it possible for instance to fund parental wage assistance programs such as the one known as APPORT in Quebec. This is an exclusively provincial program. So, with the Canada social transfer, the funding of programs like APPORT, a program developed by the Government of Quebec and appreciated by everyone, is made possible, while, under the old system, the Canada Assistance Plan, it could not be funded.

The Canada social transfer, or CST for short, also provides for the provincial sales tax to be refunded to welfare recipients, a measure which could not have been implemented under the Canada Assistance Plan. I read further that it also includes a program to provide food to disadvantaged children, which would not have been possible either under the old system because it was too inflexible.

The Canada social transfer also includes the provision of transportation services to people with disabilities, services that can be provided without having to assessment needs, contrary to the prescribed procedure for qualifying for funding under the old system.

The steps taken by the minister and his department are clearly a reflection of the federal administration's good faith and commitment to keep up with the trends towards change, as requested by the public.

As for trends toward change, as for the Canada Assistance Plan, we keep hearing: "Yes, but that mean beast, the federal machinery, is the only one setting national standards". I have said it in this House and I repeat that we are a country. I think that, whether we are from Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia or Newfoundland, we agree that we, together, as a big family, must have standards that allow for a similar quality of life throughout the country.

● (1715)

But as far as the system is concerned, we kept hearing that national standards were set unilaterally by the federal machinery. Again, in trying to respond to the needs for change, to the demands of the provinces, the Minister of Human Resources Development has ensured that national standards will now be set in co-operation with the provinces, through the Canada social transfer. So, we are not imposing any more; quite the contrary, we are responding to current federalism, evolutionary federalism. We are responding once again to the winds of change and, once again, in a spirit of good faith that demonstrates a will to work in partnership and in co-operation with the provinces.

When talking about a will to change on the part of the federal government and a will to respect the wishes of the people, we can consider the strategic initiatives put forward by the minister to implement a number of programs based on the priorities and needs of the provinces.

*Government Orders*

Can we still talk about interference by the federal machinery? I think that the action taken by the minister clearly demonstrates that we are following this trend of open federalism, of modern federalism that increasingly respects the objectives and wishes of the provinces as a whole. Furthermore, with respect to reform, we must bear in mind that the people as a whole asked that reform take place not only to decentralize but also to ensure that programs established in the 1960s can be brought into line with the new needs of Canadians in terms of social and labour market programs. That is why the minister and his officials are busy implementing programs that meet the expectations of the members of the Canadian society of the 1990s by making sure that the department can make the leap into the next millennium.

In fact, our goal is to better serve the public and provide it with tools. At this stage, on the basis of Bill C-96, whose purpose is to set out the department's mandate, I think that in the general, public interest, we must try to see our basic role, our ultimate goal and purpose, at the provincial and federal levels, as working together, hand in hand, towards change in the federal system.

The department this bill deals with is an important department because of both the role it plays in the field and of what it can achieve with the funds at its disposal.

To show how important this department is, this is the department responsible for unemployment insurance. Changes will soon be made to the UI program. Again, the minister's clear commitment to respecting all the provinces and meeting the needs of the public will show.

This is an important department, whose role in Quebec and Canada cannot be underestimated, a department which people rely on and which has an impact on everyday life, a department which, last year, spent \$13.3 billion in the province of Quebec alone.

How does this affect us? This amount of \$13.3 billion was used to help more than 164,000 Quebecers find jobs and 44,789 students find summer jobs, to pump \$1.5 billion into the Quebec post-secondary education system, to ensure that more than 80,000 Quebecers receive adequate training, while \$3 billion went to subsidizing Quebec social assistance programs, which benefited approximately 700,000 people.

• (1720)

We are talking about a department that, on the average, allowed UI benefits to be paid to some 528 unemployed people every month. That is not all. I have a long list in front of me, but unfortunately it would take too long to enumerate all the concrete actions that were taken.

The department also helped develop youth employment. So, we are talking about a department that is having a real effect,

that is undergoing changes. Given that reality, instead of always playing politics, the official opposition should rise above partisanship and, just this once, think about the people's interest, try to serve them better and, finally, work in partnership.

We know what can be achieved through partnership and, again in this case, the past gives us an indication of what the future holds. Take for example the Canada social transfer set up because people asked for it. There are also the agreements to improve job opportunities for welfare recipients, which allow us to join forces in order to help them find jobs. There is also the block funding agreement which was concluded with Quebec under the Canada Student Loans Program.

There are many examples showing that if we are ready to co-operate, as Quebecers want, and work hand in hand toward the common goal of helping all the people, so that Quebec can still have its place, we will grow together and allow federalism to grow in the best interests of the people and the provinces.

**Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the member for Outremont and I am torn between disbelief and admiration. I say disbelief because, in spite of what the situation in Canada's manpower and employment sector, the member for Outremont keeps referring to a slew of federal and Liberal policies which, in the last two years, have obviously not given any results.

He told us about the role of the federal government regarding employment development in Quebec and in Canada. He said that this is important, that great things are happening. However, when we look at the statistics on unemployment, we see a situation quite different from the picture painted by the hon. member.

I say disbelief because I cannot understand how a member, who claims to be well aware of the situation of workers and of the plight of the unemployed and the welfare recipients in Quebec and in Canada, can seriously discuss federal policies and try to convince us that everything is fine, that there are no problems, that we simply must let the Minister of Human Resources Development go on with his good work. This is why I used the word disbelief.

My disbelief is also mixed with admiration. The hon. member talked about great principles. He told us about how we must work together, grow together, co-operate, be partners, and do our share to promote Canada's development.

• (1725)

In a way, I admire the hon. member, who may well become a minister some day. Indeed, his speech was an almost flawless performance in that it reflected the Liberal philosophy heard for at least 20 or 25 years, a philosophy which expresses something that no one recognizes in Canada. We are presented with a

picture of Canada that no one recognizes. And no one recognizes it because it obviously has nothing to do with reality.

Regarding the bill's provision on manpower training, we note that, for the last four or five years, since 1991 or so, everyone in Quebec has been asking that manpower adjustment and manpower training become the responsibility of the province. I say everyone, but I should be a little more specific and provide some names, since the hon. member may not have followed the developments in the newspapers and may not have heard the views expressed.

First, there was Mr. Bourbeau, then Quebec's Liberal minister of Labour; he was followed by Mr. Johnson and Mr. Ryan. Now, it is the PQ government. All of them asked that Quebec be given full responsibility for manpower. Mr. Dufour, president of Quebec's Conseil du patronat, made the same request. And so did, just this week, Mr. Gérald Ponton, president of Quebec's Association des manufacturiers.

I ask the hon. member: How does he explain the fact that everyone in Quebec, except for the provincial caucus of the Liberal Party of Canada, is asking that manpower training be made Quebec's responsibility? Why is it that he and the minister do not see that this is what Quebecers are asking for? Why is it that his government will not comply with that request in the bill before us today?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before giving the floor to the hon. member, I must say that I failed earlier to carry out a duty with regard to the adjournment proceedings.

It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—International Criminal Court.

**Mr. Cauchon:** Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleague's remarks. First, as regards admiration, I would ask my colleague not to waste any energy in admiring me but rather to use his energy in helping the federal system change, in working to represent objectively and constructively the interests of the whole population of Quebec so that we can continue to make Canadian federalism change.

I talked earlier about remarks that are an insult to people's intelligence. We have to listen. There are people watching us today. Some members said the bill deals with manpower. The bill before the House, Bill C-96, deals—and I point this out to people watching us—essentially with structuring the department, providing the minister and his department with a mandate and the tools needed to be able to work. It is a bill of a general nature that has nothing to do with manpower per se.

As concerns manpower, and again I said it in my main speech, we ought to wait. We are now dealing with a bill of a general nature. I said in my main speech that the minister and his

### *Private Members' Business*

officials did an outstanding job in order to serve and to respond to demands for change made by the population. There are more things to come. What I ask the official opposition to do is to work in co-operation with us, to accept the referendum results and to help bring about changes.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** 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

[*Translation*]

### MINING EXPLORATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The House resumed from October 4, 1995, consideration of the motion that, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider implementing a new program of mining incentives which would encourage exploration and development in Canada.

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would find Motion M-292 put forward by my colleague from Timiskaming—French River quite acceptable if it would take into account the history of this country and particularly of the province of Quebec.

I am in favour of implementing a new financial incentives program to encourage mining exploration and development in Canada and in Quebec, but not at any price or under any condition.

I do believe that natural resources play a crucial part in the economy of any country. A country without natural resources is a country that depends on international markets. It is very hard for a country with no natural resources to properly develop a processing industry. This industry would always rely on major markets and bear the brunt of a supply and demand system.

It would also be subject to the whims of the money markets which always seek to get the most out of our natural resources. We had a striking example of that situation in 1929, during the Great Depression.

When the automotive industry was in full expansion, the rubber producing countries, especially in Southeast Asia, could not get a reasonable price for their products although demand was very strong.

World financial markets were pulling the strings and, unfortunately, were getting richer at the expense of the producers. Government had to intervene so that this industry would not go bankrupt.

We still have the same market system and the government must act at the natural resources level. To yield all possible

*Private Members' Business*

benefits, the development of natural resources must be planned coherently and consistently, and I would not say this is the case in Canada.

The competition between the federal government and Quebec and the other provinces is counterproductive and above all very costly. It generates very expensive duplication and this waste of energy and money only benefits our competitors on the world markets.

While we, in Canada, are fighting each other and while the federal government is trying to oust the provinces from a jurisdiction which is rightly theirs, our competitors get the opportunity to capture our own markets. A country which fails to invest in the development of its natural resources shows a lack of foresight which makes it very vulnerable.

Motion M-292 by my colleague tends to maintain a minimum investment in the Canadian mining industry and this is very good.

Moreover, a country whose national government violates the jurisdictions of other levels of government cannot expect an exceptional performance from its industry. In Canada, we have had huge difficulties in this area for some years.

If you are a producer and if, every time you want to go ahead, you are faced with two levels of government that disagree and with two sets of standards, you will waste valuable time and energy that would be better spent elsewhere.

As everyone knows, a country's natural resources belong to the community. If they are available for the well-being of the population, they are at the heart of our own development. In addition to creating jobs, they play an active part in our economic growth and collective wealth.

As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, sections 109 and 117 of the 1867 Constitution Act gave the provinces ownership of the lands, mines, minerals, and attendant royalties; several provinces, including Quebec, used these provisions to promote local industrial development and economic diversification.

• (1735)

I was elected in a rural riding and a relatively poor region. Our natural resources are the key to the survival and development of small communities in our regions. The involvement of the government in this crucial economic sector is essential, and this is why I congratulate my colleague for presenting this amendment.

But I firmly believe that the federal government should stick to the Constitution and let the provinces and Quebec take care of this sector. The federal government should give back to the provinces the sums it has collected and continues to collect for

natural resources, and tell them: "Administer them the best you can".

The federal government profited from the revenues yielded by the development of natural resources, and it would only be right, as is requested in Motion M-292 proposed by my colleague, that that money be used for further developing these resources. The interference of the federal government in natural resources is serious. For example, the federal government has heavily taxed petroleum, which is outright interference in interprovincial and international trade.

It unilaterally fixed the sale price of oil and gas, wading into the market beyond provincial boundaries, thus forcing certain producing provinces to reduce their royalties and, in certain cases, even causing them to lose certain foreign markets.

Moreover, one must not forget that the federal government has jurisdiction over interprovincial pipelines, interprovincial hydro lines and other methods of transportation between two or more provinces. Finally, in case of conflict leading to political stiffness like we experienced under the Trudeau government, the federal government could in a twisted manner use the declaratory power included in section 91(10)c) of the Constitution Act of 1867 to unilaterally declare, as we have often seen the Liberals do, that projects like power dams, mines and oil wells fall under exclusive federal jurisdiction. Furthermore, it could use the incidental power to regulate working conditions and product quality in those projects, thus encroaching once more on provincial jurisdiction.

The present government already did that through its environmental legislation which declared its authority on such projects. Many people, particularly now, ask themselves why Canadian federalism does not work. Yet, the answer is obvious. There is in Canada a level of government that does not respect the jurisdiction of other levels of government. There is a government which wants to grab all power for itself.

There is a government which does not have for objective the well-being of Canadians, but the appropriation of all power. I conclude by saying that the Bloc Québécois will support the motion, but not without certain reservations.

[English]

**Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak today in support of Motion No. 292, especially after the fairy tales I have been hearing from the member of the Bloc.

During my seven years as a member I have had an opportunity to meet various sectors of the mining industry, people involved in the mining industry on a daily basis. The main message they have been giving governments over these years is that governments must make a solid commitment not only to keeping the mining industry in Canada but also to making it prosper.



The motion before us today proposes the government consider implementing a new program of mining incentives which would encourage exploration and development in Canada. Although most people equate these incentives with taxes and grants, this is not necessarily the case.

• (1740)

I commend the hon. member for Timiskaming—French River for putting this motion forward. He has been very supportive of the mining industry. As he previously stated in the House, all the mining industry wants is a level playing field and a tax system competitive with the rest of the world and competitive internationally. In order to do this it is essential to streamline government procedures and to provide the mining industry with a single window approach to approvals.

The parliamentary secretary will be speaking after I finish. I am sure he will bring us up to date on how the minister is moving in these areas.

Why is this motion so important to Canadians? It is important because we are being asked to consider new initiatives, initiatives which previous governments did not feel were necessary.

When driving through Hagersville or Caledonia in my riding the first things we see as we approach these communities are the shafts of the gypsum mines. They support the gypsum plants which produce gypsum board which is shipped throughout North America. These communities rely on the mines, as do small communities in remote and rural areas all across the country. For visitors these mines show the importance of mining to the economic and social well-being of the country.

There has been a progressive decline in investment, employment and mining exploration in Canada over the last ten years. Between 1990 and 1993, 20,000 jobs were lost in the Canadian mining industry. Taking into consideration that mining provides 400,000 direct and indirect jobs in Canada, that number is quite substantial.

There are approximately 150 communities across Canada which depend on mining for their livelihood. When we factor in the number of businesses and the family members who buy goods from the stores and businesses, we are talking close to one million Canadians depending on this industry, a big industry in Canada.

We are also talking about an industry which pays some of the highest industrial wages in Canada: \$847 per week. Most of these wages are earned in rural and isolated communities across the country. They provide the infrastructure in many places which keeps rural Canada together.

Between 1986 and 1991 Canada failed to attract a single new mining project with capital of more than \$250 million. By

### *Private Members' Business*

comparison, Latin America acquired five such contracts. Likewise, from 1991 to 1992 more than 150 companies worldwide reduced expenditures in Canadian mining projects by 30 per cent, from \$430 million to \$302 million.

We need to look at why these investors are no longer selecting Canada and we must move to provide solutions to the problem. Why are they going to South America? Why are they going to Southeast Asia? The common feeling is it must be because of the environmental differences. I do not think that is the case. That may be a small component of it but more and more it is a direct result of government red tape.

We have three and in some areas four different levels of government. These companies have to go through an enormous amount of red tape to get anything done. It should be a primary role of anybody looking at solutions to the problem to deal with the whole question of red tape.

In 1994 the total contribution to the Canadian economy from mining equalled \$19.1 billion. We must also remember this is a cyclical industry; it has ups and downs. In 1992 and 1993 alone 44 Canadian mines closed while 22 opened. We can see the trend is not in the right direction.

• (1745)

The requests that have been put forward by Keep Mining in Canada are not only logical but they are very plausible and workable. The Keep Mining in Canada campaign, supported by the industry, has laid out 10 reasonable points that it feels, if achieved, would help its industry.

The Standing Committee on Natural Resources when chaired by the member for Kenora—Rainy River conducted extensive hearings with all the stakeholders which resulted in the setting out of nine key recommendations committee members felt that if followed through on would help the industry.

They talked about streamlining the federal-provincial environmental regulations, which only makes sense and I know the Minister of the Environment is working in that area now; implementing an appropriate incentive to stimulate grassroots mineral exploration, and I know some hon. members do that sometimes as well; changing the tax laws on mine reclamation funding; establishing processes for land use planning that respect mineral tenure and ensure both the protection of Canada's heritage and access to the mineral resource development. We have to be able to balance those two. I know the parliamentary secretary will be happy to tell us following my speech how the minister is working in that area.

Overlapping jurisdictions also have a negative impact on investors. Much time and money is spent by companies filling out separate forms for either municipal, provincial or federal levels of government. They always seem to have different guidelines. These companies have to jump through a number of

*Private Members' Business*

hoops. Surely our governments can work together and come up with a single window and a single set of regulations which these companies can follow.

Canada also must implement an appropriate incentive to stimulate grassroots mineral exploration. By improving the tax laws and reclamation funding we would be promoting good environmental management. I know the member for Davenport wants to talk about that a little later.

The taxation of money put into trust by a company to meet future demands for mine reclamation should definitely be one of the items the government should look at. I am sure the member for Davenport will have something to say about that.

The last item I want to consider today in my last few minutes is the topic of establishing a process for land use planning that respect mineral tenure to ensure both the protection of Canada's natural heritage and access to mineral resource development. Mining is part of our heritage and we must ensure that it is accessible and that its terms can be met.

A commitment to supporting the mining industry does not translate into excess money being spent. Many incentives can be implemented that are not costly but which would encourage exploration and development. I talked about a few of these incentives in my speech. I urge anyone who seriously considers what is being voted on today to take a look at this. This is a votable item. It is a serious item. It is serious in the sense that it helps our program to develop and create jobs in this country.

We are voting today on the very survival of the mining industry and the demise of the communities that mining supports. Mining has always been a very important part of our heritage and I hope we will keep it.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the motion we are debating today says that the government should consider implementing a new program of mining incentives which would encourage exploration and development in Canada.

Mining is one of the most important industries in Canada. It deserves the government's attention. It pays the highest average wage of any industry in the country which is over \$200 a week higher than its next highest wage category of transportation and communication. Mining products total 15 per cent of our exports. It is a very important industry.

Investment in the exploration of new mines is less than half of what it once was in the early 1990s. In real dollars investment in the early 1990s was around \$800 million annually. This year it is expected to be \$300 million or maybe less. Exploration and development have fallen drastically because Canada has failed to provide a favourable investment climate.

• (1750)

Canada used to be a world leader in mining activity, but that leadership is in jeopardy. Other nations now offer a more favourable environment for mining companies. Canada has fallen from first to fourth place in attracting new investment. We have not opened a major new mine in the last five years. We need to address the problem quickly, not by the year 2000, not within the term of the government's mandate. We need to start now to turn the situation around.

The motion before us speaks about incentives for the mining industry to stimulate exploration and development. What kind of incentives are being talked about? Is it some huge program of cash rebates? Are costly tax breaks needed so that the industry can flourish once again?

I intend to support this motion but I want to make sure to let members know what we mean by incentives. For the Liberal or the socialist, an incentive is some kind of government assistance. It is a handout. It is a grant, a transfer or a tax shelter that is big enough to overcome the disincentives that are found in the industry. If there is over-regulation, for example, the government handout will be enough to induce companies to overlook inefficiencies in the system.

These types of government programs are like giving an oxygen mask to someone who is choking instead of just loosening the rope that is hanging around the neck.

For the free enterpriser, the entrepreneur who is a self-starter, an incentive is not a grant from the government where it picks some winners and losers in the industry. An incentive is merely an opportunity.

If I know miners at all, they are free enterprisers. They are risk takers. They are self-starters. They do not want special help. They want a level playing field and an opportunity to show their skills, develop the resources for the good of the country and for their companies.

We were talking with someone from a major mining association who represents mining companies yesterday. He told us that the industry is not looking for handouts. That is not what it needs. The industry is looking for the government to get out of its way so that it can get on with doing what it does best.

I am supporting this motion today because that is what I mean by incentives. I mean deregulation, not in a way that harms the environment, but in a way that makes government approval processes more efficient.

Government departments and different levels of government should communicate with one another to harmonize contradictory or overlapping legislation. Right now this is Canada's problem. The government strangles the industry with red tape,

then someone wants to come along and give the industry an oxygen mask of government incentives. We say, take off the red tape and the industry will be healthy again on its own.

Today we had a representative from the Mining Association of Canada appear before the standing committee. He said: "The current regulatory system is choked with red tape. Regulations, guidelines and decision making processes duplicate and contradict each other from one department to another and between the two levels of government". We have to solve this problem.

The industry also needs security of land tenure and security in Canada's legal regime. Mining companies have to know that when they start a project they are going to have an opportunity to finish it.

Security is also necessary in the new environmental assessment process. The government has made wonderful noises about this problem. I am sure the hon. parliamentary secretary is going to try to sum this up.

The Minister of Natural Resources has said many of the right words to the industry and made many good promises. The red book, the Liberal mining platform and the White House mining initiative are all full of great words.

The industry minister promised action on streamlining regulations this year, 1995. However, to quote Greg Waller, an executive with Cominco, obviously exasperated with the government's lack of action to date, says: "The mining industry is getting impatient with the empty words".

An example happened this last week. I received copies of two separate letters from the provinces addressed to the Minister of Natural Resources, one in September and one in October, requesting, almost pleading for a meeting between the minister, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and their provincial counterparts. They did not even get the courtesy of a reply from the Minister of Natural Resources until a provincial minister talked to me late last week.

• (1755)

I raised the issue in the House last week. I find out now the minister had a conference call with the intergovernmental affairs minister and the provincial minister. That is a start. It is a shame it takes two and half or three months to arrange a simple teleconference call among three parties who say they are interested in getting to the bottom of this regulatory problem.

There was a good presentation on regulatory reform in committee today. There were some specific recommendations and reforms that would help the industry. Many of those ideas were adopted by an all-party committee in last year's report "Lifting Canadian Mining Off the Rocks". These all-party resolutions were brought to the government. They were recom-

mendations from all sides. Not a single one of those recommendations has been adopted to date.

Again, they are good words, nice words, but we do not need more words. We do not need more committees. We do not need more studies. We do not need more talk. We do not need more task forces. We do not need government inquiries. We do not need empty promises. We know the problems. We know what to do to fix them. What is needed right now is not knowledge, more ideas. We need the political will to get the job done.

Here is part of the conclusion from today's presentation by the mining association: "Real progress requires the removal of costly regulatory systems that are process based rather than performance or results oriented. This implies a willingness by the federal government to let go of outdated and expensive centralist systems. It is a willingness which has not been expressed in concrete action to date".

We need to get away from an expanded role for the federal government in the mining industry. The federal government must get off the industry's back and out of its pockets and allow the industry to rise to the prominence it should have. That should be left primarily with the provinces and the federal government should remember that.

We are dealing with two philosophies of government. Is the role of the federal government an ever increasing one or should it take heed from what the industry, the provinces and many Canadians are saying? They are saying the role of the federal government is not to continually expand into areas of provincial jurisdiction; the role is to see where there is overlap and then to withdraw and allow the provinces to get the job done.

The Minister of Natural Resources has been politely applauded for saying the right words to the natural resources community. She talks the talk, but can she walk the walk? Her political honeymoon with the industry will soon be over unless she produces results to act on the good intentions she has expressed.

The problems with regulatory reform are the first test of this minister's real political will. Will she be able to overcome her colleagues around the cabinet table who are calling for natural resource industries to sit on their hands watching as sustainable development slowly devolves into sustainable preservation? I hope she has that will. I hope she will be able to stand up to her colleagues, stand up for a more rational approach to environmental assessment, stand up for Canadian jobs and expertise and development.

I call on the minister to back up her words with some action starting today. Provide the only real incentive the Canadian mining industry wants and needs which is substantial, positive regulatory reform. She knows what has to happen. Let us see it happen. Let it happen now.

*Private Members' Business*

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the member for Timiskaming—French River for his forceful introduction of this motion and for his keen interest in the importance of the mining industry.

The motion before us urges the government to adopt the recommendations of the report of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources entitled “Lifting Canadian Mining Off The Rocks” and urges the adoption of a new program of incentives.

It seems to me that at a time of budget austerity and restraint it would be wiser not to seek new tax incentives and subsidies. It is true that the mining industry is an important part of the Canadian economy. It is true that the past recession has proven difficult for the mining industry, but the resource sector has returned to profitability. For example, Barrick Gold Corporation of Toronto posted record profits of \$250 million in 1994, up 17 per cent from 1993.

In addition, as the member for Timiskaming—French River pointed out at the beginning of this debate, there was a substantial increase in exploration activities throughout Canada in 1994, 9.1 per cent or \$3.3 billion above 1993 according to the Minister of Natural Resources and the press release which she issued on February 9, 1995.

• (1800)

On page two of the report I mentioned earlier we find the following statement: “An application to build a mine in Canada, for example, can take up to four years to make its way through environmental assessments, in contrast to a mere six months in Chile”. Are we to conclude that Chile has a more advanced environmental assessment process than Canada, or that Chile is providing greater environmental protection than Canada?

Environmental assessment regulations and legislation and the cumulative impact assessment are essential parts of sustainable development. They are here to stay. They are safeguards on human and environmental health.

The report goes on into great detail on issues of tax reform. It is silent on the cost of tax incentives not only in terms of forgone revenue but in terms of potential damage to water, soil, and air. This, I submit, requires attention.

The concluding paragraph of the report on page 11 is also important because it reveals a big gap between the position of the mining industry and that of the government. The paragraph states: “Governments must strike a much more realistic balance between environmental considerations and the economic viability of the industry”.

This idea of balancing environmental and economic considerations runs counter to the Brundtland definition of sustainable development and the position of the government in the red book and also paragraph 6(a) of the Department of Natural Resources

Act, which calls for the sustainable development of Canada’s natural resources.

Balancing environment and economy is not sustainable development because it separates the two, running the risk of making policy decisions that give precedence to the economy over the environment. The mining association must realize that the Department of Natural Resources has a mandate to integrate the environment and the economy, as defined in the red book.

Regarding federal and provincial overlap and duplication, it is important to act on what is known. In the late 1980s the federal government delegated authority for the monitoring and enforcement of mining regulations to the provinces. In his 1990 report the then auditor general Kenneth Dye stated: “In the one area where the federal government has already delegated monitoring and enforcement authority to the provinces, there has been a serious deterioration in compliance. A review of the metal mining liquid effluent regulations issued under the Fisheries Act indicates that compliance fell from 85 per cent in 1982 to 48 per cent in 1988”. This conclusion seems to be important and should be kept in mind when we hear calls for voluntary programs to reduce emissions.

Voluntary programs such as the accelerated reduction and elimination of toxics, ARET program, are not substitutes for regulations. This conclusion is substantiated by a 1994 Kellogg Peat Marwick management survey, which found that 95 per cent of respondents from Canadian organizations cited compliance to regulations as the principal motivator on environmental issues, while only 16 per cent cited voluntary government programs as a principal motivator.

The suggestion that greater investment incentives to the mining industry should be offered at a time when governments are desperate for revenues is not synchronized with a government agenda attempting to reduce deficit and debt. Instead, it would be preferable to ensure sustainable development in a variety of ways, including an efficient management of minerals, for example, by ensuring that recycled materials and virgin materials are treated equally under the tax system.

It is important to note that a 1994 study entitled “A Comparison of Tax Incentives for Extraction and Recycling of Basic Materials in Canada” concludes that there is a potential bias in the tax system toward the use of virgin materials relative to recycled materials. This bias ought to be addressed and corrected.

In addition, to ensure sustainable development we could consider programs aimed at new technologies for mineral extraction and environmentally sensitive exploration methods and equipment. We could ensure that regulations aim at environmentally responsible exploration methods and that the regulations are enforced. We could ensure that exploration, mining operations, and reclamation projects are conducted in an

environmentally sound manner and do not compromise vital land uses such as ecologically sensitive areas and parks.

• (1805)

Mining and sustainable development can be integrated for the long term benefit of Canadians and the economy.

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the House today on Motion 292, which would require the government to consider a new program of incentives to encourage exploration and development in Canada. In part the question is the definition of incentives and what that actually means.

[*Translation*]

I would like to thank my colleague, the hon. member for Timaskaming—French River, for having brought these important matters to the attention of the House.

[*English*]

Mining makes an enormous contribution to the Canadian economy and way of life, representing a vital source of employment in more than 115 communities throughout the country. It provides direct jobs for more than 300,000 Canadians and contributes more than \$20 billion to the economy every year.

Moreover, mining activities have a significant indirect effect on the Canadian economy, from the small local supplier to the specialized financial institution in Toronto, Montreal, or Vancouver. For every job created in the mining industry an additional job is indirectly created in other sectors of the Canadian economy.

The Canadian mining industry is known throughout the world for its leadership in developing and applying state of the art exploration and mining techniques and technologies. We are very proud of the expertise that was developed here in Canada to take full advantage of our rich mineral endowment.

The government appreciates the key role of mining to our economic well-being. However, we are also aware of the challenges the industry has been facing, especially from increased global competition and mineral investment. We must meet these challenges by working with all the mining stakeholders to sustain the vitality of the industry and provide conditions that will foster its growth.

In our opinion, the best way to support and encourage the mining sector is to reduce the level of long term structural impediments to mineral investment. Many of these impediments were identified by the Whitehorse mining initiative, which saw the federal government, along with the representatives of industry, provincial governments, environmental

### *Private Members' Business*

groups, labour unions, and aboriginal organizations, come to the table to work together. A consensus was reached and the WMI leadership council accord was signed in September 1994, which outlines agreed upon principles and goals to guide the development of mining in this country.

To help develop an action plan to address the WMI issues that fall within the jurisdiction of the federal government, the Minister of Natural Resources established a private sector ministerial advisory committee. One of its first tasks is to provide commentary and advice on the sustainable development of mineral, mines, and metals issues paper the minister released in September in Vancouver. This release fulfils a promise the minister made. After discussion on the paper, the minister will work with the stakeholders to develop a mineral and metal policy for consideration by cabinet.

To address the most fundamental industry concerns we introduced a measure in the 1994 budget allowing a deduction for mine reclamation trust fund contributions. Our commitment to mineral development was also reaffirmed when the mining sector was identified as one of the six key sectors where the government wants to see significant improvement to the regulatory regime. Furthermore, our natural resources standing committee is currently examining this very issue.

Some specific areas where we are working to make tangible long term improvements include administration of the Fisheries Act, land use and related decision making, the definition of waste, regulatory regimes north of 60, regulatory impact analysis, and toxic management policy and practices. Important improvements on issues of overlap and duplication could also be achieved through various initiatives to harmonize federal and provincial regulatory regimes.

On October 19 Natural Resources Canada and the Mining Association of Canada co-sponsored a seminar on regulatory streamlining in order to help identify concrete ways of accelerating progress on these issues. In support of the same objectives for jobs and new investments, NR Canada has been marketing Canada's mineral opportunities in Canada and abroad in an effort to attract much needed capital investment for our mineral industry.

• (1810)

The Minister of Natural Resources is a strong champion of the Canadian mining industry. Earlier this year she participated in the international "Investing in the Americas" conference where she vigorously promoted Canada as an attractive country for mineral investment.

[*Translation*]

These efforts are very important, because investments are essential to ensure the industry's future.

*Adjournment Debate**[English]*

We know that Canada's geography and geology are attractive. Exploration levels have recently started to recover, thus reflecting increased confidence in Canada as a mining country.

The 1995 budget must be counted among our efforts to help solve the problems of the mining industry. By forcefully proceeding to put our economic house in order, we are sending a clear signal that we want to regain control of our country's finances. The measures implemented in the last budget will result in more favourable investment conditions in Canada, which will certainly benefit the mining industry.

The government remains committed to a prosperous mining sector in Canada and promotes actions that are consistent with our budgetary objectives and the efficiency of the federation. Mining, more than most industries, is global. The influence that Natural Resources Canada exercises in national and international fora makes a significant difference to the sustainable development and competitiveness of the industry. Our science and technology and our policy investments are cost effective and bring benefits to Canada in all regions.

The initiatives I have discussed are fundamental critical steps that will result in greater levels of certainty for the mining investor. This government understands that reality. We will continue to work in partnership with provinces and territories to ensure that our geological potential is fully realized and Canadians have an opportunity to benefit from a strong mining industry.

The government appreciates the important contribution the mining industry makes to our country's job creation and economic growth. We understand the challenges that face the industry today. This government is following a policy agenda to put in place an attractive investment climate that encourages and supports a prosperous mining industry committed to sustainable development.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The hon. member for Timiskaming—French River, under whose name Motion 292 stands, has asked the Chair if he could close the debate on this motion under his name, with the understanding that he would only take two minutes and at 6.15 p.m. the Chair will put the question. Is there agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Benoît Serré (Timiskaming—French River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. First of all, I would like to thank all of my colleagues in the Bloc and the Reform Party, and all my colleagues in the government, who have spoken so eloquently on this motion and particularly on the importance of the mining industry in Canada.

I think that we all, as parliamentarians and as federal politicians, acknowledge the importance of this industry to Canada. It is wonderful to see all parties supporting this motion and I thank you for doing so.

*[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** It being 6.15 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 93, the time provided for debate has expired.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I think you would find unanimous consent to call it 6.30 p.m. and proceed with the adjournment debate.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Does the House agree that we proceed with the adjournment debate?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

*[English]*

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on September 29, 1995, I asked the Minister of Justice whether he and the Canadian government supported the proposal for an international criminal court and, if so, what they were doing to advance this proposal. While the minister gave me a very positive response on that date, I want to pursue this further in order to put more details on the record of the House with respect to the proposed international criminal court.

Right away I should clarify the difference between the International Court of Justice, that is, the world court presently sitting in The Hague, and the proposed international criminal court.

The existing International Court of Justice, the world court, deals with disputes between the states; in other words, a dispute between the United States and Nicaragua or a dispute between Canada and Spain. If a country breaks its obligations under an international treaty a group of countries or another country may sue the accused country, the state, in the International Court of Justice. However, the International Court of Justice does not deal with international offences committed by individuals which are in violation of the same human rights treaties passed by the United Nations.

*Adjournment Debate*

For example, although it has been 50 years since the Nuremberg trials following the second world war, nothing has been done to set up courts which can do what the Nuremberg trials did. The Nuremberg trials tried individuals who had committed war crimes during the second world war and held them responsible for their acts before the international community.

While there was a lot of talk following those trials that we should set up a permanent international criminal court, nothing was done until 1953. In 1953 a draft statute was prepared to establish such an international criminal court but it fell victim to the disputes of the cold war and never went anywhere.

However, times have changed and there has been a new initiative in recent years to once again establish an international criminal court which would hold individuals responsible when they commit crimes against humanity, crimes of genocide, crimes of international terrorism and crimes of international drug trafficking. Although such individuals might be charged before their own domestic court or before the court of the country in which the victims were found, there is more credibility if there is a standing international criminal court in which such individuals can be tried.

We can recall a few years ago when certain Libyans were accused of putting a bomb in a plane which blew up over Scotland, killing many people. There was an attempt to bring the Libyans to trial in Scotland but there was a credibility question because many individuals doubted whether the Libyans would get a fair trial in a Scottish court when the passengers were killed in Scotland. It is much better that we have an international criminal court for those kinds of offences in which the judges are from many countries, not necessarily from the country of the victims, and therefore there is a semblance of credibility and fairness.

This matter has advanced quite far. In 1994 the United Nations set up a special ad hoc committee on the establishment of an international criminal court. The ad hoc committee has met twice since last December and the whole matter seems to be well on its way.

My purpose tonight is to ask the parliamentary secretary, since the very positive response of the minister in September, whether the ad hoc committee has completed its work and has reported to the sixth committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

When does he expect we will see agreement to a statute setting up such an international criminal court? It will be a great step forward when this is done. I congratulate the Canadian government on the work it has done so far. I hope this whole project will soon see the light of day.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice after question period today asked me if I would respond to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce on his initiative and his perseverance to establish a permanent international court.

Events such as those in Rwanda and in the former Yugoslavia have amply demonstrated the need for a permanent international court to try individuals responsible for those most atrocious crimes of all: genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The end of the cold war and a new found political will permit the international community to consider the establishment of such a court as a worthwhile and serious idea.

The permanent international criminal court would serve two crucial purposes. First, an important deterrent to criminal acts is the knowledge that perpetrators will be persecuted either by national authorities or by an international court.

Second, the establishment of such a court responds to desire for justice on the part of victims of these offences, thus permitting the international community to contribute meaningfully to the maintenance of peace and security by discouraging reprisals or other acts of vengeance.

Canada is at the forefront of efforts to create this court. The Department of Justice together with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Department of National Defence have been participating this year in two meetings of an ad hoc committee created by the General Assembly of the United Nations to review the major substantive and administrative issues arising out of the draft statute for the court.

In accordance with the recommendations the ad hoc committee will be presenting this fall to the general assembly, Canada is now pushing for the convening of an international conference to negotiate the creation of the court.

We are very proud of the contribution Canada is making toward the establishment of the court as well as our current work on cases to be tried by the ad hoc courts for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. I hope this satisfies the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce who, I say again, has shown leadership on this issue.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to Standing Order 38, the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24.

(The House adjourned at 6.23 p.m.).

# CONTENTS

Thursday, November 9, 1995

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	16399
<b>Interparliamentary Delegations</b>	
Mr. Wells .....	16399
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Justice and Legal Affairs</b>	
Ms. Phinney .....	16399
<b>Public Accounts</b>	
Mr. Bélisle .....	16399
<b>Contractors Protection Act</b>	
Bill C-356. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	16399
Mr. Marchand .....	16399
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Ms. Phinney .....	16399
<b>Justice</b>	
Ms. Phinney .....	16400
<b>Employment Centres</b>	
Mr. Nunez .....	16400
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Ringma .....	16400
<b>Assisted Suicide</b>	
Mr. Chatters .....	16400
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	16400

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Manganese Based Fuel Additives Act</b>	
Bill C-94. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading .....	16400
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	16400
Motion .....	16402
Ms. Phinney .....	16402
Mr. Chatters .....	16403
Ms. Phinney .....	16404
Mr. Caccia .....	16405
Mrs. Ur .....	16405
Mr. Chatters .....	16407
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	16407
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	16407
Mrs. Ur .....	16407
Division on amendment deferred .....	16408
<b>Department of Human Resources Development Act</b>	
Bill C-96. Motion for second reading .....	16408
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	16408
Mrs. Lalonde .....	16414
Motion .....	16418
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	16418
Mr. Duhamel .....	16424
Mr. Dubé .....	16426
Mr. Dubé .....	16427
Mr. Richardson .....	16427

Mr. Dubé .....	16427
----------------	-------

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Florence Christie</b>	
Mr. McWhinney .....	16430
<b>Householders</b>	
Ms. Meredith .....	16430
<b>Canada Post</b>	
Mrs. Wayne .....	16430
<b>Very Reverend Laszlo Tokes</b>	
Mr. English .....	16430
<b>Status of Women</b>	
Mrs. Sheridan .....	16431
<b>Drayton Festival</b>	
Mr. Richardson .....	16431
<b>Federal Transfer Payments</b>	
Mr. Solomon .....	16431
<b>Prisoners Week</b>	
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	16431
<b>United Nations Charter</b>	
Mr. Bergeron .....	16432
<b>Remembrance Day</b>	
Mr. Murray .....	16432
<b>Astronaut Chris Hadfield</b>	
Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton) .....	16432
<b>The Economist</b>	
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead) .....	16432
<b>Televoting</b>	
Mr. Ringma .....	16432
<b>Veterans Week</b>	
Mr. Speller .....	16433
<b>Veterans Week</b>	
Mr. Harvard .....	16433
<b>Poverty</b>	
Mr. Dumas .....	16433

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>Special Committee on Canadian Unity</b>	
Mr. Gauthier .....	16433
Mr. Massé .....	16433
Mr. Gauthier .....	16434
Mr. Massé .....	16434
Mr. Gauthier .....	16434
Mr. Massé .....	16434
Mrs. Venne .....	16434
Mr. Massé .....	16434
Mrs. Venne .....	16434
Mr. Massé .....	16435
<b>Canadian Unity</b>	
Mr. Manning .....	16435



Mr. Massé .....	16435
<b>Suspension of Sitting</b>	
(The sitting of the House was suspended at 2.27 p.m.) .....	16435
<b>Sitting Resumed</b>	
The House resumed at 2.45 p.m. ....	16435
<b>Canadian Unity</b>	
Mr. Manning .....	16435
Mr. Massé .....	16435
Mr. Manning .....	16435
Mr. Massé .....	16436
Mr. Manning .....	16436
Mr. Massé .....	16436
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	16436
Mr. Massé .....	16436
Mr. Duceppe .....	16436
Mr. Massé .....	16436
<b>Rwanda</b>	
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	16437
Mr. Collenette .....	16437
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	16437
Mr. Collenette .....	16437
<b>Purchase of Helicopters</b>	
Mr. Leroux (Shefford) .....	16437
Mr. Collenette .....	16437
Mr. Leroux (Shefford) .....	16437
Mr. Collenette .....	16437
<b>National Defence</b>	
Mr. Hart .....	16437
Mr. Collenette .....	16438
Mr. Hart .....	16438
Mr. Collenette .....	16438
<b>Purchase of Helicopters</b>	
Mrs. Debien .....	16438
Mr. Dingwall .....	16438
Mrs. Debien .....	16438
Mr. Dingwall .....	16439
<b>Disaster Assistance</b>	
Mr. McKinnon .....	16439
Mr. Collenette .....	16439
<b>Health Care</b>	
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	16439
Ms. Marleau .....	16439
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	16439
Ms. Marleau .....	16439
<b>Helicopter Purchase</b>	
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	16439
Mr. Dingwall .....	16440
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	16440
Mr. Dingwall .....	16440
<b>Sydney Tar Ponds</b>	
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	16440
Mr. Gray .....	16440
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	16440
Mr. Gray .....	16440

<b>Medicare</b>	
Ms. Bethel .....	16441
Ms. Marleau .....	16441
<b>Purchase of Helicopters</b>	
Mrs. Picard .....	16441
Mr. Collenette .....	16441
<b>Social Programs</b>	
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) .....	16441
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	16441
<b>Education</b>	
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) .....	16442
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	16442
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	16442
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Gauthier .....	16442
Mr. Gray .....	16442
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge) .....	16443
<b>Remembrance Day</b>	
Mr. MacAulay .....	16443
Mr. Leroux (Shefford) .....	16443
Mr. Manning .....	16444
Mr. de Jong .....	16444
Mrs. Wayne .....	16445

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Department of Human Resources Development Act</b>	
Bill C-96. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading .....	16446
Mr. Dubé .....	16446
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	16446
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	16447
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	16448
Mr. Crête .....	16451
Mr. Abbott .....	16452
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West) .....	16452
Mr. Abbott .....	16454
Mr. Boudria .....	16455
Mr. Cauchon .....	16456
Mr. Caron .....	16458

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Mining Exploration and Development</b>	
Consideration resumed of motion .....	16459
Mr. Canuel .....	16459
Mr. Speller .....	16460
Mr. Strahl .....	16462
Mr. Caccia .....	16464
Mr. Rideout .....	16465
Mr. Serré .....	16466
(Motion agreed to) .....	16466
Mr. Boudria .....	16466

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

<b>International Criminal Court</b>	
Mr. Allmand .....	16466
Mr. Flis .....	16467

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste – lettre**

**8801320  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canada Communication Group — Publishing  
45 Sacré–Coeur Boulevard,  
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non – livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*  
Groupe Communication Canada — Édition  
45 boulevard Sacré–Coeur,  
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons by the Queen's Printer for Canada.**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes par l'Imprimeur de la Reine pour le Canada.**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**