



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 086

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, June 15, 1994

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 15, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

—————
Prayers
—————

The Bloc Québécois also intends to keep a close watch on the government to ensure that it stops giving preferential treatment to this country's millionaires who can shelter their money from taxes using the loophole known as family trusts.

* * *

[*English*]

JUSTICE

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, in August 1992, 73-year old William Dove was lured from his cabin near Whitewood, Saskatchewan and brutally beaten to death by two men and a teenager. Unbelievably, Hubert Acoose, one of the two men convicted of manslaughter, was granted a day parole last week. This is less than two years in jail for killing a person. This is the kind of decision that many Canadians find incomprehensible.

What guarantees can the Solicitor General give Canadians that Mr. Acoose is not a threat to public safety? Are the Solicitor General and the members of the Parole Board who released Mr. Acoose willing to accept personal responsibility and liability for any crimes Mr. Acoose may commit while on day parole?

Are parole members willing to be personally responsible for their bad decisions? The government is running a huge social experiment and Canadian people are assuming all the risks. Canadians are demanding that the government make public safety its number one priority, and the government's response is to let killers out on our streets.

* * *

ATLANTIC CANADA

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, agriculture is extremely important to the economy of Atlantic Canada. In recognition of this fact the co-operative subagreements between the federal government and the Atlantic provinces have been extended for 1994–95.

However, to date only provincial contributions have been made to these agreements.

The funding of these subagreements is used for valuable projects such as land development in my home province of New Brunswick and in my Carleton—Charlotte constituency. They are extremely important in building the self-sustaining economy, a goal which we are all working toward.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

UKRAINIAN CATHOLIC WOMEN'S LEAGUE OF CANADA

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, the member for Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold joins me in extending warmest congratulations to the Ukrainian Catholic Women's League of Canada which celebrates its 50th anniversary this year.

The UCWLC has a membership of over 6,300 and takes a strong interest in today's social issues such as the family and child violence, to name only two. It has made a major contribution to many communities across Canada and today we wish to recognize its contribution to the well-being of our communities.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ASSOCIATION QUÉBÉCOISE DES PRÉRETRAITÉS ET DES RETRAITÉS

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to announce that the Association québécoise des pré-retraités et des retraités is marking its 15th anniversary. Membership in this association is growing every year as more people join the attack on the federal government's unacceptable scheme to impose a graduated tax on individuals earning more than \$25,000 a year.

Senior citizens can rest assured that the Bloc Québécois will defend their dearly won rights and will oppose any measure designed to cut the deficit at their expense, given that so much administrative duplication between the federal and provincial governments could be eliminated.

S. O. 31

I encourage the minister and the departments responsible to provide the federal funding required for these agreements as soon as possible so that we might continue to build our agricultural economy and the self-sufficiency of Atlantic Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCIAL MARKETS

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, some individuals delight in insinuating that the political situation in Canada and Quebec is the cause of the instability affecting the Canadian bond market.

It is important to set the record straight and to say that nothing could be further from the truth. Japanese investors sold off large numbers of Canadian bonds which they owned in March, after the budget was tabled and well before the Leader of the Official Opposition made his trips abroad. The bond divestment was prompted by the negative reaction of financial markets to the Liberal government's budget.

Mr. Masakazu Mizutani, Vice President and Treasurer of the Bank of Tokyo in Toronto, confirms that investors have eased up considerably on their sales of Canadian bonds and that today, "they do not have many left to sell".

In short, the hike in interest rates and the massive divestment of Canadian bonds in March are the result of ill-conceived budgetary and monetary policies on the part of the Liberal government.

* * *

[*English*]

REFERENDUM '94

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the member for North Vancouver to remind the House that voting in North America's first electronic referendum started this morning.

Voting on the Young Offenders Act will continue 24 hours a day until Monday, June 20. This should give all members ample time to vote in the referendum using the secret PIN numbers they received earlier. The Hill phone system will not allow calls to 1-900 numbers, therefore members wishing to vote must do so from off the Hill and are therefore subject to the same user-pay principle as all other Canadians taking part in this historic event.

(1405)

North Vancouver voters were also issued PIN numbers to ensure one person, one vote, but anyone in Canada can register their opinion on the Young Offenders Act by calling 1-900-451-5033 from their touch-tone phone.

I am confident all Canadians will look forward to assessing the results of Referendum '94.

* * *

ST. GEORGES ANGLICAN CHURCH

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, St. Georges Anglican Church opened its door to Haligonians in 1800. The church was built by Edward, Duke of Kent, father of Queen Victoria, then the commander of the Halifax garrison. It was architecturally a perfect circle and for almost two centuries a unique landmark in our city.

In 1917 the church was seriously damaged in the Halifax explosion. It survived and in 1983 the Prince and Princess of Wales attended the rededication ceremony which stood in testimony to the devotion of those who undertook the task of restoring it.

In 1990 it was designated a national historic site.

Unfortunately two weeks ago this magnificent building was nearly ruined as a fire gutted its walls and destroyed a third of its structure. It is estimated that the total restoration cost will far exceed the \$1 million in insurance.

To date congregation members have begun a nation-wide fundraising campaign to restore this historic landmark to its original beauty.

All Haligonians, all Nova Scotians and indeed all Canadians want to stand with them and hope that they will restore this great site.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Gar Knutson (Elgin—Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place today to briefly comment on the current debate over what shape the country's gun control legislation should take in the future.

Gun enthusiasts in my riding have told me that three initiatives would help greatly in solving Canada's gun problem. First, Canada's laws regarding the safe storage of firearms must be followed through. Two recent tragedies that have involved guns in my riding occurred when legally purchased firearms were stolen and used in criminal matters.

Second, I urge this government to look at the form of a picture ID for firearms acquisition certificates. This would enable gun sellers to be sure that the individuals possessing the firearms acquisition certificate are the ones who earned it.

Third, many individuals in my riding support the concept of needing to use a firearms acquisition certificate to purchase ammunition. The middle way must be tried.

I urge this House to aim for innovative and modest ideas.

S. O. 31

THE STANLEY CUP

[English]

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, although we were saddened by the riots in Vancouver last night, I am very proud and very honoured, as the member of Parliament for Vancouver East, the home of the Vancouver Canucks, to congratulate the players, coaching staff and management on a remarkable play-off season and for nearly capturing the most coveted of all sporting prizes, the Stanley Cup.

Few predicted that the Vancouver Canucks would have reached the Stanley Cup finals. They demonstrated extraordinary maturity, talent and perseverance in overcoming numerous challenges, including stretching the finals to a seventh and deciding game.

I would also like to congratulate the New York Rangers. They were formidable opponents. On behalf of all Canadians, members of the House of Commons and especially the members from British Columbia and my constituents I would like to congratulate the Vancouver Canucks again for their outstanding performances.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

[Translation]

RWANDA

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert): Mr. Speaker, we are dismayed, repulsed and made to feel helpless by television pictures and reports out of Rwanda. The discovery of a mass grave where close to 20,000 men, women and children were murdered in a convent near the Tanzanian border has shocked people all over the world.

This lunacy must stop. The international community can no longer stand by and watch this venting of hatred, this systematic genocide that is increasing daily and reflects the worst aspects of human nature.

The Rwandan situation is critical, and political decision makers must take the necessary steps to put to an end this carnage, which historians in the next century will find difficult to explain. In the midst of all the vicissitudes facing the peoples of Africa, the killing of Rwandan citizens merely because they are who they are is quite simply shameful. It is time to do something about it.

TAXATION

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, just as high government debt and deficits distort decisions in financial markets, so tax and spend policies distort family decisions.

(1410)

Monday's CTV poll demonstrates that 3 million Canadian families would rather have one parent stay at home with the children but cannot afford to do it.

This year families will have to pay 48 per cent of their income in taxes and so their lifestyle decisions are effectively dictated by the state.

Unfortunately, governments are then forced to become more and more interventionist by giving selective tax breaks and running expensive national programs. What parents really want are the resources to do good parenting jobs themselves.

By easing tax burdens on all Canadians, Reformers would increase lifestyle options within all families. Reform would empower parents to make employment arrangements according to their preference; free to work outside their residence or free to work at home with their own children.

* * *

SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the first socialist government in North America was elected in Saskatchewan.

On June 15, 1944 Tommy Douglas and his team of candidates from the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation came to office and with rolled up sleeves, a people first agenda and lots of hard work they set about the undaunting task of pulling Saskatchewan out of debt and improving the quality of life of its citizens.

In Saskatchewan the legacy of Tommy Douglas and his successors Woodrow Lloyd, who made hospitalization a reality, and Alan Blakeney, who presided over 11 consecutive balanced budgets, is being taken up by current Premier Roy Romanow and a team of New Democrats who are successfully tackling and reducing what was the highest provincial per capital debt in Canada while at the same time establishing progressive health care reform.

A good future is based on remembering your past. Today we remember with respect and admiration Tommy Douglas and the Saskatchewan CCF.

S. O. 31

TRADE

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West): Mr. Speaker, we should all recognize the importance of removing the internal trade barriers which are obstacles to economic competitiveness and growth in Canada.

Internal trade barriers raise the cost of doing business. There are over 500 internal trade barriers in Canada with a cost to Canadians of approximately \$6.5 billion annually in lost income.

Negotiations under way between federal, provincial and territorial governments will lead to an agreement by June 30, 1994. The federal government is committed to working toward the agreement that will start the process of building open, efficient and stable domestic markets.

The agreements sought will put in place a framework that will lead to dismantling the barriers that have been erected by governments since Confederation 127 years ago. It is time to put an end to the trade restrictions that we would neither tolerate nor impose on international trade. We have for too long divided our country into many small restricted segments.

I urge members to support our Minister of Industry and his counterparts from the provinces and territories in their challenging and very important task.

* * *

THE VANCOUVER CANUCKS

Mr. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to congratulate the Vancouver Canucks on an absolutely outstanding season and a brilliant performance in the Stanley Cup play-offs.

The Canucks exceeded our wildest expectations. They attained a goal that most teams can only dream about and they did so by virtue of their great skill and spirit. They have made all Vancouverites, British Columbians and Canadians proud.

On behalf of the constituents of Vancouver South I congratulate a hockey team with heart, drive and charisma. In our eyes you are all winners.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN LEGION

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton): Mr. Speaker, the ban on religious headgear in some Legions across Canada is a divisive action.

On behalf of all Canadians who believe in equality I want to thank my hon colleague from Calgary Southeast who cancelled her Legion membership over this issue.

I hope that all members who are Legion members also make their views known.

Understanding each other's religions and cultures is the only way to put an end to intolerance.

Some members of this House have offered to invite me to speak at Legion halls in their ridings. I would offer all members my assistance in this regard to talk to them about the significance of the turban.

Together we can put an end to intolerance.

* * *

BOSNIA

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the joint declaration by the religious leaders of different faiths, Serbian Orthodox Church Patriarch, Pavle, Russian Orthodox Church Patriarch, Alexei, and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb, Croatia, Cardinal Kuharic, calling for an immediate peace in Bosnia—Hercegovina.

(1415)

This ecumenical initiative could fill the tragic vacuum in political leadership and at last end the bloodshed in the region.

* * *

ATLANTIC FREIGHT RATE SUBSIDY

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John): Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Transport announced cuts to the freight subsidy on shipping western grain. As well, the minister indicated that the government will be rethinking the overall subsidy program in general, including Atlantic Canada's freight rate subsidy program.

I have been aware for some time now that the Department of Transport has embarked on a closed door internal study and review of the Atlantic freight rate subsidy program. This study contrasts the open consultative process that the government promised.

If Atlantic Canadians are to suffer further cutbacks in a program such as the freight rate subsidy, I would ask that the minister open up these discussions so that the stakeholders involved in this program can have full consultation, participation and input into this very important program which places 12,000 maritime jobs in jeopardy.

* * *

NATIONAL ACTION COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defence of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. It was the subject yesterday of a churlish attack by a member of the party opposite who suggested, incredibly, that this women's group does not really represent

Oral Questions

hundreds of women's organizations and millions of Canadian women. Indeed, it has been suggested that it is merely a special interest group with its hand out for government cash.

I call on the National Action Committee on the Status of Women to put these accusations to the lie by immediately rejecting all government funding, by immediately raising all the money it needs from its own supporters. I know it can do it. I know millions of Canadian women will show their support by their dollars. That way the government will save hundreds of thousands of dollars which can then be spent directly on the many women in this country who truly desperately are in need.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

POLICY ON LOBBYISTS

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, today's *Ottawa Citizen* outlines the policy on lobbyists to be announced tomorrow by the Prime Minister. In its red book, the Liberal Party promised to tighten controls on lobbyists by implementing the June 1993 recommendations of the House of Commons standing committee.

I ask the Prime Minister, on the basis of the information made public in this morning's *Ottawa Citizen*, whether we are to understand that, in fact, the government policy on lobbyists proposes nothing more than a more or less improved status quo.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock we will table the bill and answer questions after the bill has been made public.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, after all the time we have been waiting to see where the government stood on its election campaign promises, we now have in a respected newspaper an undisputed report on the contents of the policy. We want to question him today on this issue.

In particular, I want to ask the Prime Minister how he can argue that his policy will reinforce controls on lobbyists, when it allows them not to disclose their dealings related to government contracts or bills and even to hide the identity of the ministers they are directly trying to influence.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we had the courtesy to consult the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Reform Party on this issue; the Government House Leader and Mr. Pelletier from my office have met with them, told them whom we wanted to appoint as ethics counsellor and given them an outline of the bill.

The leader of the Reform Party had the courtesy to respond, while the Leader of the Opposition did not even respond to our consultations with him.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised by the Prime Minister's behaviour, when he knows that this meeting only led to a general exchange of views without anything specific on the contents of the lobbyists bill. Since the Prime Minister is getting ready to answer our questions tomorrow, I would like to give him some food for thought and ask him if he wants his commitment to impose greater transparency on lobbyists to be taken seriously, if he is ready today, or tomorrow if he wants, to make a priority of having the new ethics counsellor really investigate the actions of the lobbyists implicated in the questionable Pearson Airport contract.

(1420)

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, lobbyists' involvement in the Pearson deal was the subject of a thorough investigation. The Nixon Report findings are well known, and I hope the Leader of the Opposition agrees with the government's decision to cancel this contract.

* * *

SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Today, the provincial social services ministers gathered in Halifax will issue a joint statement to warn the Minister of Human Resources Development not to make his action plan on programs reform public without first consulting them and more importantly, without having addressed their concerns. So, the deadlock between Ottawa and the provinces persists because, as the Nova Scotia Minister of Community Services put it: "I do not think that we have backed down. We will stand very firm. We are not wimps."

My question is as follows: Will the Prime Minister recognize that this stern warning from the provinces is an indication that social programs reform, the only major project initiated by this government since coming to power, is stalled because of his government's obstinacy in imposing its views on the provinces?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the lead minister has consulted on several occasions with the ministers in question. In the joint statement released earlier today, all the provincial ministers agreed that a Canada-wide reform of social programs was required and they invited the minister to discuss the process with them. He has done that in the past and intends to do so again in the weeks to come. The deadlock exists only in the hon. member's mind, because consultations are ongoing and these consultations are the reason why things are taking longer. Last week, we were criticized for not imposing immediately our choice of a solution and the

Oral Questions

reason for that was simple: we were not through consulting with the provinces.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier): What the provinces want, Mr. Speaker, is to be consulted all together, not individually and one pitted against the other.

Does the Prime Minister not realize that the provinces have taken the legitimate stand that they have because they refuse to bear the brunt of a reform that would result in lower federal transfer payments and enable Ottawa to off-load once again part of its deficit onto them?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance tabled his budget, he made it quite clear that we were not going to reduce transfer payments. This was clearly indicated. The provinces were also said to want some idea of what the spending would be like over the next two or three years, and the Minister of Finance provided them with just that, a precise account of the expenditures for this year, next year and the year after that. The provinces know exactly what funds are currently available, pursuant to the commitment made to include in transfer payment arrangements procedures allowing for the necessary planning by the provinces. The budget is perfectly clear on this issue. I do not understand the provincial ministers' concern. In fact, that is what the minister will reiterate in the meetings, bilateral or multilateral meetings as the case may be, he will be having with the provincial ministers.

* * *

(1425)

[English]

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

On numerous occasions spokespersons for the government have referred to the small business sector as the major engine of the economy and a major job creator. Yet a recent survey of small business conducted by the *Financial Post* reveals that only 14 per cent believe that the government's small business initiatives will create jobs and 87 per cent believe that the government is not representing their interests particularly with respect to the deficit.

When will the government formally recognize that the only thing most small business people want from the federal government is for it to get off their backs and out of their pockets?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I certainly noticed the survey that the leader of the Reform Party mentioned. It did indicate, although clearly according to the polls that were included in the survey this was not, you might

say, our natural constituency, we were gaining in support even among that constituency in every part of the country, save for one province. That indicates that the program the government has put in place is winning support among the small business community.

It might be helpful to the Reform Party to understand that we do understand exactly the point that removing burdens from small business will help them succeed. That is why in the February budget the Minister of Finance announced that we will be reducing the payroll tax on unemployment insurance premiums. That is a key way to help small business create jobs.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, speaking of burdens then, 70 per cent of the entrepreneurs surveyed by Arthur Andersen said that the biggest single obstacle they faced was high taxes. The next largest group said that their biggest problem was intrusive government legislation and regulations. These are the obstacles that small business people themselves say prevent them from expanding and creating more jobs.

I ask the Prime Minister what new measures the government is prepared to take to remove the two greatest government created obstacles to job creation in this country which are high taxes and red tape.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, over the last few months in the ongoing work in the industry committee, which in fact I appeared before yesterday to discuss small business issues, we have seen a very co-operative effort among members from all three parties with respect to focusing on the issues which concern small business.

With respect to the level of taxes and the regulatory burden together with issues such as access to capital and the ability to apply new technologies, there is a co-operative effort under way to particularly address the issues that concern small business.

It is clear from the studies with respect to the impact of small business on the Canadian economy that is where the job creation will be. If we can continue to work co-operatively with our friends across the floor looking for solutions that address particular problems, then we can put together a package building on the initiatives the government has already announced, building on the promises we made in the red book and which we are fulfilling to help that sector create jobs.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary to the Prime Minister and to the minister.

Canadian entrepreneurs say the best thing the government could do to promote job creation would be to reduce government spending and provide tax relief. According to the Arthur Andersen survey 97 per cent of the entrepreneurs surveyed said that the government should have cut more deeply in the federal

Oral Questions

budget and 86 per cent of them did not believe that the government is serious about deficit reduction.

If the government is serious about reducing the deficit, if it wants to send a strong, clear message to these job-creating entrepreneurs over the summer, will the Prime Minister commit to bringing in a minibudget in the fall which redoubles the government's deficit cutting efforts?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec): Mr. Speaker, having spent a reasonable amount of time in that particular sphere to which the leader of the Reform Party addresses, I happen to know that the one thing entrepreneurs want from their government is a firm commitment to their objectives and credibility.

They want us to hit our targets. They do not want a panic reaction. They do not want minibudgets. They wanted us to bring forward a budget that would attain its target. We did that.

(1430)

Next September, as we promised in the House, we will be setting our new economic scenarios as a prelude to the consultations for the February budget. Again at that time we will give an indication of where we are going. We are on target. We are going to hit our target.

The only thing I really have to say I will say to the Prime Minister. I do not want to wash any dirty linen in public but I would disagree with the Minister of Industry. He said that according to the survey we are leading in nine out of the 10 provinces. It is my understanding, Mr. Prime Minister, that we are leading in all 10.

* * *

[Translation]

RWANDA

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs. We have learned that in connection with the thirtieth summit of the Organization of African Unity in Tunis, an immediate cease-fire agreement was reportedly concluded between the forces of the provisional government in Rwanda and the Rwandan Patriotic Front.

This cease-fire would end the massacres in which more than half a million people may have been killed, including 60 Tutsi children slain yesterday after they were taken from a church where they had sought refuge.

Does the minister confirm that a cease-fire agreement was reached between the belligerents and can he tell us where matters stand on this subject?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs): Mr. Speaker, of course we hope that a cease-fire between the parties will be respected. Like the hon. member, we already had word

that a cease-fire had been declared. Unfortunately, subsequent information told us that it had already been violated, in fact.

So at this time I cannot give more specific information than the latest reports that the parties had concluded an agreement which would allow a United Nations contingent to come soon to help the parties in question observe a cease-fire and restore order in that country, which has been particularly affected in recent weeks.

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East): Mr. Speaker, in view of the information which the minister has just given us and which does not seem to be complete, I nevertheless ask him if, in case a cease-fire is declared, he can tell us if he intends Canada to play a role in a United Nations mission in Rwanda and can he also tell us if the Canadian government intends to increase its humanitarian aid efforts in that country?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's first question, I must inform her that the government is now considering a request that the United Nations made not only to Canada but also to some other countries. A decision on this will be made in the next ten or fifteen days.

As for the hon. member's second question, I can assure her that the Canadian government is ready to step up its aid program for the Rwandan people who have been greatly affected by this conflict.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Yesterday the Fraser Institute announced that tax freedom day, the day when Canadians stop working for the government and begin working for themselves, will not come until June 23 of this year. This is four days later than last year and represents a total tax load of 48 per cent compared with 44 per cent last year.

Instead of fiddling with the method of taxation, as the minister is preparing to do with the GST, when will the government eliminate the deficit so that the level of taxation can be reduced?

(1435)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec): Mr. Speaker, we fully appreciate the terrible burden of taxation that Canadians have had to bear as a result of the 39 separate tax increases introduced by the previous government. It is one of the reasons why in the last budget we did not seek to increase taxes but rather sought greater tax equity.

I am sure the member opposite understands the absolute necessity of building fairness into the tax system. In fact, in the last budget we announced certain potential tax decreases. I

Oral Questions

would never disagree with the Minister of Industry and in his previous answer he talked about the reduction in unemployment insurance premiums. That is a tax decrease.

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer. I address my supplementary question to him as well.

Recently the International Monetary Fund pointed out the connection between persistent deficits, deeper recessions and unemployment.

Does the minister agree with the IMF when it says that deficits cause unemployment and recessions and therefore the deficit must be the number one priority if Canada is to experience lower unemployment and economic growth?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec): Mr. Speaker, the relationship between high deficits, low productivity and consequent high unemployment is one with which no one would disagree.

However the reduction of the deficit must come in many ways, certainly a reduction of government spending, but at the same time an increase in employment. By far the best way is by putting Canadians back to work, in addition to cutting spending.

I would also say that I agree with the IMF, so ably cited by my colleague, when the IMF said that Canada next year would lead the industrialized world in job creation, economic growth and productivity.

* * *

[Translation]

LUMBER

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères): Mr. Speaker, the composition of the extraordinary challenge committee in the Canada-U.S. lumber dispute is the subject of lively debate between Ottawa and Washington. The Americans are casting doubt on the representativeness of Canadian experts sitting on this committee, and some are even calling for Canadian panelists to be investigated by the FBI from now on to determine how unbiased they are.

Will the Minister for International Trade undertake to indicate forcefully to the United States that its position and claims in this matter are quite simply unacceptable and that its attitude threatens the very existence of the panel system for settling trade disputes between our two countries?

[English]

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, we reject the statements that were made with regard to possible FBI investigations of panellists under the NAFTA and the FTA. I would only add that it is a matter that the

Solicitor General would be able to address if the member wishes to delve further into it.

Certainly under the FTA and NAFTA there is no provision whatever for the type of activity that the hon. member has cited and we reject any such practice.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères): Mr. Speaker, does the minister agree that the American attitude constitutes a new delaying tactic by the United States to allow it to maintain countervailing duties, the brunt of which is being borne by Quebec lumber producers who, it has been proven, receive no subsidies?

[English]

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister for International Trade): Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea why the United States representative would have said such a thing. Perhaps she offered it as a comment in the heat of the legal discussion, but it certainly has no substance in practice. We would not accept any such practice as described by the hon. member.

* * *

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

I found this quote in the October 29, 1990 edition of the *Toronto Star*. It reads:

I am opposed to the GST, I have always been opposed to it and I will be opposed to it always.

The Prime Minister should recognize these words, they are his own.

Will the Prime Minister finally admit that his promise to eliminate the GST in his first year of office was foolhardy and that Canadians had better get ready for a modified GST from this Liberal government with a brand new name?

(1440)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, not only did I say that in 1990, it was in the red book. It stated clearly in the red book the conditions for a replacement of the GST. We have always said that because it is the policy of the government.

We have a committee on the GST and the member sits on it. I remember it was some time ago when the leader of the Reform Party made a promise, a solemn commitment, that he would get rid of the GST. He changed his mind.

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Prime Minister. We would get rid of the GST and we would balance the budget within three years. Just give us the chance.

Oral Questions

This past weekend, the vice-chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance said that he favoured extending the GST to include both groceries and prescription drugs for certain tax benefits.

Can the Prime Minister tell Canadians if the vice-chairman was speaking on behalf of the government? Is his government planning to tax both groceries and prescription drugs under a new, broadened version of the GST?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are waiting for the report of the committee. We are very interested. We have made a commitment that the GST will be replaced within two years.

We were elected less than eight months ago and we have made a lot of progress. We said we would establish a committee on this subject very early in the process. It will report next week I understand. We will study the report and make a decision about the replacement. There will be no spectacular flip-flop like the one made by the leader of the Reform Party.

* * *

[Translation]

MARINE SAFETY

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, the trawler *Rally 2*, which belongs to a company named Madelipêche, recently experienced serious mechanical problems which endangered the lives of its crew members. These problems seem similar to those which, in November 1990, resulted in the sinking of a sister trawler, *Le Nadine*, and in the death of eight crew members.

Will the Minister of Transport confirm that the federal office responsible for transport safety is conducting an investigation on the mechanical problems experienced last week by the *Rally 2* in the Magdalen Islands? Otherwise, will the minister pledge to shed light on that incident?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. member that since I also come from a region where fishing is a very important activity, and since I am aware of the importance of safety for those who make a living at sea, we will take every possible measure to ensure the protection and safety of fishermen.

I can understand the hon. member's concern; he is certainly aware that a coroner's report was prepared and that investigations were conducted. We will continue our efforts to ensure that a tragedy such as the one which occurred in 1990 does not happen again. We will conduct all the investigations necessary to find out what happened this time.

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, it may be the distance separating us, but I did not hear clearly whether the minister intends to hold an inquiry on the most recent mechanical problems.

In the marine sector, and the minister will surely agree since he also comes from a maritime region, a sister ship can help find the cause of an incident.

Here is my second question: Could the minister take this opportunity to reopen the investigation on *Le Nadine*, considering that its sister ship is involved and that allegations were made concerning the captain of that first ship? Since allegations were made to the effect that some information may have been withheld, I ask the Minister of Transport to reopen the inquiry on *Le Nadine*.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that we will not rule out any inquiry or possible solution.

(1445)

As regards the ship which is still in operation, studies or investigations will be conducted and it would certainly make sense to look back at the first incident. The Department of Transport has the responsibility to ensure the safety of those who work in such industries and sectors.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. The minister has been informing us about activities planned to celebrate National Public Service Week.

Does the minister feel comfortable holding such a celebration after the government's extension of the wage freeze, an action the head of the Public Service Alliance of Canada refers to as "hypocritical?"

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure): Mr. Speaker, I think our employees fully understand the fiscal realities governments in Canada find themselves in.

The need to bring down the deficit and for better control of the debt is what we promised to do in our red book and what we promised to do as a result of the budget and bringing the deficit down to 3 per cent of GDP. This has become a necessary part of that kind of control, and I think it is understood by our employees.

I also think they understand the other part which is to help create and maintain jobs. That is certainly what we wanted to do in the case of the public service.

Having said that, National Public Service Week gives us the opportunity to recognize the valuable contribution our employees are making through the provision of services to the people of the country. The member for Ottawa West initiated it through Parliament some two years ago so that we could recognize the dedication and commitment of our public servants

Oral Questions

and at the same time tell Canadians about the valuable services they are providing in a more cost effective fashion.

* * *

THE FAMILY

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, an Angus Reid poll published in this week's *Maclean's* affirms that the well-being of the family is important to all Canadians.

Yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance stated that he was satisfied with the way the tax system treats families. Yet in some cases families where one parent stays at home to look after their children can be penalized by as much as \$3,000 to \$6,000 a year. It may not seem like a lot to him or his cabinet colleagues, but there are many parents who think that \$3,000 to \$6,000 is a lot of money.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Does he agree that the current tax system discriminates against families that choose to care for their children at home?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)): Mr. Speaker, I answered the question yesterday when it was put to me. I remind the hon. gentleman that the treatment of families is a very difficult aspect of taxation.

If he were to design a tax system I would ask him, and I am sure there is a supplementary question coming, to please state in his supplementary question exactly what he means by family. Maybe he would like to give us a definition.

The Speaker: If I understand, I think we have the sides crossed here. I hope the hon. member for Kootenay East will pose a question.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to pose a question. I recognize that is why this is called question period.

The Angus Reid poll pointed out that many Canadians are concerned about the future of the family. Canadians know that the tax system is discriminating against families that choose to have one parent stay at home.

My question is again for the Prime Minister. Will he instruct his Minister of Finance and human resources department to extend the same tax treatment currently given to those who send their children to day care to those who care for their families at home?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)): Mr. Speaker, once again we have the spectre of a party that has a problem with tax policy. Its

members have been saying that they want a tax policy that treats families in a certain way. Yet they will not tell us what they mean by the word or what their position is on it.

(1450)

They are criticizing the present system, which is an individual taxation system. Since the institution of income tax in Canada taxes have not been family based but individually based. If they are going to take a position that we should have a family based tax system or a family return, they had better think about it very carefully because its costs would be very large.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GUN CONTROL

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice.

During the election campaign last fall, Liberal candidates said they would strengthen gun control laws in Canada and stop the illegal importation of all types of firearms. Last year, nearly 4,000 guns were either stolen or lost in this country, and the smuggling of military and para-military weapons remains a flourishing industry in Quebec and Ontario.

When does the Minister of Justice intend to act on his party's commitment to, as it says in the red book, strengthen gun control and counter the illegal importation of banned and restricted guns? When will the minister decide to act?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, we have started already. First, I have met with colleagues in cabinet to discuss measures that can be taken to deal with the smuggling of illegal weapons into the country.

Second, I have written to my provincial and territorial counterparts to ask them to see to the enforcement of subsection 85(1) of the Criminal Code which deals with minimum penalties for those who use firearms in the commission of offences.

I can tell the hon. member as well that we are considering changes to that section to make the consequences for the criminal misuse of firearms more severe. At the same time, through consultations with caucus and in taking into account all perspectives on the issue, we are going to come forward in the fall of this year with proposals to strengthen the regulation of firearms in the country, balancing always the need for safety in our community with the interests of those who have legitimate uses for rifles in hunting and on the farms.

[Translation]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Solicitor General.

In more than 80 per cent of crimes involving the use of guns in Canada, the weapons were smuggled into the country. What concrete measures has the Solicitor General put in place to deal effectively with the illegal importation of guns into Canada?

[English]

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the national action plan against smuggling, announced and implemented in February, included action not just against cigarettes but also against drugs and firearms.

The additional efforts of the mounted police and other police forces are targeted against the importation of illegal firearms. This effort is continuing and increasing.

* * *

LIGHTHOUSES

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. The commissioner of the coast guard has stated the annual savings associated with destaffing lighthouse stations on the west coast is \$7 million.

On June 2, in an appearance before the Senate transport committee hearings, officials stated the total costs of servicing B.C. light stations at \$3.4 million for salaries, operating, maintenance and direct costs.

How can the minister achieve \$7 million in savings by cutting a portion of a \$3.4 million program that would need major capital spending to implement?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the question of destaffing lighthouses should only be dealt with on the basis of exact and specific savings. It goes far beyond that.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Young: The question is coming from a party that is always looking for savings but does not want to listen to how we can achieve it.

(1455)

We are saying that the technology available in Canada and around the world has resulted in the automation of this kind of facility in many countries. In the United States there is one lighthouse left; it is a historic one at Boston. In Australia and in the United Kingdom there has been destaffing of lighthouses. In the maritime provinces of Canada we have destaffed lighthouses.

Oral Questions

We understand the impact of that action on the people, the men and women who have worked in this traditional activity for many years.

The Department of Transport has a fiduciary responsibility for the safety and security of those who use the sea as a means of navigation. We will be going to that obligation. We are going to make sure that the Canadian sea navigation system is as good as any in the world. Unfortunately, as we move into the 21st century, some of the practices of the past will have to be changed.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The local population knows the value of these lighthouse keepers to public safety. Lighthouse keepers are designated as an essential service. In making this designation the federal government has explicitly recognized the crucial role lighthouse keepers play in marine safety.

Could the minister explain how the government on one hand declares lighthouse keepers an essential service and on the other hand announces an intention to eliminate them?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, Canadians understand that the lighthouse system, the navigational aid systems that have existed in Canada were based on systems that came in from Europe.

For example, the United Kingdom by 1997 will have completely destaffed its lighthouses. Australia and other seafaring nations around the world have understood the need for change. We recognize how important it is to the people who are directly affected.

If the hon. member is asking whether we are concerned about the impact on the human beings who are going to have their lives disrupted, lose their jobs or be shifted into other occupations, the answer is yes. Our responsibility is to deliver modern technological navigational aids to Canadians and those who use the sea. That is what we are going to do.

It would be far more useful if hon. members opposite, who are always looking at ways to try to improve the efficiency of services provided by Transport Canada at a reasonable price, would support us rather than play petty politics.

* * *

[Translation]

ASTRAL

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard): Mr. Speaker, last week the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata mentioned the CRTC's decision to issue two licences for special channels to Astral and said that this company was, and I quote: “—from Toronto”.

On behalf of the employees of this important company in the cultural sector, would the Minister of Canadian Heritage clarify

Point of Order

this statement and tell us whether the company is from Toronto or is, as I am inclined to think, a national company with headquarters in Montreal?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage): Mr. Speaker, the Astral headquarters have always been in Montreal. The company's top management, including the president, are all from Quebec and live in Montreal. Astral employs more than 800 Quebecers and, thanks to federal assistance, it is investing \$17 million in a technical centre on Sainte-Catherine street. That is the type of company that the hon. member from Rimouski—Témiscouata judges not to be concerned with Quebec's interests.

I will not hold that against her. I am sure that she is much more familiar with Saint-Germain Street in Rimouski than with Sainte-Catherine Street in Montreal.

* * *

FORESTRY

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, the Minister of Natural Resources indicated that a major international public relations campaign was needed to convince foreign buyers that British Columbia's forestry practices were consistent with the imperatives of sustainable development.

Yet, when they testified before the natural resources committee, Canada's ambassadors to the European Union as well as to the Federal Republic of Germany stated that the companies involved were not doing what they could to defend their own interests on the international market.

My question is for the Minister of Natural Resources. Does she agree with the views expressed by these two ambassadors and does she believe that the forestry companies in question could be doing more to defend their own interests?

(1500)

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Let me say that my department is working very closely with provincial departments of natural resources and forestry and with industry to ensure that we clearly get our message of commitment to sustainable development out in Europe and wherever else we have markets for our forestry products.

* * *

DISCRIMINATION

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The Minister for Canadian Heritage opposes discrimination on the basis of race. We in the Reform party agree with him. We oppose discrimination of any kind.

Unfortunately, the Secretary of State for the Status of Women supports special interest groups that discriminate if she thinks that they are in the interest of society. It is clear the government will only fight discrimination when it favours its policy.

Will the Prime Minister explain exactly what criteria the government uses when it decides to discriminate or not to discriminate?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage): Mr. Speaker, of course I listened carefully to the observations made yesterday by the Secretary of State Responsible for the Status of Women. I share her view that women in Canada are not an interest group. They are half the population. I would add that the other half would not exist were it not for the help given by the both halves.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: My colleagues, I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of His Holiness Serbian Orthodox Patriarch Pavle.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

*[Translation]***POINT OF ORDER**

CORRECTION

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, because I care about intellectual honesty and transparency, I would like to correct an error that I unwittingly made on June 8 last.

In my question that day to Minister of Canadian Heritage, I stated that the Astral communication group was from Toronto. After verifying my sources, I wish to inform the House that the principal shareholder in Astral is the Greenberg family of Montreal.

Obviously, the minister was no more aware than I was that Astral was owned by Montreal interests since he did not correct me when I put my question to him. However, I can see that he has read the copy of the letter which was sent to me as a result of the information provided in this House. Furthermore, since I was born in the Plateau Mont-Royal neighbourhood, I can say that I am just as familiar with rue Ste-Catherine as I am with rue St-Germain in Rimouski.

The Speaker: That is quite a correction.

[English]

I have a point of privilege arising from Question Period from the hon. member for St. Paul's.

PRIVILEGE

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Barry Campbell (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege with respect to certain statements made about me by the hon. member for Calgary Centre. If he had read the article in its entirety, which is always a good idea before commenting in this House, he would have found that the author of the story indicated and I quote, "Mr. Campbell refused to comment on the recommendations of the committee". I made no statement to the author of the story about my view on the question. Further, the reporter has apologized to me for the misleading headline and misleading story.

I would ask the hon. member for Calgary Centre through you, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw this statement.

(1505)

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member mentioned, it was the front lead story in the *Toronto Star* of Saturday. It was under a big banner. I read the story like everybody else. I was only referring to what was said in the paper. The fact that the reporter misquoted him and the fact that he has a problem with the reporter, I am sorry, but that is not my problem. I just read what was there and I presented my question based on that fact.

The Speaker: My colleagues, from time to time we do read facts in newspapers which could be more accurate than others. I would ask hon. members to be patient and courteous with one another. I do not know that there is a point of privilege there. It surely is a point of correction.

I believe the hon. member has done that. I would hope that the newspapers would check their facts before they make any statements attributable to anyone else.

Would the hon. member for St. Paul's have anything to add to this?

Mr. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, it is not so much about the reporter checking his facts as it is about the hon. member opposite reading the story to completion.

The Speaker: I would rule that there is no point of privilege but surely the correction will have been made or the misunderstanding corrected.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS*[English]***GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8) I have the honour to table, in

Routine Proceedings

both official languages, the government's response to four petitions.

* * *

SULPHUR DIOXIDE EMISSIONS

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise in the House to advise fellow parliamentarians of the signing of the second international protocol on sulphur dioxide emissions. Canada signed this new United Nations agreement in Oslo, Norway yesterday. It is a major step forward in the ongoing battle against acid rain.

The first international agreement on sulphur dioxide was the 1985 Helsinki protocol. Under that agreement Canada pledged to reduce its sulphur dioxide emissions by 30 per cent starting in 1993. Thanks to excellent co-operation by the provinces, environmental groups, consumers and industry, Canada has met its commitment. Our sulphur dioxide emissions have now fallen below the 3.2 million tonne limit set for Canada in the agreement. By the end of the year emissions in eastern Canada will have been reduced by more than 40 per cent from 1980 levels. That is a success story.

The 1985 Helsinki protocol set the foundation for the Canada-United States air quality agreement.

[Translation]

The fact of the matter is that sometimes, very complex international agreements can make a difference and do make a difference. Canada wants to remain a leader in acid rain control and that is why we signed a new protocol in Oslo yesterday.

This international agreement was signed following extensive consultations with the territories and the provinces.

I am very pleased to report that the international negotiators have adopted an important concept developed by Canadian scientists from Environment Canada. This new concept which was adopted in Norway is that of critical levels.

What this means in simple terms is that beyond a certain level, sulphur dioxide emissions become harmful to the environment. This level can vary from one part of the globe to another and, within a country, from one region to the next.

(1510)

[English]

It is important that we are now moving to set sulphur dioxide emission levels based on science and regional targets within countries rather than just national limits. This allows Canada and other countries to direct their efforts to where the real problems exist. We believe that the provisions of the Helsinki agreement will lead to improving the effects of reduction of acid rain in the areas of Canada where the problem lies, namely in the seven eastern provinces of our country.

Routine Proceedings

However, the Helsinki protocol, good as it was, will not end acid rain in the long run in about 10 per cent of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Canada has accepted to set a ceiling on emissions in that part of the country which requires a longer term commitment. We are therefore creating within Canada a sulphur dioxide management area, with specific goals attached to it, which take us well into the 21st century. In the long term, we want to bring sulphur dioxide emissions in the southeastern part of Canada down to an environmentally benign level. We will focus on the area most affected, that is to say the area south of a line going from the St-Lawrence estuary to the bottom of James Bay and on to the northern part of Lake Superior.

This new area will include southern Ontario, the southern part of Quebec as well as all of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the latter provinces being really seriously affected.

[*English*]

Our target for this area is sulphur dioxide emissions below 1.75 million tonnes beginning in the year 2000. This is an important breakthrough in international negotiations. The problem was that the national levels were arbitrary, particularly for a country as large as Canada.

Our environmental problems are not the same in every part of the country and this new agreement recognizes that. The new Oslo protocol also sets tough new standards for reporting and compliance by countries. This agreement is a major step forward but it is not the total answer to the entire acid rain puzzle.

The United States has not yet agreed to sign the protocol. The Government of Canada believes and hopes that this new agreement will act as an impetus to the United States just as the previous protocol opened the way to our bilateral treaty on air quality.

Indeed, I have scheduled meetings next month in Washington with the director of the Environmental Protection Agency in which we will be discussing very specific air quality issues like carbon dioxide emissions and in particular sulphur dioxide emissions to look at what bilateral actions we can take, not at the exclusion of multilateral activity but to complement it.

We have set new long term limits for the region of our country that produces sulphur dioxide flowing into Canada and the United States. We want the United States to take reciprocal action to reduce its sulphur dioxide flowing into Canada.

If there is one thing Canadians are unanimous about, it is that our country must take a leadership role on the problem of acid rain and the problem of air quality generally. By signing the Oslo protocol, we are continuing to do so.

May I conclude by saying that Canada's representative at the signing ceremony was appropriately the hon. member for Daventry who serves as the chairman of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development. Anyone who knows the hon. member will know that he was one of the first Canadians to wear the pin which was so strongly identified with the coalition on acid rain activity that actually led to the first international agreement.

He has pushed longer and harder than any other member of Parliament for control on sulphur dioxide emissions. By identifying our problem area and agreeing to long term emission limits for our region, Canada is accepting its responsibility to protect our lakes, maple sugar producing trees, wildlife, fish, buildings, forests and above all, its citizens from the dangers of acid rain.

We will continue to work with concerned Canadians and provincial governments in the ongoing development of the national strategy on air issues. There are no overnight solutions but there are some solutions. I think on this file we have found some real solutions that have improved the situation and will continue to do so.

(1515)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, as the Official Opposition critic on the environment, I want to salute the federal government's initiative in signing yesterday in Oslo the new UN protocol on sulphur dioxide emissions.

The new international agreement sets for the first time emission quotas for each country based on nature's resistance capacity in each of the signatory countries.

The approach used in the protocol shows once again that countries, peoples and regions facing the same problem must sometimes apply different solutions taking into account their environment and social characteristics. It goes without saying that this is in line with the aspirations of Quebecers, who believe that the Quebec government should have all the powers of a sovereign state while co-operating with its neighbours on international issues.

The signatory countries have different goals to reach in the coming years. I would like to give you a few examples. Germany plans on reducing its sulphur emissions by 87 per cent compared with the 1980 levels by the year 2005, by renovating the obsolete factories and thermal power plants of the former East Germany.

Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Austria will join in this effort by reducing their emissions by 80 per cent by the end of the century.

Greece and Portugal will only have to reduce their emissions by 3 to 4 per cent because their soil is rich in limestone, which neutralizes the acidity of sulphur dioxide naturally. This approach is more interesting than that of the 1985 Helsinki

Routine Proceedings

Protocol, under which the signatory countries had to cut their sulphur emissions by 30 per cent compared to the 1980 levels by this year.

Canada, for its part, must create a sulphur dioxide management zone including the Atlantic provinces, southern Quebec and Ontario.

It goes without saying that all the initiatives affecting this management zone will first have to be approved by the provincial governments concerned. With respect to the sharing of environmental responsibilities, we know that the initiatives against acid rain in Canada are put forward by the provinces, which pass regulations by negotiating voluntary agreements with polluters.

The federal government, for its part, tries to reduce the acid pollutants that make their way into Canada, from the United States for instance.

Problems such as acid rain call for the co-operation of all stakeholders. Sulphur dioxide is a colourless and very odorous gas. It comes mainly from oil and gas processing, mineral smelting, and coal and heavy oil combustion. Each day, the chimneys of our incinerators spit out tons and tons of this gas into our atmosphere.

(1520)

Many reports have been made on the very harmful effects of acid rain, especially on forests and particularly Quebec's maple trees, as well as the problems for human health that can in many cases lead to increased sensitivity among those who suffer from asthma and bronchitis and make breathing more difficult for some people. We must also mention the deterioration of green spaces and the damage done to very valuable cultural artifacts.

I think that there is a very serious problem with the Oslo Protocol: the United States did not sign it. You know as well as I do that the United States is a huge consumer, and whoever consumes produces waste. As Lavoisier said so well, in nature, nothing is created and nothing is lost. And, as if by some unfortunate chance, warm winds from the United States blow regularly towards Quebec.

I seriously wonder how come the Minister of the Environment was unable to convince our powerful neighbour to sign this Oslo agreement. She just said that she will go to Washington next month, so I hope that she will return with good news for Quebec because you understand as I do that the acid rain we have does not come only from Quebec smokestacks. Most of it comes from Ontario or the United States.

Clearly, for Canada this means that the scope and effectiveness of the protocol will be less. Indeed, it is essential to co-ordinate action on both sides of the border.

According to the 1992 report of the Sub-Committee on Acid Rain of the Standing Committee on the Environment, although a unilateral Canadian program to fight emissions that cause acid rain is morally or politically defensible, any permanent solution must include the United States. That is why we support the environment minister's efforts, which coincide with Quebec's interests, in her talks with the American authorities about acid rain.

The Bloc Québécois is proud of this Oslo convention but we also have high hopes for the environment minister's visit to Washington next month.

[English]

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to salute the minister on the signing of this agreement. Clearly, as she said in her statement, if there is one thing that Canadians are unanimous about it is that our country must take a leadership role in the problem of acid rain.

At the same time I would like to make special mention as she did of the hon. member for Davenport. He has been a thorn in the side of people who have been satisfied with the status quo. I would like to commend him for his efforts, particularly on this issue.

The minister stated it is important that we are now moving to set sulphur dioxide emission levels based on science and upon regional targets within countries rather than just national limits. This is particularly important.

(1525)

What she is stating as I understand it in plain English is that the standards are going to be based on science. Very frequently in environmental issues we have the problem of emotion; if it looks bad it must be bad, if it smells bad it must be bad. This is very bad science and so again I commend the minister and the department on the fact that the standards are going to be based on science.

I also reflect the comments made by the member from the Bloc and underscore the fact that the United States has not signed the protocol. I underscore that fact primarily from the point of view of competitiveness. Surely as human beings, as Canadians and as Americans, we must have an awareness—we do have an awareness—a consciousness of the fact that we can no longer continue with the old ways where we end up with trees, forests, indeed streams and rivers being polluted or dying. We cannot continue with that and surely Canada is taking a leadership role.

However, the fact that the United States has not signed the protocol I believe is a major problem from the point of view of Canadian competitiveness. We have to be very conscious and I would encourage the minister in her discussions with the United States envoys and the negotiators to make sure that Canadian business interests are protected because if not these are our jobs.

Routine Proceedings

At the conclusion of the minister's statement she said we will continue to work with concerned Canadians and provincial governments in the ongoing development of a national strategy on acid rain.

Two items continuing with the thought that we will continue to work with concerned Canadians, we have to make sure that among the stakeholders whose point of view is being considered that businesses are deeply and heavily involved in the process, they are fully consulted and that the impact this has the potential of having on our competitive Canadian position, business wise, is fully taken into account.

She mentioned the fact that there will be further consultation and an involvement of the provincial governments.

For exactly the same reason we can have within Canada duplication of standards based on very well-meaning laws and rules and regulations and legislation that may be brought before this House or provincial legislatures and by the very fact that there is duplication, again we end up putting an extra burden on the businesses in Canada.

I do not stand here speaking for business for the sake of business. I stand here speaking for business because it is business that employs Canadians. It is business that generates real wealth, that can be taxed. It is business that drives the finances of our nation and when we forget that we stray an awful long way from the reality that we must be careful that we are not killing the goose that is laying the golden egg with a very benevolent attitude toward these concerns.

The minister concludes there are no overnight solutions but there are solutions and again I commend the minister, the department, on the signing of this accord and I do believe it is a major step in the direction of reducing sulphur dioxide emissions to a reasonable and responsible level.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

FINANCE

Mr. David Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Finance dealing with Bill C-32, an act to amend the Excise Tax Act, the Excise Act and the Income Tax Act.

[Translation]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 29th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership of committees.

By leave of the House, I intend to move concurrence in the 29th report later today.

(1530)

[English]

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development regarding Bill C-30. The committee has examined the bill and has agreed to report it with an amendment.

* * *

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1994

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-42, an act to amend the Criminal Code and other acts (miscellaneous matters).

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

* * *

GRANDPARENT'S DAY ACT

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-259, an act respecting a national grandparent's day.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for Calgary Southeast for seconding my motion.

I am pleased to table a bill whose purpose is to recognize Canadian grandparents by establishing a national grandparent's day.

It is appropriate in this Year of the Family, 1994, to pay tribute to our grandparents who have laid the foundation of our family structure and future well-being, to encourage all Canadians, particularly children and grandchildren, to remember and appreciate their grandparents and to honour all grandparents in acknowledgement of their contribution to Canadian society.

I recommend the second Sunday in September to be declared national grandparent's day.

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

CRIMINAL CODE

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-260, an act to amend the Criminal Code (replica firearms, theft, import or unlawful sale of firearms).

She said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Yorkton—Melville for seconding my private member's bill.

There has been a great deal of concern expressed in the House, in the media and by ordinary Canadians about the criminal use of firearms. There is only one effective way to combat the criminal use of firearms and that is to go after the criminals who use them.

I was pleased to hear in the House today that the Minister of Justice is considering changes to the Criminal Code to deal with this issue. I would suggest that this private member's bill gives the government the option of dealing with the matter immediately.

The purpose of this bill is to amend section 85 of the Criminal Code. The bill would remove the difficult onus on the crown of having to prove that the object used in the commission of a criminal offence meets the legal definition of a firearm. This is accomplished by adding replica firearms to the section. In addition, the minimum sentence for a first offence is increased from one year to five years and for subsequent offences the minimum is increased from three years to ten years.

This bill also creates two new offences. The first is theft of a firearm, which will carry a minimum sentence of three years. The second new offence is the unlawful importation of a firearm for the purpose of using it in the commission of a criminal offence or to be illegally sold. This offence will also carry a minimum sentence of three years.

The last part of this bill would go after those individuals who sell firearms illegally. They will now be deemed to be a party to any offence that the buyer commits with that illegally purchased firearm.

(1535)

The bill sends a clear message to criminals. If they use a firearm in their criminal activity they are going to go to jail for a long time.

If the House is serious about going after the criminal use of firearms, let us put the right target in our sight; the criminal who uses firearms.

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

*Routine Proceedings***COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move:

That the 29th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That between the hours of 6 p.m. and 10 p.m. this day no dilatory motion or quorum call shall be receivable by the Speaker.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

PETITIONS

ASSISTED SUICIDE OR EUTHANASIA

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition with 179 signatories from Vancouver Quadra, my constituency, and from Vancouver generally, including many senior citizens.

The petition asks that the House refuse the repeal or amendment of section 241 of the Criminal Code and expresses at the same time approval of the Supreme Court decision of September 30, 1993 refusing assisted suicide or euthanasia.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Jean—Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions, pursuant to Standing Order 36, which have been certified correct as to form and content.

The first petition deals with abortion and proposes that we amend the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Jean—Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, the next two petitions deal with sexual orientation. They ask Parliament to amend the human rights code to include in the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

ASSISTED SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA

Mr. Jean—Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, my final petition is on euthanasia. It asks Parliament to make

Routine Proceedings

no changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present today from my constituents in Port Moody—Coquitlam.

The first is in memory of Dawn Shaw and it requests that Parliament enact legislation to change the justice system to provide greater protection for children from sexual assault and to ensure the conviction of offenders.

ASSISTED SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, the second petition from my constituents asks that Parliament not repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code in any way and to uphold the Supreme Court of Canada decision of September 30, 1993 to disallow assisted suicide and euthanasia.

(1540)

INCOME TAX ACT

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am honoured to present a petition on behalf of 53 Canadians.

The petition asks Parliament to amend the Income Tax Act to exclude child support payments from the taxable income of custodial parents.

[*Translation*]

RETIRED PEOPLE'S INCOME

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to table a petition signed by close to 1,500 residents from my riding of Chicoutimi and the Saguenay—Lac—Saint—Jean region.

The petitioners oppose the repeated attacks on retired people's income, and they ask Parliament to reject any measure which would adversely affect retired people's income. In Quebec, over 52 per cent of the retired population is already living below the poverty level.

I fully support that petition and I urge the government to follow up on it.

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to present petitions on behalf of my constituents to request Parliament to not amend the human rights code, Canadian Human Rights Act

or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to include the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

RIGHTS OF GRANDPARENTS

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I would like again today to add more petitions on behalf of Canadian grandparents who ask Parliament to amend the Divorce Act to ensure the right of access of grandparents to their grandchildren.

It is the hope of this member that all members of the House will support our grandparents and bring about the necessary changes to protect both the grandchildren and the grandparents.

ETHANOL PLANT

Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition under Standing Order 36 on behalf of the member of Parliament for Kent. His constituents petition in regard to the building of an ethanol plant in his riding which will create 1,100 person-years of work.

They petition the government to maintain the present exemption on the excise portion of ethanol for a decade. This would allow for a strong and self-sufficient ethanol industry to develop in Canada.

On his behalf I present this to the House.

[*Translation*]

VIA RAIL

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans): Mr. Speaker, since this is my first experience at tabling a petition, I simply want to mention that this petition is not against bilingualism and the Official Languages Act, as is regularly the case with petitions tabled by Reform Party members, and nor is it a petition such as the one tabled by the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, which aimed at—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order. I believe I am entitled to ask the hon. member to table his petition in accordance with the form and practice in use in the House, and not get into a debate.

Mr. Guimond: Mr. Speaker, I am tabling a petition signed by thousands of Canadians asking the government to continue to subsidize VIA Rail.

These Canadians, who are members of the association called Rural Dignity of Canada, demand that the federal government hold public hearings and consultations before making any decision on cuts and abandonment of lines proposed by VIA Rail.

Quebec and Canadian citizens also demand that a one-year moratorium be immediately imposed on the closure of any railway line.

*Government Orders**[English]*

VIOLENT CRIME

Mr. Murray Calder (Wellington—Grey—Dufferin—Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am presenting to the House a petition which carries over 4,700 signatures.

The petition was initiated by Connie Murray of Clifford, Ontario in the memory of the tragic shooting and death of 25-year old Joan Heimbecker.

The petitioners pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation which would grant no parole for convicted criminals and that life sentences be carried out for the full duration of the convict's life.

GUN CONTROL

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure, particularly today when I introduced my private member's bill, to present a petition from 103 constituents.

The petitioners feel that the government's attempt on gun control against legitimate gun users is not the route to go. They ask that Parliament not accept that proposal but to bring forward legislation that would deal with the criminal use of firearms.

It is my pleasure to present this petition to the House.

(1545)

ASSISTED SUICIDE AND EUTHANASIA

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have before me a petition which has been signed by 32 members of my riding of Peace River. The petition deals with the subject of assisted suicide and euthanasia.

Section 241 of the Criminal Code states that everyone who counsels a person to commit suicide or aids and abets a person to commit suicide whether suicide ensues or not is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 14 years.

The petitioners therefore pray that Parliament not repeal or amend section 241 of the Criminal Code in any way.

NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD ACT

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my pleasure to present a petition signed by 150 residents throughout southwestern Ontario. These petitioners pray and call upon Parliament to amend the National Energy Board Act in order to provide intervener funding when residents are involved in proceedings relative to a pipeline.

WASTE DISPOSAL SITES

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from almost 300 people in the township of Smith and other parts of Peterborough county. It concerns the selection of waste disposal sites.

I will summarize this extremely well phrased petition. The petitioners feel that the problems of selecting waste disposal sites are not being properly addressed at present. They also believe that good agricultural land is not being protected.

The petitioners request that Parliament refer this matter to the ministers of environment and agriculture in the hope that discussions with the provinces will result in a national approach to waste management.

KILLER CARDS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a second petition from 107 people in Peterborough riding. These people are concerned about the sale of the so-called killer cards.

The petitioners call upon Parliament to amend the laws of Canada to prohibit the importation, distribution, sale and manufacture of so-called killer cards in law and to advise producers of killer cards that their products if destined for Canada will be seized and destroyed.

I have signed both these petitions.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall all questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Shall all notices of motions for the production of papers stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I want to inform the House that, because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended by 21 minutes, pursuant to Standing Order 33(2)(b).

GOVERNMENT ORDERS*[English]***PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AGREEMENTS ACT**

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (for the Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-22, an act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, be read the third time and passed.

Government Orders

(1550)

Mr. Joe Fontana (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak at the third and final reading stage of this most important bill. This bill is an act respecting certain agreements for the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport. In layman's terms that means it is the bill to formally cancel the agreement which was entered into by the former government. This issue has been debated at length in this House and in committee.

This bill reflects another election commitment made by this government. During the course of the election, our leader who was the Leader of the Opposition at the time, gave notice that after the election the agreement would be reviewed by the incoming new government.

True to his and this government's word, upon election of the Liberal government we had Mr. Nixon review the agreement to ensure that the public interest was being served. His conclusions and recommendations which formed part and parcel of the Minister of Transport's recommendation has resulted in this bill.

To make it clear to everyone, including the opposition parties, the bill effectively and formally cancels the agreement. Both opposition parties agree with the government that the agreement should be cancelled. There is unanimity in this House with regard to its cancellation. There seems to be no dispute whatsoever as to whether or not this agreement needed to be cancelled. I am happy to thank both opposition parties for supporting this legislation.

Having said that, the opposition parties have given their qualified approval but have voted against the bill at report stage. They will probably also vote against it tonight because in their opinion they have serious reservations with regard to the bill. Therefore, it is only appropriate for me to take the opportunity to try to answer the questions put by both opposition parties and the improvements which in their minds need to be done to this bill.

The Bloc Quebecois throughout the course of debate on this bill seems to be fixated with putting blame, or finding out where the blame lies. The government side understands that is important and essentially that is why we introduced the bill to cancel the agreement. We knew the agreement was flawed in its process and its substance. The process was questionable not in legal terms but in terms of the role of the lobbyists in putting together such an agreement.

Bloc Quebecois members have insisted that a public inquiry by a royal commission was needed to find out who was to blame for putting this agreement together in the first place. We could go on a wild goose chase to find out who was to blame. At the

end of the day however even after a public inquiry by a royal commission, legislation would still have to be put in place to effectively and formally cancel the agreement, not to mention the millions of dollars and the time that would be wasted in such an exercise.

The Canadian people themselves gave a verdict to the people involved in that deal, namely the former Conservative government. The agreement was signed two weeks before the election, after being given notice by the present right hon. Prime Minister not to do so but to wait for the new government to review it. Despite that warning, the former Conservative government signed the deal. We know what happened to that government. Public opinion was that what had occurred was not in keeping with what was perceived as good government practices. Hence, that government was defeated. There were many other reasons for that but I suggest this agreement was part and parcel of it too.

(1555)

With respect to the other parties that signed this agreement, the testimony at committee hearings and Mr. Nixon's report makes it clear that while we may not have liked the process and we might question the roles of the government, the partnerships and the lobbyists, the fact remains that an agreement was signed legally and formally by another government and another party.

During the hearings this government and its members did not stand in the way of asking for witnesses to come before the Standing Committee of Transport to question the people who were directly involved. I heard someone mention yesterday that perhaps all the parties did not avail themselves of that opportunity. That is perfectly true.

The solicitor from the Pearson Development Corporation was there. The Paxport people were there, including Mr. Don Matthews. The former president of Paxport was there, Mr. Hession, and a number of other witnesses. However, a number of witnesses, including former government members and lobbyists, indicated they could not or would not appear before the committee. That is regrettable because the government and the people of Canada deserve to know all the facts. We would have wanted that, but that did not occur.

There was some mention of putting subpoenas before witnesses as suggested by the Bloc. As worthy as that might seem however, that process was fraught with peril in terms of time and of whether or not we would ever get to the bottom of the story.

One fact is clear: The government, the opposition parties and the Canadian people agree that this deal should be cancelled. So what would be accomplished by going on a so-called witch hunt to look for that person who may or may not have done something right or wrong? Mr. Nixon said that nothing illegal occurred, that in fact, as we have all agreed, the process and the substance was flawed.

Government Orders

This bill has essentially tried to do a number of things. First and foremost however it was necessary to cancel the deal formally because there was no cancellation provision in the contract. The government needed to do that formally.

Second, the bill outlines what can or should be paid to the parties to this agreement. The bill does provide guidance and restrictions to the Minister of Transport.

This government has said it does not believe that the process was as it should be and that lobbyists played a very big part, perhaps too big. In the next day or two the Minister of Industry and the parliamentary secretary will introduce changes to the lobbyists act to ensure that the rules are clear to everyone as to what lobbyists can and cannot do with government or members of Parliament. It will put in place a code of ethics among other things.

However, the purpose of Bill C-22 is not to debate or discuss the role of lobbyists. That is a bigger issue which will come later. The bill does say the government will not pay one cent in lobbyists' fees. We will not pay one penny toward lobbyists' costs.

The bill also says we will not pay for the lost profits or lost opportunities that Pearson Development Corporation or the limited partnership might think that in cancelling the agreement they are entitled to.

(1600)

This government has said clearly no lost opportunity, no lost profit. The only thing that we think this government will pay and should pay is legitimate out of pocket expenses that can be justified, that in fact show value for work received because there are a number of third party claimants that are part of the whole apparatus. They are to a certain extent innocent parties to an agreement, parties which might have done some architectural work, engineering work or other legitimate work which was invoiced to the partnership. The government is prepared to consider those invoices and to meticulously look at them to ensure that in fact they are legitimate, that they were for the purposes of Pearson airport and not for something else.

We have a negotiator presently looking at each and every one of those invoices. Some 60 volumes of paper need to be gone through to ensure that, as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Transport said, the government does not pay a penny more than what needs to be paid. We want to ensure that our process can withstand the scrutiny of the public, the opposition and the Auditor General.

We want to make sure that the cabinet by order in council only pays those invoices that are in fact legitimate. That is the process. There is a negotiator and that is what is happening now.

The Reform Party has had some problems with respect to the question of transparency. What is it that we are paying? Who should decide what should be paid? It was suggested that the parliamentary committee on transport look at those invoices and make recommendations to the minister and in fact have a hearing on what invoices should be paid. Those are legitimate questions.

The minister and I and others have stated that the system, the bill, the process within this House of Commons and government operations are transparent. Before even one cent is paid the Auditor General will obviously be very interested in this.

There is a public accounts committee of this House of Commons, chaired by the opposition that can ask for all the documents to be brought forward. There is the accountability of government. The cabinet is accountable to the people of Canada for making those kinds of decisions. There is an apparatus in place to ensure that the process is transparent, that accountability is clearly to the government.

The minister indicated, and I think we passed an amendment by the Bloc at committee, that he will table with this House all the documents that he can table respecting freedom of access to information and guidelines and rules as to what can and cannot be made public. There was a commitment made to this House that would take place.

The bill says, yes, we might pay something, but you will have to prove to us that each and every invoice is legitimate. One must take this bill in its context. This is a very unique bill, unheard of really in terms of Canadian history, where a government would move so boldly as to cancel an agreement and say no loss of profit and no lobbyist fees. It says something much more important.

It says that we need to get on with managing the future of Pearson because it is an important transportation hub in this country. It is a nationally significant airport that impacts the west, the east, Quebec and Ontario. We need to get on with planning the future of Pearson. This bill is absolutely necessary for us to do that. We cannot plan its future unless we formally cancel the agreement and deal with this matter once and for all.

(1605)

The bill also says that if there is no successful completion to negotiations, 30 days after proclamation of the bill there shall be no payments at all. That is a pretty strong stick for this government to use to try and bring all the parties at the table to a reasonable completion to the negotiations. That is an important aspect to this bill because we cannot and I am sure the opposition parties would not want us to continue to carry on fruitless negotiations. This bill does put in place a sunset provision that says 30 days after proclamation, if there is not a negotiated settlement there shall not be one penny paid.

Government Orders

It also protects the government against lawsuits. We cannot take it to the courts because we believe we need to get moving on it.

I know that the debate will continue somewhat today and that both opposition parties will try to make their case again for more transparency, more accountability. The Bloc will suggest that we cannot deal with this bill because we do not really know the true facts about what happened behind those closed doors. That is true and it is regrettable but we have to deal with reality. The reality is that we need to get on with planning Pearson's future, dealing with the bill. There will be other opportunities to discuss the influence of lobbyists and so on and that will come in a subsequent bill.

I want to touch base on a couple of points that I think are absolutely necessary. Talking about expediency, when the bill moves to the Senate where it will go through a similar process, we hope that the Senate will respect and move expeditiously in passing this bill. It is in the best interests of the country to do so in order that the government can get on with planning for the future of Pearson and assisting the travelling public as much as possible.

We believe that this is a very unique bill in Canadian history because of some very unique circumstances. Hopefully they will never occur again.

I believe we all will have learned from this process what governments can and should do prior to an election, especially on nationally significant issues. Perhaps decisions do not have to be made in the last minutes before the end of a government's mandate, especially on an issue that captured the attention of this House some one and a half years before the election. Our party spoke very often and very forcefully to the government, raising concerns about the process and as to whether we ought to divest ourselves of a nationally significant piece of property which serves millions of travelling Canadians as well as people visiting this country.

I know how frustrated we were. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry will tell you that we were very frustrated because we had no opportunity to discuss whether or not the concept of privatization of Pearson should even proceed. We were not given the opportunity. It was done in a very heavy-handed way by a former government. It paid the price for those kinds of actions that Canadians saw as being very cynical and having caused an awful lot of problems for politicians in general as well as the House of Commons with regard to its credibility and integrity.

The Bloc Quebecois wants to accuse us of essentially doing the same thing as the former government. Heaven forbid. The fact is that we are cancelling this contract. We will not pay compensation to lobbyists for profit. We will only pay invoices that are legitimate. They will perhaps say there are some Liberals somewhere in there that we are trying to protect.

This government before, during and after the election and up until now has made one commitment to the Canadian people. It did not fudge, hedge, or anything else.

(1610)

This bill does cancel the agreement totally. The only thing left is to decide if there is any compensation to be given to the other party that signed that agreement.

I would hope that the opposition parties, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, support the government in cancelling this agreement and also recognize that no bill is ever perfect.

We agree that amendments sometimes are made. In fact the committee did report an amendment and the government side supported it. We agree. Yes, there were amendments put yesterday by both opposition parties. I tried to tell the opposition parties that transparency and accountability are built into the bill as well as built into the system.

Yes, we are all mistrusting of the system. We have been here only seven or eight months on the government side. We will have to show members and restore everyone's faith in the system. There are checks and balances in the system to ensure that only those invoices that need to be paid shall be paid and we will, as a government, be subject to the court of public opinion.

I am not sure that the public wants us to write a cheque to rid ourselves of this problem. Of course not. The minister and the Prime Minister have said that we will not pay a penny more than we have to. It was a legally signed agreement. As repugnant as it was that a former government should even do it two weeks before an election, it did it. That government did it.

Therefore we have obligations. When a government does what it is doing today by this bill, it has to consider its impact on future contracts, on the international reputation that we have as to whether or not a government can be trusted that once it enters into an agreement, it will in fact fulfil its contractual obligations. That is a worry and members should understand that.

That is why it allows the discretion in the bill to pay for the legitimate expenses. I hope as we wrap up debate on this issue that the opposition parties will understand that this government wants to get on with planning the future of Pearson airport and the aviation industry in this country.

The only way we can do that is to finally put this agreement behind us and get on with completing the negotiations. In fact, if the negotiations are not completed and this bill is proclaimed 30 days thereafter there shall be no compensation.

We hope that our friends in the other place, the Senate, do not play any games with this bill and the public interest is best served. We hope it expedites this bill as quickly as possible so that we can get on with again planning the future of Pearson.

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans): Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today somewhat disappointed, but not beaten. On Tuesday, June 14, this House adopted the report of the Transport Committee, despite the amendments proposed, warnings given and negative vote entered by the Official Opposition and the third party. Yet the amendments we presented would, we hoped, have enlightened our colleagues on the compensation which the government intends to give to the former directors of Pearson Airport, namely the Pearson Development Corporation.

I was very disappointed to see and hear the Chairman of the Transport Committee tell this House yesterday that he did not intend to spend a million dollars to call witnesses who, in one way or another, would repeat what we already know. He also mentioned that even if witnesses were called, the result would be minimal because the process is too cumbersome and it simply would not be worthwhile. He informed us that the last time witnesses were subpoenaed was in 1913, when the matter had to be taken to the House and the Sergeant-at-Arms was sent to get the witness. The outcome was that the person wound up in jail. This is not what we are requesting. What we are asking for is the application of quite recent precedents, one of which was set on Tuesday, August 20, 1991, before the finance committee, where the following motion was introduced. I will read it in the language of Shakespeare so that everyone can understand:

[English]

On a motion by René Soetens, it was ordered, that—Diane Woodruff, from Price Waterhouse, Frank Kolhatkar and James Goodfellow, from Deloitte & Touche, be summoned and required to appear before the Committee.

(1615)

[Translation]

Another precedent was set on Monday, October 21, 1991, when the hon. member for Windsor, the current Government House Leader, who was in opposition at the time moved:

[English]

That Anwar Khan be summoned to appear before the Committee.

After debate, the question being put on the motion it was by a show of hands, agreed to: YEAS: 3; NAYS: 2.

[Translation]

The motion was agreed to. More recently, on Tuesday, December 8, 1992, the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs agreed to summon the Minister of National Defence to appear before the committee on February 2 to discuss the Auditor General's 1992 annual report.

I wanted to set the record straight and I can tell you that both the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport and the chairman of the transport committee were aware of these facts yesterday because I had made the same presentation in committee. The chairman of the transport committee and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport refuse to spend \$1 million to make the truth known to Canadians.

At the same time, their party is considering paying as much as \$250 million perhaps to friends of the two older parties—the Liberal and the Conservative Party—although we do not even know yet if we should pay a single penny in compensation or if Pearson Development Corporation should not be reimbursing the government instead.

Also, my colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport in this Liberal government, has no qualms paying the bills Pearson Development Corporation may submit, because, as he indicated: "The Auditor General has a job to do and he will report any irregularity in the bills paid by the government." Let us not forget that, as is always the case with reports from the Auditor General, observations are made after the fact.

That is why we in the Official Opposition, wanting to prevent such occurrences and ensure that the taxes of Canadians and Quebecers are used wisely, have reacted. We proposed that a commission of enquiry be established to uncover the truth. That is not serious.

I trust the Auditor General and his recommendations but I am not confident that the current government will take them into account and recover the amounts actually spent, even if it was recommended by the Auditor General. If this government is really serious, it should read the Auditor General's latest report and make the requested corrections immediately. We may then believe that it is possible to act first and then to make the recommended corrections.

Yet some members of the transport committee such as my colleague from the Reform Party asked only for incremental measures, a certain openness and a transparency that the Canadian people want to see right away. Liberal members do not seem interested in seeing again Tory ghosts like Otto Jelinek, as my colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton West, stated in response to my speech on June 13.

I am not interested either in seeing these ghosts again. In any case, we only have to look at how often the current leader of the Progressive Conservative Party and hon. member for Sherbrooke sits in this House to be convinced that if we saw him, we would have the impression of seeing a ghost. That is true, but I would like to compel them to come before the transport committee to shed light on the previous government's actions in awarding the Pearson Airport privatization contract.

Government Orders

(1620)

We are now at third reading and I am trying one last time to inform my colleagues properly on the history of the Pearson Airport privatization. Together let us look at some important dates.

On April 8, 1987, the government published its policy on airport management in Canada and recommended that airports be operated by local authorities. On June 22, 1987, the Government of Canada designated Airport Development Corporation, Claridge, to build and operate terminal 3 at Pearson.

In September 1989, Paxport presented a proposal to privatize terminals 1 and 2 which was rejected by the government. On October 17, 1990, the government invited the private sector to help modernize terminals 1 and 2. No details were provided at that time.

On February 21, 1991, terminal 3 began operations under Claridge Holdings Incorporated. On March 11, 1992, the government officially called for proposals to privatize terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson. A single sentence, no prequalification.

Early June 1992, bidding closed. Two bids were received: one from Paxport, the other from Claridge.

On December 7, 1992, Paxport's proposal was selected; it had until February 15 to show that its proposal was financially viable. This condition was not met.

On February 1, 1993, Paxport and Claridge merged in the T1T2 Limited Partnership. From February to May 1993, the financial viability of the project and Air Canada's lease were discussed.

In May 1993, official negotiations began and Claridge took control of the T1T2 Limited Partnership. On June 18, 1993, a memorandum of agreement was signed on the privatization of terminals 1 and 2. On August 30, 1993, the Minister of Transport announced a general agreement between the two parties and promised a final agreement would be signed in the fall.

On September 8, 1993, the Government of Canada called an election. On October 7, 1993, the legal agreement on privatizing terminals 1 and 2 was signed. On October 25, 1993, the federal election was held. On November 29, 1993, the Nixon report was published, and on December 3, 1993, the Prime Minister announced the cancellation of the agreement to privatize the airport.

Before the final signature, the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada and present Prime Minister warned the parties that he would not hesitate to cancel this agreement. Following that statement, the chief negotiator asked for written instructions to proceed to the signing of the contract. The then-Prime Minister requested specifically that the transaction be completed that same day. Mr. Nixon found in his report that the lobbyists' role in this matter went beyond the usual normal bounds. In fact,

lobbyists were directly responsible for the reassignment of several senior public servants and the request from some others to be replaced.

The 90-day call for tenders was surprisingly short, and it was impossible for groups other than those already involved in the administration of the airport, such as Claridge and Paxport, to submit a valid bid. This explains why only two bids were received. Paxport had previously submitted a privatization plan in 1989, and Claridge was already operating terminal 3.

It is surprising that no prior financial analysis was required in this proposal. It is not usual democratic practice to sign a transaction of this magnitude during an election campaign, thereby binding the soon-to-be-elected government to a policy established by the previous government.

From a financial standpoint, as previously mentioned, Pearson is the only profitable airport in Canada. The agreement prohibits Transport Canada from making investments that might have a detrimental effect on Pearson's traffic in any airport within a 75-kilometre radius of the Pearson Airport; this clause gives preference to Pearson over other airports in the region.

My purpose in reviewing the events of 1987 to 1993 in this matter, first of all, is to make sure that my colleagues in the House are aware of the importance of the decision we will be called upon to make—a decision that will make people aware of the kind of democracy in which they live.

(1625)

Parliament has all the instruments it needs to find out the truth and decide accordingly. But we must be prepared to forget partisan considerations and to probe some apparently disturbing facts. We have four instruments: the House of Commons, the committees, royal commissions of inquiry and finally, the justice system.

In this particular case, the Prime Minister quickly cancelled the privatization contract because he thought there might be misappropriation of funds. However, since he made that decision, what did we find out? Not much, but it was not because the opposition lacked the political will. Here in the House we asked for a royal commission of inquiry. Our request was turned down. In committee, we invited witnesses. What happened? They did not appear.

Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I will go through the list of 17 witnesses I tabled in the transport committee. We invited Ray Hession, who agreed to appear. We invited Robert Nixon, but our Liberal colleagues said that his detailed report was clear enough. Ramsay Withers refused. Herb Metcalfe refused. Fred Doucet refused. William Rowat refused. Huguette Labelle refused. Former minister Jean Corbeil refused. In the case of Robert Wright, our Liberal colleagues made the point that since Mr. Wright was responsible for negotiations between the parties, it was perhaps irrelevant to invite him to appear before the

Government Orders

committee. We agreed. Jodi White, the former prime minister's chief of staff. Doug Young, the Minister, who agreed. Robert Bandeen refused. Peter Coughlin refused. Don Matthews agreed. Former minister Otto Jelinek refused. Representatives for Air Canada agreed to appear, and finally, Liberal Senator Leo Kolber refused.

That was the list of 17 witnesses I invited to appear before the committee.

When we look at the connections of these people, I understand why my Liberal colleagues refused to let people testify before the committee, when we are talking about certain representatives or lobbyists who are close to the Conservatives. I disagree in the case of people with very close connections with the Liberal Party. For instance, Otto Jelinek, a former Conservative minister who is now president of the Asian branch of the Matthews group, and Ray Hession, a former Deputy Minister of Industry and senior executive at Supply and Services under the Trudeau governments.

We could add Herb Metcalfe, a lobbyist with the Capital Hill group, a former representative for Claridge Properties and a former organizer for Jean Chrétien. We could mention Ramsay Withers, a Liberal lobbyist with very close connections to Jean Chrétien and a former Deputy of Transport.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order! I wish to remind hon. members that the proper procedure is to refer to a member of this House by his title. For instance, when speaking about the Hon. Jean Chrétien, members should refer to him as the Prime Minister.

I would also mention at this time that the same holds true for our colleagues in the other place. I wanted to point this out as we begin this debate.

Mr. Guimond: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. In the heat of the moment, I forgot the rules, most likely because of my lack of experience.

I was speaking about Mr. Ramsay Withers, a Liberal lobbyist with very close ties to the current Prime Minister, and a deputy minister of transport during the tender process for Terminal 3 at Pearson Airport.

Let me also mention a member of the other place, Mr. Léo Kolber, who also happens to be a member of the board of directors of Claridge, according to the *Financial Post Directory of Directors*. This same person hosted a \$1,000-a-plate dinner at his Westmount home. On hand for the occasion were, among others, Charles Bronfman and the current Prime Minister, who was in the midst of the election campaign.

(1630)

Finally, another player in the deal is Mr. Peter Coughlin, a senior official with Claridge Properties who has twice refused to testify before our committee. I suggested that we subpoena him, but my proposal was defeated by the Liberal majority on the committee. The same thing occurred when we wanted to subpoena former minister Otto Jelinek.

So, since the witnesses did not appear, and since we had unsuccessfully asked the committee chairman to insist that the witnesses appear, I asked the transport committee to employ the means provided by our ancestors to find out the truth, namely to subpoena the witnesses and thus force them to appear. The motion was again defeated in committee.

Even if we would have had to take the matter again before the House, even if the Sergeant-at-Arms would have had to take the necessary steps to bring the witnesses before the committee, even if it had cost a million dollars—which I seriously doubt—, we should have made use of the tools at our disposal to shed light on some worrisome facts, as the Nixon report indicates.

Democracy has its costs. If we want to preserve democracy, we must be prepared to assume those costs. It is the only possible way to protect society from certain abuses by individuals who would do anything for their own personal gain.

To prevent certain people from appropriating public assets to which they are not entitled, it must be made clear to those people that the government will use whatever means are available to it to “air out the dirty laundry”, so to speak.

By failing to act like a responsible government and to assume its responsibilities, the government is encouraging certain groups to bypass normal channels and to try to turn quick profits without worrying about tomorrow.

Why is the present government in such a hurry to pass this bill? Is it worried about having to pay a few dollars in interest on unpaid invoices? But perhaps there will not be any compensation. How could there be any interest if there is no compensation? Or is the government rather afraid of losing contributions to its election fund?

The government cannot, for partisan political reasons, suppress such a scandal that might impact upon previous and future generations of politicians. We must clear up this matter. We must show that we act openly. We must restore the trust of Canadians. The money owed to the government must be recovered, and we must stop making handouts in this matter.

For the sake of social justice, we must let the public know the truth.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise today on third reading of Bill C-22.

I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for London East about the process that we are going through. I am sure he, like many other members when they were campaigning in the last election, was absolutely distraught at the level of cynicism that we found among the voters as we went door to door. I must admit the mistrust they had of politicians put me at an all time low.

Bill C-22 really focuses on the mistrust and the cynicism that people have toward politicians. I believe that mistrust was reflected in the fact that we had such a huge turnover in members in the 35th Parliament. When we start talking about the Bloc looking for blame, or the Reform Party looking for transparency, really what we are talking about is trying to establish the credibility of politicians and returning the trust that has been lost in this place.

(1635)

I am sure the Canadian people applauded the decision to cancel the Pearson contract because during the campaign it was obvious it was under a cloud. I would suggest that those same people would not be very happy with the fact that the negotiations for any possible compensation are proceeding under what appears to be a cloud.

It was suggested that the Nixon report did not say that there was anything illegal. While that is true, a lot of questions were raised in that report. Indeed, beneath the questions that were raised there may be something illegal. We will never know how things are proceeding because of this reluctance to open up the process to public scrutiny and working toward restoring trust in ourselves and in the system.

I see two contradictions with the red book in Bill C-22. First, the government was elected on the premise of jobs through infrastructure development. Here we are talking about what arguably could be the biggest piece of infrastructure in Canada. Much needed development is being held up because of negotiations regarding compensation which are going on behind closed doors. Six months have passed since the contract was cancelled and nothing has happened toward construction or job creation.

Mr. Nixon stated in his report that construction should proceed. I would like to quote from his words on page 13, paragraph 4:

I further recommend that Transport Canada continue for the time being to administer Terminals 1 and 2, and proceed with necessary construction. Thereafter, I recommend that Transport Canada recognize the airport authority. Once operational, the airport authority would receive from Transport Canada, the responsibility of the day to day operations of the airport complex. It would also deal with the planning, financing and construction of airport infrastructure. In particular, this would include Terminals 1 and 2 and the runways, taxiways and aprons at Pearson.

To this point, nothing is happening as far as construction goes.

The other contradiction is the reluctance to open up the process to the light of day. This again flies in the face of the red book promise of governing with integrity. I would like to quote from chapter six of the red book, which deals with this particular issue. I think it fits very well with what we are talking about tonight:

This erosion of confidence seems to have many causes: some have to do with the behaviour of certain elected politicians, others with an arrogant style of political leadership. The people are irritated with governments that do not consult them, or that disregard their views, or that try to conduct key parts of the public business behind closed doors.

That is very significant in what we are doing here in Bill C-22.

We in the Bloc have attempted to open up the process. The Canadian people should be aware of what is going on. They are the ones who will be paying whatever compensation may or may not be agreed on.

As I mentioned earlier, the Nixon report raised a lot of questions and yet provided few answers. We owe it to the taxpayers to answer those questions. We owe it to the people who were identified in the report. They should have an opportunity to clear their names and reputations.

However, transparency is not to prevail. The cloud over the initial deal under the Tories is now covering the compensation that may or may not be paid.

Why are we even considering one nickel of taxpayers' money to a group that does not deserve a penny of hard earned dollars? Let me review. The deal was signed on October 7, 1993, just 18 days before the election was called, knowing full well that the deal likely would not survive a change of government.

We were not dealing with people who were political novices, unfamiliar with the system. We are dealing with both Tory and Liberal supporters, politically well connected people who apparently were about to line their pockets at the Canadian taxpayers' expense. When you consider the challenge, you have a government run operation generating some \$70 million of profit each year.

(1640)

An hon. member: Some years more.

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre): Some years more. Governments do not have that reputation for making money. In fact the reverse is true. There have been cases where they have taken over money making propositions and soon run them into the red. Here is an unbelievable opportunity, a government run venture about to be turned over to the private sector.

Government Orders

Under normal circumstances there should have been a stampede to bid on this project. The term, a licence to print money, is very appropriate here; a sure winner, you cannot lose. Making money with this deal is as sure as death and taxes.

The original Tory group made a big issue in its proposal that there must be competition in terminal 3. That was a key part of its proposal. This was the only way to ensure protection for the public using this facility. When it was discovered that the group did not have the financing or financial ability to proceed, it went looking for a white knight.

Again, when you remember the fact that this was a guaranteed money maker, you would have thought that there would be no problem finding a suitable backer for such an airtight money making project. We do not know how many people sought to become a part of the plum, but what we do know is that the operators of terminal 3, the Liberal connection, turned out to be the white knight. Out the window goes competition. Any possible challenge to future profits was removed and the taxpayers and the travelling public are now in the hands of a monopoly.

Canada's most important piece of infrastructure is now shared by both Tory and Liberal supporters. A suspicious mind might consider this to have been a very smart move to insulate the deal from political interference.

What is interesting about the Nixon report is that it did not deal with the Liberal connection with the same intensity to which the Tory group was subject. They might have been successful had the public not reacted so strenuously to this deal. A shady deal by the Tories is no different than a shady deal by the Liberals. The Canadian taxpayer does not know the difference in shades of dirt.

Let us go back to the deal for a moment and see if we can find any reason for paying taxpayers' dollars to anyone. No evidence exists of any work being done between October 7 and the cancellation date; not one load of gravel, not one shovel in the ground. In my opinion, nothing happened during that period because of the uncertainty.

The original Tory group had presented an unsolicited bid for this project back in September 1989 and no compensation was requested or paid when it was rejected at that time. No doubt a great deal of work went into this proposal and it placed the group at a very distinct advantage when the government in March 1992 decided to request proposals for privatization.

The fact that 90 days only had been allowed to produce these proposals gave the original group of 1989 a tremendous advantage, a point not missed in the Nixon report.

Our problem is that no compensation as opposed to something in the order of \$25 million to \$30 million for out of pocket expenses or \$180 million if we buy the ridiculous argument of lost profits. Why not let the principals prove in an open forum what money was spent on this project between October 7, the signing date and December 2, 1993, the cancellation date. If any costs were to be justified, this is the only timeframe that should be considered.

Today's Toronto *Star* reports that this review could cost taxpayers as much as \$98,000, a further expense in salaries and expenses to Bob Wright, the lawyer appointed by the government to handle this wrap-up. Mr. Wright is a former fundraiser and law partner of the Prime Minister. I would suggest without questioning Mr. Wright's integrity or ability, the public perception is not the one we wanted them to have. Here we are trying to restore this level of trust and confidence and with an appointment like this one the public perception is that it appears to be more of the same.

(1645)

One has to ask why the Liberal government is going out of its way to protect the previous Tory government. If the deal is half as bad as the Nixon report speculates, the taxpayers of Canada deserve a full explanation. If more time were required to accumulate witnesses who were prepared to attend, why not allow for it? For reluctant witnesses, why not use the subpoena process available to committees to force their appearance?

In closing, while many voters supported the government's decision to cancel the project, those same taxpayers are sure to be offended at the way the compensation package is being negotiated. The fear we share with so many Canadians is that there is the potential for possibly millions of hard earned tax dollars to be paid to people who are more deserving of criticism than compensation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We now move to the next stage of the debate where members will have a maximum of 20 minutes for their interventions, subject to 10 minutes for questions or comments.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity to participate in third reading of Bill C-22.

Before I get into the main body of my remarks I would like to say to the member from Simcoe in the Reform Party through you, Mr. Speaker, that the bill states quite clearly under sub-clause 10(2) entitled "No compensation":

No amount is payable under an agreement entered into under this section in relation to

(a) any loss of profit, or

Government Orders

(b) any fee paid for the purpose of lobbying a public office holder, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Lobbyists Registration Act*, in connection with any agreement,

The Minister of Transport said quite clearly in the House last week that not a nickel's worth of taxpayers' money would be spent unless it was directly related to the contract.

All this is subject to the auditor general, which ultimately means that the Reform Party will have access to it. We will be publicly accountable for any decision the government takes in terms of using taxpayers' money with regard to Bill C-22.

It is never after the fact when one is talking about a transaction like this one. The previous government paid a very heavy price because in opposition we took a very strong stand on the issue of privatization of the Lester B. Pearson airport. I am happy to say that I have not wavered on the issue. I have always considered the Lester B. Pearson airport not to be a metro Toronto airport. It is not even an Ontario airport. It is an international airport.

There is a great misunderstanding about the contribution of the Pearson International Airport to the economy of Canada as a whole. That is one of the reasons I personally do not support the Toronto *Star* position of handing over the Pearson International Airport to an LAA, a local airport authority.

I acknowledge the member for Simcoe Centre was absolutely correct when he mentioned that it was a very profitable operation. The profit from Pearson International Airport has not just gone into the Toronto region. Traditionally the profit from Pearson has been used to help other disadvantaged airports in this country.

(1650)

The airport system, whether it be North Bay, Hamilton or any other part of the country, is inextricably intertwined with Pearson International Airport.

We said this in opposition and we said this during the campaign and we said to the Prime Minister of the day, Ms. Campbell, not to proceed with that contract.

I am proud to be part of a government which immediately upon assuming office the Prime Minister appointed someone with real credibility to look at that contract and it was discovered that it was not a good contract.

There are a couple of things that bug me about the previous government's contract on Pearson. The thing that bothered me the most was the flip clause. There was a flip clause in this contract which meant that there was a possibility that if Claridge Holdings Inc. or the Matthews Group Limited wanted to sell Pearson that option existed in that contract. The possibility existed in that contract which we have cancelled that we could have been in a situation in which Pearson would have been owned by the Taiwanese or by the Libyans. Think what could have happened.

I was very rigorous in my opposition to selling off Pearson International Airport. I believe that selling off Pearson is no different than selling off the East Block or the West Block. I believe that Pearson is an instrument of government which does not just look after air travel but is intertwined with some of the disadvantaged regions of our province and of our country. I also believe it is an instrument which can affect our tourism policy, our trade policy. It is not only the gateway to Toronto but one of the major gateways to our country. I believe this is the room, this is the Chamber that should be ultimately responsible for making decisions on how Pearson is managed.

There are times when we have been very tough on the bureaucrats who have operated Pearson International. Is it not interesting that these same bureaucrats, and the member for Simcoe Centre acknowledged this, managed to always make a profit at Pearson International Airport?

The argument from the private sector will be: "We could make a lot more". I accept that point of view from the private sector that there probably is room for improvement at Pearson International Airport. I think we should consider bringing in the experts. Hire some people, give them a four or five year management consulting contract.

Why should we give away Pearson when we can give a management contract? If the management expertise wants to compliment or support the officials of Transport Canada in increasing the profits or developing other options of profitability and testing them, bring in the management consultants and give them a contract. If they meet certain levels of profitability pay them. If they go beyond their budgets and produce more profit then pay them a bonus.

With all due respect to captain Messier of the New York Rangers, and he made a tremendous contribution in helping the team win the Stanley Cup, you will give him a good salary but you will not give him the franchise.

(1655)

That is where I have strong views on this issue. The catering is done by a very good firm in terms of the way it manages and operates it and gives a percentage back to the Crown; the parking, the taxi service, the construction. We do not want the construction. Put all of that out to the experts, but the notion of giving to the private sector an instrument of public policy—it is an instrument of public policy, not just for the Toronto area but it affects every region of this country—I believe is not the way to go.

Another thing I want to touch on is the way these public servants who are managing the airport tend to be underestimated. Is it not ironic that the manager of the airport, Chern Heed, is now respected as one of the top three airport operators in the world and is now running the Hong Kong airport?

It is a pity that we lost such a great airport manager and I hope there will be a day when we can bring him back as a public servant to participate in managing the Toronto international airport.

Government Orders

I want to go back to this notion of a local airport authority. A local airport authority usually is made up of representatives of the city and the surrounding boroughs in the greater Toronto area. I am sure we would have some representation on that board.

My concern with that is twofold. When you are only concerned with issues as they relate to your own city, you tend to be a little parochial. The difference between being involved in city politics or provincial politics versus national politics is centred around the fact that when we deal with issues in this Chamber, it is our responsibility to not just think of our own communities, our own ridings, but we have to think of them in terms of how they would affect each other's ridings on a national basis.

My concern about a local airport authority stems from the fact that I do not think that unit would have the capability of really dealing with the national interest. That is point number one.

Point number two is the member from Simcoe Centre in his speech talked about a sum of money of revenue somewhere in the neighbourhood of seventy-odd million dollars for 1993. That was a bad year. Our passenger count is down by a tremendous amount right now. Imagine when the economy comes back and we can develop some more efficiency in that airport.

Think four or five years from now when that airport could be generating a couple hundred million dollars a year. Imagine how we would feel as national members of Parliament if four or five years from now we saw a local airport authority that was generating close to a couple hundred million dollars a year. The private sector would say we are getting the first \$25 million or \$30 million. Forget it, this airport is there for the national interest.

I am speaking now as a member from Toronto. Four or five years from now, after we have renovated the airport and cleaned it up, because I really do hope that the money that the airport generates between now and then can go into the renewal and go in the deal, on the point the member from Simcoe Centre was making, we have to get some jobs going in Toronto.

(1700)

We have talked about infrastructure. The member is right. The airport is a terrific area where we can begin. Let us plough some of that money back into the airport and renovate it, renew it, do the things we have to do. Four years from now after those renovations have been made it still will be the Government of Canada operation working in partnership with terminal 3 which, by the way, is a private sector operation. That to me is a pretty good compromise.

Personally I would not have supported the privatization of terminal 3. Ideologically I do not support that thrust. However, there could be a compromise, a private sector operation in terminal 3 and Government of Canada in terminal 2. I do not think we can sustain terminal 1 the way it is right now. It is a mess.

The point is that is a good competitive synergistic approach. Let us be proud of the fact that five years from now when all of those renewals are done the cash flow coming from that airport can go into other projects in the national interest.

I say to members of the Bloc, the notion of a royal inquiry is only going to delay the process. We already know it is not a good deal, so why kill a dead cat? The Prime Minister announced that the deal is cancelled. Why take another year and a half, spend millions of taxpayers' dollars to find out what, that there were some Liberal lobbyists involved?

Well Liberal lobbyists were involved. Naturally some of my best friends are Liberal lobbyists. Do you think they did not try to lobby me to change my mind on the airport? That is their job, but it is up to us to either agree or challenge their lobby. What do you want to do? Is it going to be such a big deal?

The member from the Bloc mentioned some Liberal lobbyists so the Bloc wants to have a royal commission of inquiry into what happened. We are going to bring a bunch of Liberal lobbyists forward and they are going to say they lobbied the member for Broadview—Greenwood or other members. That is irrelevant. It is not important because we stopped the deal. We took a stand; the lobby did not work on us.

A public inquiry is not going to produce anything different from what the Auditor General's analysis will produce. The Auditor General is going to look at the disbursements the Minister of Transport will make in terms of settling this deal. He will analyse those things. Opposition members will analyse them. The press will analyse them. If there is a nickel's worth of taxpayers' money which has been spent inappropriately they are going to raise hell in this House which is fair ball.

I have to talk about my city for a minute. Toronto is going through a very difficult economic period with close to 600,000 people out of work. We want to put this file behind us so we can come back at it with a renewed thrust in order to get something going. As Mr. Nixon has recommended I believe that the airport is a good place to get some activity going, but we said not at any price. That is why we stopped the deal. It was tough to say no to that deal when there were so many jobs, but we just cannot give it away at any price.

Government Orders

It is important that we get this behind us so we can come at it with a renewed and fresh approach involving the Government of Canada. Once we get the renovation and renewal done on the whole Pearson operation, then let us hope that three to five years from now the cash flow that place throws off can help every other region of the country.

I encourage hon. members to please let us put this bill behind us so we can start with a fresh slate.

(1705)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Before we proceed to questions and comments there is a matter of other business we have to deal with.

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 Yukon—Aboriginal affairs.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

June 15, 1994

Mr. Speaker:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Peter de C. Cory, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate chamber today, the 15th day of June, 1994, at 1700 for the purpose of giving royal assent to certain bills.

Yours sincerely,

Judith A. LaRocque
Secretary to the Governor General

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills without amendment: Bill C-26, an act to amend the National Library Act; and Bill C-27, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules, the Canada Pension Plan, the Canada Business Corporations Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act, and certain related acts.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AGREEMENTS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey): Mr. Speaker, in his speech the hon. member talked about stalling this project and trying to expedite this matter as quickly as possible. There are repairs to be made to terminal 1, it is in pretty bad shape.

Could the member update us as to when Pearson started to make money? The Canadian people probably put a lot of money into it before it actually started to make money. At what point in time did this airport start to make money?

I know it is a big generator of jobs in Toronto. There must be at least 20,000 people working there.

Also, how quickly would they get the runways and the infrastructure on terminal 1 going?

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I do not know the precise year Pearson started to make money. It used to be Malton Airport before Prime Minister Trudeau named it Pearson on December 13, 1983. It was his last supper in Toronto when he announced the name as Lester B. Pearson. I do know that the now Pearson International Airport was making money in 1980.

The member has touched upon a very good point. He is alluding to the fact that over several years Canadian taxpayers have invested millions and millions of dollars in developing the airport and infrastructure, bringing it to the point it is at today.

About five or six weeks ago there was a study which ranked Pearson airport in its current state as seventh in the world. We are tough on Pearson, but the operators of terminal 3 have done a very good job. It is working well.

(1710)

I agree with the member that terminal 1, the terminal in the middle, the original terminal, is not in good shape. We all recognize that. However terminal 2 has gone through a constant renewal, both in terms of construction and efficiency. The officials at Transport Canada have done a remarkable job.

The member has raised a very good point. When we talk about 20 million passengers a year, all of them are not from Toronto. They are from every part of the country.

*Government Orders***THE ROYAL ASSENT***[Translation]*

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

(1720)

*[English]**And being returned:*

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate chamber the Deputy Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the royal assent to the following bills:

Bill S-2, an act to implement a convention between Canada and the Republic of Hungary, an agreement between Canada and the Federal Republic of Nigeria, an agreement between Canada and the Republic of Zimbabwe, a convention between Canada and the Argentine Republic and a protocol between Canada and the Kingdom of the Netherlands for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to income taxes and to make related amendments to other acts—Chapter No. 17.

Bill C-17, an act to amend certain statutes to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 22, 1994—Chapter 18.

Bill C-18, an act to suspend the operation of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act—Chapter 19.

Bill C-26, an act to amend the National Library Act—Chapter 20.

Bill C-27, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, the Income Tax Application Rules, the Canada Pension Plan, the Canada Business Corporations Act, the Excise Tax Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act and certain related acts—Chapter 21.

Bill S-5, an act to incorporate the Canadian Association of Lutheran Congregations.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS*[Translation]***PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AGREEMENTS ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to our colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, and I still do not understand why he is refusing to convene a royal commission of inquiry to look into this very dubious affair, the likes of which I have not seen in the

20 years that I have been in this country, and to examine the lobbying issue as well. Some light needs to be shed on this affair and on the role played by lobbyists. In my opinion, all of these issues need to be clarified.

Tomorrow, the government will be introducing a bill aimed at regulating lobbying activities. I hope that they will be very clear and that we will have the opportunity to debate this very important bill.

I also fail to understand why the bill is so contradictory. On the one hand, the government says no compensation will be awarded, while on the other hand, the bill allows the minister to grant sums of money to the parties involved. Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry enlighten me on this apparent contradiction?

[English]

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, through you I say to the member for Bourassa that we should be perfectly clear and should not leave the impression with the people of Canada that there will be any compensation for lobbyists.

The bill states very clearly in subclause 10(2):

No amount is payable under an agreement entered into under this section in relation to

(a) any loss of profit, or

(b) any fee paid for the purpose of lobbying a public office holder—

We should make sure that point is clear. Somehow the Bloc mixes the lobby issue with disbursements that might be paid for the leadup to the conclusion of the contract. Lobbyists will not be paid.

(1725)

There is a point we have to make. I believe my colleague and seatmate, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, tried to make the point about the seriousness of the bill to the Bloc. The bill has no precedent. We have taken a contract that was signed by a previous government, as the member acknowledged, 18 days before election day.

There is a convention in our country that in the last period of an election campaign senators are not appointed, deals are not signed, and we await the outcome of the election. The previous Conservative government broke that convention and the victim was that private sector firm.

Now we have to be fair to the victims, the subcontractors and other people who led up to the packaging of the bid which was called by a duly elected government. We are trying to communicate to the opposition, not the Reform Party but to the Bloc Quebecois, that there will be no compensation for future profit and no lobby money will be paid. We believe the small and medium size operators that were part and parcel of the bid and

Government Orders

had some legitimate expenses that went into that consummated transaction should be treated fairly.

We are trying to strike a balance which is accountable. We are accountable once it is over. I want to say to members opposite through you, Mr. Speaker, that a royal inquiry will take millions of dollars and another 18 months. During that same period we could have the renewal and renovation of an airport which is so vital to the national interests of the country looked after.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased again to be able to speak on Bill C-22 at third reading. I will not hide from you that the Bloc Québécois is against this bill, especially the part that allows the government to pay the compensation it sees fit to those who signed the contract for privatizing Pearson Airport, without releasing full information on the circumstances which led from the decision to privatize the airport to the signing of the contract.

The Prime Minister promised us a clear, open, rigorous process to get to the bottom of this failed transaction and to fully elucidate the involvement of political staff or former political staff and lobbyists in this affair. Remember the summary report prepared by Mr. Nixon. He said that political staff and lobbyists had an uncommon role in negotiating this transaction, but it stops there.

Some even say that this could be one of the biggest contract-fraud cases ever on Canadian territory. The conditions under which this contract was awarded are suspect and we are being kept in the dark about them. Bill C-22 even leaves open the possibility or gives the government complete latitude to compensate those who might have lost when this process of privatization was halted.

(1730)

Why not get right to the bottom of this question? It could prove useful to deal with similar cases in the future, because we must not lose sight of the fact that in many cases, the political staff and the lobbyists who were involved in this transaction and in the whole Pearson Airport privatization process are the same ones who are now working on other files, whether to promote the interests of the companies they represent or simply as professional lobbyists.

As we have said over and over and will continue to repeat for the next three years if necessary, we from the Bloc Québécois are under the impression this is one of the worse cases of patronage in the history of this country. I am starting to wonder, and even if I never managed to get an answer since Bill C-22 has been under consideration, I put the question to the Liberal government: Is it because it realized that the interests of friends,

former friends or great friends of the party were at stake that, on the strength of a simple report, the Liberal government now refuses, or so it seems, to answer to an extensive and in-depth commission of inquiry into the whole process, a process which according to Mr. Nixon's summary report, was mind-boggling, full of inappropriateness, oddities and things never heard of in this sort of transaction?

This was a contract to privatize one of Canada's most profitable airports. So, all the considerations, the entire process which have led to this contract being drafted should be brought out in the open. The players should also come out in the open. Let me remind you, Madam Speaker, the names of a few of the friends of the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party who were involved in this process, this privatization attempt. It is always a pleasure for me to name names because, so far, the government has refused to clarify the involvement of these people, when we know full well that they are very closely tied to the Liberal Party of Canada and perhaps, in fact certainly, to the party fund as well.

As you know, the Liberal Party of Canada, like all major Canadian establishment parties, is not subject to any legislation on political party financing or rather on the financing of political parties by the people, unlike the Bloc Québécois. So it is quite normal that a contract of this nature or a process leading to the privatization of the biggest Canadian airport would bring up the names of people, organizations or business owners who contribute large amounts of money to political party funds. Something like that could not happen with the Bloc Québécois because our hands are not tied by corporate, anonymous and impersonal contributions. We are disciplined in this respect and only accept contributions from real Quebec citizens. I think it is good for us and for democracy.

It is probably because they realized that friends of the Liberal Party of Canada were involved in this deal that they refuse to shed light on it. I repeat, as it can never be repeated often enough: the list of the people involved may help us understand not only why the Liberal government refuses to disclose all the facts but why its bill gives it all the latitude needed to bribe those directly or indirectly linked to the failed Pearson Airport privatization process.

You remember Senator Leo Kolber. He was the one who organized the cosy \$1,000-a-plate dinner where the guest of honour was the Prime Minister. Guests could shake hands with the Prime Minister in the midst of the election campaign and talk to him about their little problems, perhaps in connection with the Pearson Airport privatization or to the money they would lose if the privatization deal was cancelled. In short, Senator Leo Kolber was a stakeholder in this event and especially in the whole Pearson Airport privatization process.

Government Orders

(1735)

There was also Mr. Bronfman, who did not hesitate either to attend this \$1,000-a-plate dinner to shake hands with the future Prime Minister. Herb Metcalfe was also present. He is a lobbyist and former organizer for Mr. Jean Chrétien before he became Prime Minister. He is close to the Prime Minister and was very involved in the whole process to privatize Pearson Airport.

Ray Hession was also present. He is a former deputy minister of Industry and senior civil servant with Supply and Services, under the Liberal government of Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Mr. Hession was also involved in the process to privatize Pearson Airport.

There were others too, including some Conservatives. The current government is Liberal. I think it is worth repeating that we have serious doubts about the purpose of Bill C-22, given the names of the key players, the contributors who finance the Liberal Party of Canada, and also the inclusion of a clause designed to compensate those who may have suffered a prejudice when the Prime Minister decided to cancel the privatization process.

In addition to the fact that this government refuses to shed light on the role of these players, who are known to be very close to the Liberal Party of Canada, there is also the fact that the contract for the privatization of Pearson Airport is full of very unusual clauses.

That document is something else. Let me give you some examples which are still mind-boggling at the conclusion of the review process of Bill C-22.

The contract was for a 37-year period expiring on October 31, 2030, with an option to extend that period for an additional 20 years. Why is that? It is because the Ontario legislation provides that, on leases longer than 50 years, a provincial tax applies to any transfer of property.

Normally, if the duration of the lease had not been split, those involved in the transaction would have had to pay around ten million dollars to the Ontario revenue ministry. Just imagine, with the federal government's complicity, individuals were making deals and the terms of their contracts were such that they could avoid paying legitimate taxes to the Ontario government. That is rather amazing.

When in this country's history have we ever seen the federal government paving the way for a party to avoid provincial taxation? This is quite extraordinary.

Rent is calculated on the basis of gross revenue. According to the contract, Pearson Development Corporation was to turn over 30.5 per cent of its gross revenues for the previous year to the government, up to a maximum of \$125 million in gross revenues. For any amount in excess of \$125 million in gross

revenues, Pearson Development Corporation was required to pay the government 45.5 per cent of its gross revenues from the leasing operations.

Calculating gross revenue is an extremely technical process, but very important nonetheless because this type of clause is rarely found in contracts, even in those far less important than the one to privatize Pearson. For the purposes of this calculation, gross revenue includes all revenues generated through the operation of terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson, excluding ten significant deductions, which reduce the buyer's rental, accommodation and contracting costs.

The deductions amount to the taxes collected from consumers and passengers which are pocketed by Pearson Development Corporation on the government's behalf. Extraordinary sources of revenues are discounted for the purposes of calculating gross revenue. This is unusual when determining basic rent in a transaction such as this.

(1740)

When we look at revenues which, although not unusual, are infrequent and are not generated through the normal operation of the terminals, including access sales, we see that these too were not included in the calculation of gross revenue on which rent will be based.

The same holds true for investment revenue. The contract contains a number of bizarre provisions. Unless these are closely scrutinized and unless those individuals associated with the privatization process, the principal players in this deal, are called upon to testify—I named a few of these players a moment ago, but there are many others—until such time as we can ask them questions, we will not know the whole story as far as this deal is concerned. There are many incongruous aspects to the Pearson privatization contract.

Many questions also arise about the rebates and refunds awarded by Pearson Development Corporation in the case of airport equipment. Here again, we find some strange provisions. There is also something odd about the way the government will recover the costs associated with the occupation of airport space.

I will not give you a complete list of all the incongruities since time will not allow it. During the course of this debate, we have been able to bring to light a number of the contract's incongruous provisions which make this deal unparalleled in Canadian financial history.

We could have also talked about severance pay for Transport Canada employees. That situation is also disgusting. If you look at the facts, even dispassionately—passionately it is worse—if you think that the government of Canada had offered separation allowances to 160 of its own employees despite the fact they were guaranteed employment for two years with Pearson Development Corporation—

Government Orders

Separation allowances totalling \$5.5 million would have been paid to 160 federal employees while allowed to keep their jobs. That is revolting! It is totally unacceptable, particularly in view of the unemployment levels and the housing situation, when people are asking for social housing and getting none. I am bringing up social housing because I just attended a meeting on the subject and once again, the government has refused to at least consider alternatives so that the neediest—some 1.2 million households nationwide—can find decent housing and not have to spend in the neighbourhood of 50 per cent of their income on rent.

You can imagine how I feel about a government that does not want to listen to the complaints or the cries of despair of the most ill-favoured members of our society, that does not want to pay any attention whatsoever to the social housing situation in Canada and is pursuing the very policy it had been denouncing in no uncertain terms since 1992. I am speaking on behalf of all their spokespersons when I contrast this with the government allowing employees guaranteed to keep their jobs for the next years at least to be paid \$5.5 million in compensation. I am at a loss to know how social justice works in this government.

The latitude the government is giving itself as well as the almost impudent fashion it presents the capacity the government has to compensate friends of the system without specifying any amounts—it could be in the millions—can also be contrasted with the brick wall we are facing when we want to raise issues like social housing and unemployment insurance cuts with the government. However hard I try to stay cool in face of such injustice and double standard, my blood boils. Friends of the party—the very rich friends of the Liberal Party of Canada and contributors to the party fund—get to be treated one way while those who have no voice, no power and no lobbyists representing them on the Hill, in ministers' offices or in the office of the Prime Minister are treated differently.

I think there are enough grounds—and I still cannot see why the government is so obstinate—for making an effort to bring to light the whole story regarding the privatization process at Pearson, with all the dealings involved and all the financial inconsistencies. I think this deserves an answer from the government. If it is not true that the friends of the system had their palms greased and stand to benefit even more under Bill C-22, then let us get to the bottom of this business and get all the facts.

(1745)

We want to believe you but not on the basis of a superficial analysis commissioned by the Prime Minister, which probably has some value—I am referring to the Nixon Report—but not as much as a thorough, serious review of all the elements surrounding this deal and of what it could involve in the future.

I think we will be able to continue this debate beyond Bill C-22 after the lobbyists bill is tabled. We should find out the general provisions tomorrow. Let us not forget, however, that many of the Pearson players, as I pointed out at the beginning of my speech, are professional lobbyists. These people will continue to haunt the halls of this building and try to persuade the government to go back on its decisions, sometimes perhaps with bad intentions.

I am not saying that all lobbyists have bad intentions. On the contrary. I know lobbyists who express their clients' views in a quiet manner, but I also know other lobbyists whose integrity can sometimes be questioned, especially when they are much too close to this government and when they represent interests contributing to the election fund of the Liberal Party of Canada.

For all these reasons, the Bloc Québécois will vote against Bill C-22. We are still demanding a commission of inquiry to uncover all the facts on this deal, and it is not true that such an investigation would cost millions of dollars and take a year and a half. I think that the House of Commons has all it needs to conduct such an investigation and that, if we act in good faith, we should be able to proceed rather quickly by having the principal players in the failed Pearson Airport privatization deal testify.

I also think it is worthwhile for transparency's sake that the people of Quebec and Canada find out how the government deals with such important issues and how much influence lobbyists exert, often in an underhand way. Lobbyists often cast a shadow over government decisions, especially when they may represent the interests of the Liberal Party in some respects.

I hope the government will respond favourably to our request. It would be a good example of what it claims it wants to achieve during this mandate, that is, acting with honesty and transparency and serving the people of Quebec and Canada well. I think it would be a good start. If members on the other side of the House share our sense of democracy, they should agree to the Bloc Québécois's request.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to what our colleague said. The hon. member recalls the commitment which the present Prime Minister made in the last election campaign. First of all, if we were elected, we would immediately conduct a full review of the Pearson transaction, which we did, and that we would have a person of some standing to conduct this inquiry. In fact, the person who did it is a former representative of Ontario in London, a former minister, a former deputy premier of Ontario, someone who is well known, at least to all the provincial parties in Ontario, as really qualified and of unquestionable integrity.

On this point, the member opposite would have trouble finding anyone in the Ontario Legislature, in the present NDP government, in the provincial Liberal party or among Conservative members at Queen's Park, who would disagree with what I just said.

So we had a person of that stature to do the work. He recommended that we end the contract. The government did so. Then the government said that it agreed to defray only the expenses of those who entered this contractual agreement with the previous government but not lobbyists' expenses.

I wonder what the member opposite is driving at. Obviously the lobbyists will not be compensated; we know that. The profits that the companies lost will not be compensated; we already know that. We know all those things. The parliamentary committee heard just about all the witnesses who wanted to appear before it, maybe not all the witnesses that my colleague opposite wanted, but still a good representation of the population and we did what we promised Canadians.

The hon. member will have to explain to me and to Canadian voters what more could be asked for. We did what we promised Canadians. We did it in good faith. We terminated that agreement which of course was contrary to the interests of Canadians.

The hon. member must understand that this agreement concluded by the government was not good and we ended it. Our government ended it. The hon. member should speak up and recognize the good decision made by the Liberal government. I tell you that if the hon. member searches his conscience in the next few minutes and answers us after Private Members' Business, he could easily see that he is wrong to oppose this bill. He could even vote for it a little later today on final reading.

I submit this proposal to you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order! I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, but I am certain that the House would like to hear from the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot before we move on to Private Members' Business.

Mr. Loubier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the few remaining seconds which my colleague wanted to take up.

No one here has ever doubted Mr. Nixon's integrity—far from it. Mr. Nixon fulfilled the mandate given to him by the Prime Minister. But the Prime Minister had stated that he would shed light specifically on the twists and turns surrounding the Pearson Airport privatization process. So why stop halfway, after

Private Members' Business

getting a summary evaluation, after even Mr. Nixon—whose integrity was never in doubt—stated that there were very weird things in this matter involving extraordinary influence by former political staff and lobbyists, and that he had never seen anything like it. So why be afraid to shed light on the subject. As I mentioned previously, if there is no truth to the assertion that these are friends of the Liberal Party of Canada, why be afraid to get right down to it? We want the truth, the exact truth.

Mr. Nixon identified certain problems that were sufficient to justify immediately stopping the privatization process. But we do not know everything there is to know about this whole process, the players involved, the fact that unseemly behaviour may have occurred, gross irregularities in the financial transactions, and we cannot know it without an exhaustive public inquiry into the specifics of this matter, in which the people who were closely or remotely connected with the privatization process would be made to appear as witnesses. But the truth about this attempted privatization and the influence wielded by the lobbyists involved will never be entirely known. This is why we are calling for an exhaustive review, and never did I or my colleagues cast any doubt on Mr. Nixon's integrity. I believe that satisfactorily answers my colleague's remarks.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Order, please. It being 5.51 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]

NON-CONFIDENCE MOTIONS

The House resumed from May 25, consideration of the motion; and of the amendment.

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, on January 20 this year, the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam tabled a motion whose purpose—and I say this for the benefit of our listeners who may be wondering where all this started—was to allow members to express themselves freely and to vote against the party line, without fear of bringing down the government should a vote, fortunately or unfortunately, go against the government, and the hon. member made it clear such a vote should not be interpreted as a motion of non-confidence.

Private Members' Business

That being said, there are a number of elements in this motion, and I am trying to put them in order because to discuss the amendment to the amendment without discussing the main motion would be to overlook the broader implications. When we talk about a free vote, and I read the hon. member's speech, we are talking about seeking the views of constituents to ensure that the member responds to these views through the way he votes in the House. Supporters of a free vote claim this is necessary if the member is to fully represent the views of his constituents.

Nothing could be further from the truth. You will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the member's role is not just to represent the views of his constituents but also and above all to promote the interests of those constituents. In fact, we all realize that our constituents do not all share the same views. There is a wide range of views. There is also a range of interests. So how do we pick and choose between these views and interests? Are we supposed to turn into a calculator and wait until the telephone rings and the mail comes in and see which pile is the biggest? This pile is bigger so we should do that. Good heavens, if that is what a member is supposed to do, a calculator could do the job.

I believe members are also and above all elected for their good judgment, or at least I hope so. Whatever we discuss, the member will have to examine the issues, talk about them, do research and finally get a handle on the subject. This is not a matter of opinions or interests, it is a matter of having a good grasp of the issues. Through his membership in various committees and through his own research and the research done by his staff, a member is able to develop and define his position, in the best interests of all his constituents. This exercise cannot take place in a vacuum.

We have to meet our constituents. Like all members, when I am in my riding on Friday, Saturday and Sunday, I try to meet as many constituents as possible. I go to various meetings, I take part in a number of festivities, I meet members of municipal councils, senior citizens clubs and chambers of commerce, I meet business people, workers and various types of employees, and I listen. I listen to what they have to say, I check their interests, I tell them about the results of my research and my studies, and I explain what I have seen and heard.

(1800)

Through dialogue, and not through the use of a calculator, I can better identify the real issues and ensure improved services and a happier life for my fellow citizens. Our constituents' opinion serves as a guide helping us to better target our research and better serve our ridings.

In reality, an MP is never alone. He or she works with a caucus and also with all the other parties in this House. Indeed, even if I thought I had the best ideas for my constituents, I would still

have to convince my peers, first the members of our caucus and, eventually, the members of this House.

How can that be done, if not through the processes in place? I am not saying that these processes are great. In fact, I think they are totally outdated and ineffective, but they are there and we must make do with them.

I would first check in committee to see if my ideas get the support of my peers, and then I would turn to my caucus. I would also try to find out if other MPs from my region share similar views. We all have constituents who, up to a point, share the same concerns, worries and hopes. We have to find solutions which suit the population as a whole.

So, are those ideas of mine as good as I think they are? The regional and national caucus would enable me to find out what my colleagues think. They too, of course, have ideas. I am not the only one to have useful information or brilliant ideas. My colleagues express their views and this dialogue eventually leads to a decision, by the caucus, as to which solution is the most adequate for all the members.

Within our caucus, my vote is strictly a personal decision. I can always freely express and discuss my views, hear other opinions, and eventually accept a consensus. Consequently, when I come here in the House, I back the position developed by the caucus, and not just my own point of view.

It would be extremely simplistic and probably somewhat pretentious on my part to think that I have this ability to come up with the best solutions. In that context, it is easy to see that a free vote would become an excuse to bypass party colleagues and openly express dissenting opinions. This is not what the democratic process is all about. Rather, it means that we go and get the information from our constituents, that we get any other information available, that we put it all together to come up with acceptable solutions, all the while benefitting from our colleagues' experience and knowledge, before finally reaching a consensus on the best solution, which we, as members of a caucus, then defend in this House, in accordance with its rules.

(1805)

[English]

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out to the hon. member from the Bloc that my motion today has nothing to do with any wonderful or brilliant ideas I might have as a member of this House.

What we are talking about today is representing our constituents in this House. Those are the people we were elected to represent and we are responsible to them.

I appreciate the opportunity to begin the debate in the last hour of Motion No. 89 which advocates the relaxation of the confidence convention and, flowing from that, freer voting as party members of this House.

I have listened with interest to those who have spoken in the debate in this place and I have also listened attentively to witnesses who have come before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs who have addressed the issue of freer votes.

There are those who argue against the motion of dissent being exhibited through freer voting by the attempt to change the basic premise upon which this motion is founded in order to argue against it. For example, the member for Vancouver Quadra explained that we are not all here as independents elected on our own. I agree. We in the Reform Party realize this fact. We do not want to reduce the House of Commons to chaos and we do not believe that the timely expression of dissent by a few members would do so.

The opinion of those involved in the writing of the McGrath report in 1985 and those who sat on the House management committee in 1993 was that dissent should be allowed to be expressed without fear of retaliation by the leadership of the political party concerned. They thought it would make this House a healthier place where members on occasion would not have to vote the party line on all legislative matters.

It might help members better represent their constituents and it may also allow those constituents to feel that their views were being directly represented on the floor of the House of Commons.

Speaking of representing the views of constituents, I want to thank the member for Hamilton West for referring to this matter in his speech on this motion. He stated, referring to me: "The hon. member opposite is sadly mistaken if she thinks I or anyone else on this side of the House can be blindly led. If I supported a government objective that went against any of my well known principles I would be laughed out of this House, out of this job".

However, at the end of his speech he wavered from this bold statement when he said: "It is not the individual vote, it is the collective. It is the understanding of what we believe to be in the best interest of our constituents, of our riding, of our province and of our country".

I am not sure but I believe this second phrase contradicts the earlier bold one in which the member stated he would support his constituents' points of view against any attempt to be led around by the nose by his party.

I also want to assure my friend from St. Boniface that by the adoption of this motion the kinds of judgments we have to make as members of Parliament will not be automatically replaced by views advanced by constituents. It is the belief of the Reform Party that matters will come along in the life of a Parliament which were not addressed either directly or indirectly during the

Private Members' Business

previous election. There is no prior party position on these matters.

It is our belief that if a member wishes to dissent from the position eventually taken by the member's political party, the member should be able to do so without fear of retribution at the hands of the party leadership.

We are not advocating, as was expressed by the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, that everything be a free vote. I listened to the hon. member when he spoke in this House on May 25 and I appreciate the fact that confidence was taken out of the standing orders of the House of Commons as a result of the first report of the McGrath committee.

However, what I do not believe the member realizes is the fact it was removed made little difference. The attitudinal change on the part of the member so strongly advocated by McGrath has not taken place.

By comparison with Great Britain, Australia and New Zealand, Canada's political parties are the most tightly controlled by their respective leadership. In Australia and New Zealand, while voting against the party line is tolerated, the influence of the private member is greatest when there is a labour government. In that situation the caucus elects members to sit in cabinet and the Prime Minister allocates the portfolios.

As I have said before, this situation leads to constant interaction between leadership and backbench members wherein the views of backbench members have great influence on public policy. Is that not what we want?

(1810)

In order to be elected by caucus to serve in cabinet one must have the support of those who will not be in cabinet. To be re-elected to cabinet one surely must have demonstrated a willingness to listen to the concerns of caucus members and adjust legislation accordingly. This would result in increased influence over public policy being placed in the hands of backbenchers. That is a good sign.

However, it is in Britain where in recent times backbench independence has been asserted with members voting against the party line and in some cases defeating government legislation.

Professor Philip Norton, an academic on freer votes in Britain, explains that this phenomenon of cross-party voting led to a growing awareness of what could be achieved by such action and a recognition that the consequences expected from government defeats such as resignation or punishment by the leadership did not materialize. They did not perceive it as a threat.

This produced a change of attitude of many MPs as the old differential attitude was replaced by a participatory attitude. Backbenchers became involved in and were influencing government policy. This situation continues today in Britain.

Private Members' Business

Finally, I want to refer to the evidence given by Professor Robert Jackson when he appeared before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs a few weeks ago. He does not believe in freer voting by members and he is a strident critic of the McGrath report, a report that is really accepted by members in this House. His main concern was that freer voting would result in chaos, with the government virtually unable to govern. This is absurd.

We are only advocating limited dissent expressed from time to time without fear of repercussions from the leadership. We in the Reform Party want to see the House express itself positively on this motion and therefore we accept the amendment advanced by the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell.

However, in recognition of the fact that freer voting or the expression of dissent from the party line rarely occurs in this place I wish to make a further amendment.

I move, seconded by my friend from Calgary West, that the amendment be amended by adding immediately following the word "continue" the word "increasingly" so that the motion as amended would read:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should continue increasingly to permit members of the House of Commons to fully represent their constituents' views on the government's legislative program and spending plans by adopting the position that the defeat of any government measure, including a spending measure, shall not automatically mean the defeat of the government unless followed by the adoption of a formal motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to speak on the motion put forward by the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam who raises some very important issues. First, there is the question of confidence mentioned in her motion. Solidarity is the corner stone of party discipline which is the guiding principle behind the party system in Canada.

The system of government in Canada is based on cohesive political parties. The Canadian parliamentary system is a system of responsible government. The party with a majority in the House of Commons must prove that it has the support of the majority of members of Parliament. A majority government seldom has problems, since the voters have used their power to make their wishes known. So, why erode this principle?

(1815)

In a responsible government, the party in office is mandated by the voters to implement a specific legislative agenda. How can members think they can better serve their constituents by choosing not to support their own political party? Party discipline is linked to the concept of responsible government and the principle of confidence. The Constitution Act of 1867 provides Canada with a responsible executive within a parliamentary government.

In 1983, the Canadian Study of Parliament Group ordered Gallup to conduct a poll on public perception of Parliament. It is mainly in Quebec that members of Parliament are seen as proxies rather than delegates. That is due to the differences in the way constituents perceive their elected members of Parliament.

The issue of freer votes is linked to the role each hon. member must play. Freer votes would tend to imply more autonomy for individual members of Parliament. Yet, members can express their views, for example, before their party caucus, where members regularly hold discussions to define and clarify the positions to be taken. I do not think that we have been elected to reform the parliamentary system of Canada.

Of course, a relaxation of party discipline would increase the autonomy of backbenchers. But what would the collapse of our system give us? Short-sighted freedom. Let us have a look at the wording of the motion. It says that the government should permit members of the House of Commons to fully represent their constituents' views, which suggests that MPs do not represent their constituents' views, in short that the present system of representation is not working. Why is the member making no mention of the notion of party? Are MPs working in isolation and did they not explain, during the election campaign, the policies they would support? MPs are members of a political organisation which they support, they are closely intertwined.

Voters who elected the 54 Bloc members voted for the ideas the Bloc Quebecois is promoting. They form a strong delegation and when I vote, I feel I represent my constituents in the House. People in my riding placed their confidence in me because they knew what to expect. They voted for a program, they voted for the ideas we are promoting here on their behalf.

I chose the Bloc Quebecois because this party is in my likeness. It opens its arms to anyone who is concerned with the well-being of Quebec and tries to promote our country, either here or elsewhere. I was elected on a political platform for a good reason, I share the ideas promoted by my party, and I cannot see how I could be unfaithful to my constituents by doing what they elected me for. This way of looking at things opposes elements which, far from being contradictory, are in reality interconnected. To come to such a conclusion shows a total lack of understanding of our political system.

(1820)

The Bloc Quebecois presented an electoral platform to the people of Quebec who, democratically, elected 54 members of our party to represent them in the House of Commons. I repeat that saying that I am not in touch with my constituents because I would be voting with my party is absurd. It negates the fact that I belong to a political party that I joined because of a very deep conviction. Joining a political party means sharing a vision and therefore being stronger. The platform of a political party is

Private Members' Business

intended to regroup people who have something in common, who share a number of points of view.

The people in my riding elected me because I belonged to the Bloc Québécois and I do not see how and for what reason I could separate myself from my group. I have a clear mandate from my constituents and voting along party line seems only natural. As I said, we cannot play the wishes of our constituents against the party line because the people who elected us also chose our party and our leader. We have a clear and concrete program, and what the hon. member is suggesting does not apply to us.

The wording of the motion does not take into account the fact that those who voted for the Bloc Québécois share a number of objectives. They mandated their member to defend Quebec's interests. Obviously, Quebec spoke loud and clear during the last election. Quebecers decided to send to Ottawa a large group with a clear mandate. We are not an old party, we do not have the problems associated with a weak ideological cohesiveness.

Our constituents trusted us. They gave us their votes on October 25. We are not worn out by years of politicking, and unlike others we are not uprooted. We were given a mandate and that implies responsibilities. Quebecers exercised their rights under a universal suffrage system.

As for the amendment by the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, that the motion be amended by adding after the word “should” the following: “continue to”, I have only one comment. This, Mr. Speaker, is simply playing with words, it seems to indicate that members always have the possibility to vote as they please. Therefore, the Bloc Québécois is against the amendment and against the motion.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to this much discussed motion again today. The member who introduced the motion said in her motion, first of all, that the government should permit members of the House of Commons to fully represent their constituents' views, and so forth.

The motion assumed that members were not doing that, since its purpose was to permit them to do something that was apparently prohibited before. As was pointed out by the hon. member for the Bloc, nothing could be further from the truth. Parliamentarians are here to represent the interests of their constituents. If they already represent their constituents, they need no permission to do so. However, if we dig a little deeper, we see there is something else in this motion which asks the government to permit members to fully represent their constituents' views. If one asks the government, presumably this means a member on the government side, because after all, the Bloc member opposite seldom asks me, in my capacity of Deputy Government Whip, how to vote. Of course this also applies to the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam, who seldom asks me how to vote on a bill, and I do not expect her to.

(1825)

So presumably, the hon. member's request was for government members to be allowed to vote freely. I do not see why she did not mention opposition members. Was this an oversight? A few days ago, there was a vote in this House on a proposal for a high-speed train between Montreal and Toronto, if I remember correctly. The Quebec City—Windsor corridor—of course, the train would not be built simultaneously in the entire corridor. No one was suggesting that. The proposal was for building this high-speed train. We on the government side noticed that members of the Bloc Québécois all voted the same way, that members of the Reform Party all voted the same way, and that members of the Liberal Party, the government members, were the only members to vote on the basis of a free vote. Some were in favour and others were against. So it is clear the motion should have been amended. Members of the government already had the right to vote freely, and they did so on that day.

There were two options: first, amend the motion to allow opposition members to vote freely. After all, members on the government side were already voting freely. Or the motion would be amended to say that we would continue to permit government members to vote freely since they were already doing so. That is when I moved my amendment that government members be able to continue to vote freely.

However, I am always a little worried about members opposite. I really would like Reform Party members to be able to vote freely as well.

[English]

How pleasant it would be if Reform members could vote freely as we do in the Liberal caucus. Mr. Speaker, you will understand my concern in that regard because they have not yet had free votes in the Reform Party. The same applies to the Bloc. I only wish that they could vote as freely as we do on the government side.

In any case the Reform Party now says that the motion should be amended so that it would read that the government should continue to increasingly permit free votes. I am not sure how one does that but I am certainly not against it because government members already have that freedom I previously described.

I was hoping that the member for the Reform Party would amend the motion to finally provide for a means by which opposition members could vote freely. That really would have been innovative. That would have made the Reform Party a truly modern parliamentary institution as is the present government.

I guess we will have to wait for that motion to occur some other time. Perhaps I could put a motion on the *Order Paper* which would read something like this: “That this House permits the third party to vote freely as does the government”. That would be a good motion. I think my colleague, the member for St. Boniface, would agree that it would be a very progressive thing to do, to permit opposition members to vote as freely as we do on this side of the House.

Private Members' Business

I heard the discourses of hon. members from the Reform Party and others. There is a statement or at least an insinuation in there to the effect that the rules right now make it such that everything is a matter of confidence. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have already explained, and I have given evidence, how in private members' hour the government side is the only side that votes freely. The opposition maybe some day will come around to it.

(1830)

On the issue of supply days, members know very well that the report of the Special Committee on the Reform of the House of June 18, 1985 already has made that change to the standing orders. It is on pages 106 and 107 and highly commended to the people across the way. It is excellent bedside reading. Members will know, having read it, that at least as it pertains to supply days and opposition days, they are no longer automatically a matter of confidence. That was passed on June 18, 1985.

I know that the Reform Party is not a progressive bunch but it has been nine years. One would think that after nine years even its members would have been aware of the change. It is three days short of nine years, mind you, because this is June 15, 1994. It was passed on June 18, 1985. Perhaps over the next three days, members will become aware of it.

Finally, members of the Reform Party have a misconception that works something like this. Government MPs are coerced to vote for the government and opposition MPs spontaneously all vote the same way without coercion. Of course that is sheer nonsense. Members of the Liberal Party vote similarly on many issues because fundamentally they believe in the same things. Reform members presumably vote similarly because they believe in the same things.

If members across the way, particularly the member from Calgary who is paying close attention to this and I think is getting ready to take copious notes, do not realize this and if the hon. member thinks that government members are somehow coerced into voting in a similar way then surely the argument has to be extended to say he does it too. After all, I understand he is the deputy leader of his party. Therefore he would probably be in a position to dictate to other members of his party.

Members can see that the arguments presented by the members across just do not work. When they say the government members should be voting more freely, they should put a mirror in front of the first desk in the House and look within to see that in their own party they, least of any political party in the House of Commons, have anything that could even be remotely considered a free vote.

On the other hand, we in our party have proven in the past and the voting record of the House would demonstrate that we have voted freely on the government side. Such has not happened either in the Reform nor in the Bloc Quebecois.

I am not trying to defend the Bloc. That is the last thing I would ever do, as most members know, but at least they do not pretend they are doing otherwise. The member has given an excellent discourse on how he believes the constitutional conventions have worked traditionally and how a party stands as a unit and how it works that way.

[Translation]

Of course I think he took this assumption a little further than it should be taken, but in any event, at least he did not claim to go against the party line. But when I hear the Reform Party, for instance, that wants to set rules for others which the party itself is not prepared to follow, I say: Let us not get carried away!

Hon. members opposite know perfectly well that Liberal members in this House were elected with an excellent prime minister and a red book we are now busy implementing. We intend to offer the people of Canada good government, while exercising the freedom I just described in the last few minutes.

I intend to indicate to this House that as far as I am concerned, I will support the motion on the amendment to the amendment as moved by the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam.

[English]

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, can you tell me how much time I have? I gather we are near the end of this.

(1835)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The member will have until 6.39 or approximately five to six minutes.

Mr. Harper (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I am addressing the motion of the member for Mission—Coquitlam to permit free votes more frequently in the Chamber, specifically for MPs to fully represent the views of their constituents of the government's legislative program, and that a defeat of the government not automatically be considered a measure of confidence.

I am happy to follow the previous speaker, the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, not only because he endowed a promotion on me today but because he raised a number of issues that are crying with such misinformation that they demand a response. I am happy to do so if anyone is still watching after that particular discourse.

The member gave an example of what occurred in Parliament, that there has not been very much cross party voting. It is a good illustration of what we are talking about here. The motion does not talk about members wildly firing off in all directions on every particular issue. It implies that under certain conditions and for very particular reasons of constituent representation we would expect and allow members of various parties to represent those views.

So far, as we all know, the government has presented a very light legislative agenda to the House. The issues that are divisive between the parties have in every single case touched directly upon the program on which we as members of the Reform Party and which they as members of the Liberal Party were elected.

The one instance the member provided of some free voting in the House was when three Liberal members broke with the government to vote different from government members on one particular private member's motion which he chastises our party for not having split on. That particular motion was that we build an expensive infrastructure of high speed rail between Windsor and Quebec City. Given the ridings of members of Parliament of the Reform Party, it is not hard to figure out that they would be unwilling unanimously and freely to agree to such a ridiculous proposition from the point of view of their own constituents.

That should clear up some of the misconceptions raised about free voting and about what it means. Voting freely, which we favour and which we have advocated, is not that we would vote stupidly as the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell suggested.

The second point that really should be made concerns background. We should remember when we get into notions of cabinet confidence and caucus solidarity a bit of history. I seriously hope the member is not trying to convince the House and Canadians that there is no such thing as confidence in the Chamber today, any more than there is no such thing as parties. These kinds of positions are maybe legalistic but clearly ridiculous.

Historically the function of confidence has changed dramatically. We should remember that in the early days of the parliamentary system the purpose of the confidence convention was to ensure that ministers of the crown, who originally were representatives in a very true sense of the Monarch, had the confidence of the elected people to function in their capacities. Today the meaning or the context has entirely changed. Today the Monarch is not usually a direct participant in the political affairs or daily affairs of the nation. The cabinet is representative of the outcome of general elections. The cabinet confidence and the

Private Members' Business

confidence convention applied to the Chamber in this day and age is not to make cabinet report to the House. It has been turned around in the new context to make the House responsible to cabinet. That is the problem we have to look at.

I fully support the motion. We should give some thought to why it is, in spite of the legalistic declarations that appear in some of the standing orders and others, that the confidence convention has not been broken. We should ask ourselves what needs to be done to create a new kind of system.

We have suggested from time to time that the Prime Minister could rise and suggest to the House that there be the freedom to vote more freely. It is true, but in and of itself it is not adequate. It suggests that the Prime Minister possesses such power that he or she could simply determine whether or not votes were free and, that raises questions about whether votes really are free.

There are a number of mechanisms in other countries; the three line whips in Great Britain, the fact that political parliamentary parties are organized on a more bottom-up basis in countries like Australia. This allows a very different style of leadership to emerge whereby it is not just the formalities of practice that apply but there are real issues of diversity of power within political parties that give members greater say and a greater ability to represent their constituents, particularly where those conflict with more broad party interests that are not necessarily representative.

There is a lot I want to say on this issue of how we should examine the deficiencies of the power structure. Unfortunately, I do not have the time. I appreciate the Chair's patience and I will terminate my remarks now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I thank the hon. member for Calgary West. I would like to extend to the member for Mission—Coquitlam, whose private members' motion it is, M-89, the opportunity to close the debate.

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to sum up today. This is my first experience with having a motion drawn in a private members' situation and I am honoured that it was deemed to be a votable one.

I and members of the Reform have really enjoyed debating this issue that is so dear to our hearts with other members in the House. I respectfully urge all members to support Motion 89, for this is why we are here in the House, to democratically make change. Nothing is stagnant. I am not asking to make change for the sake of change, but relaxation of the confidence convention will result in a more accountable and workable House of Commons. I urge everyone to support us on this motion.

Government Orders

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 6.39 p.m. it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put all questions necessary to dispose of Motion M-89 now before the House.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Carried on division.

(Amendment to amendment agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The next question is on the amendment as amended. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment, as amended?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Carried on division.

(Amendment, as amended, agreed to.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The next question is on the main motion, as amended. Is the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion, as amended?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Carried on division.

(Motion, as amended, agreed to.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

(1845)

[*Translation*]

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AGREEMENTS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure in the House on third reading of Bill C-22 to explain why my party, the Bloc Québécois, is vigorously opposing the adoption of this infamous bill.

The Nixon report left parliamentarians in the House unsatisfied. Mr. Nixon, whose integrity is beyond reproach, within his mandate, an ad hoc mandate to clarify only a few aspects, nevertheless concluded that there had been undue manipulation, influence peddling and political interventions at the highest level. Those were the conclusions of his report. He submitted his report to our well-known Prime Minister, the hon. member for Shawinigan, with no recommendation other than the cancellation of the contract.

I think we agree that the contract should be cancelled, but the Nixon report left us unsatisfied. After all, we did not learn much about the whole story. Concerning the possibility of political influence peddling, were there any bribes involved? Were some civil servants bribed? Was there mischievous or pernicious interfering so that not only this immoral deal was signed but, even worse, a blind eye was turned to true criminal actions, to fraudulent intentions, to criminal intentions to defraud the Canadian people and to rob them of important parts of their heritage?

A few years ago, I acted as inspector in a bankruptcy. It was obvious that it was a fraudulent bankruptcy. The bankrupt had asked some of his friends to forge him a couple of bills and, when the creditors met, these friends of the bankrupt, who were also creditors, at least on paper, opposed practically every solution suggested by the other creditors to recover their money. Then, the official receiver, a man of experience, looked them right in the eyes and asked them if they had been bribed. Their attitude had left him no other choice. It was recognized that these people had produced forged bills to be able as creditors to come to the rescue of their friend who was in dire straits.

Frankly, I cannot help but compare them with some members opposite who so determinedly defend what I consider to be the rip-off of the century.

(1850)

To my knowledge, there has not been during this century such a blatant, shoddy attempt to defraud the public treasury of hundreds of millions of dollars and deprive Canadians, including the hon. member for Saint-Boniface, of substantial sums of money to which they are rightfully entitled.

It hurts to see parliamentarians call into question each other's integrity, to see the integrity of parliamentarians who came here for no other reason but to help administer the country's finances—parliamentarians like myself who do not have their hands in the government cookie jar—called into question by some of their colleagues outside the House. I can understand why the member for Saint-Boniface is so riled up.

One Friday evening not long ago, I visited some Franco-Ontarians in Toronto. Speaking about the Pearson deal, these Franco-Ontarians told us, the members of the Bloc, mentioning names which I will not mention at this time, mentioning that members from I believe the riding of Broadview—Greenwood, or was it Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, had no doubt been bought off by the lobbyists because they were defending so staunchly the Pearson Airport deal.

The Deputy Speaker: Order please! As the hon. member knows, I have just arrived, but I heard something quite startling. I hope the hon. member did not say that a member had been bought off.

Mr. Lebel: I did not say that.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: Very well then. Please carry on.

Mr. Lebel: You probably misheard, Mr. Speaker, because you had just taken the Chair. I said that when I was in Toronto, people in the audience had made malicious insinuations such as the one I quoted earlier but would rather not repeat. It is heartbreaking for a parliamentarian to see fellow citizens questioning the moral integrity of their elected representatives because this can only rebound on this House, whichever side you are sitting on. It hurts and I think, in fact I am convinced, the hon. members for Broadview—Greenwood and Glengarry—Prescott—Russell have shown an open-mindedness, an honesty and an understanding that does them credit.

I do not like peddling malicious gossip heard in the basement of a hotel, as was the case in this instance, except to say that it hurts.

Then, when we want to know why people who have tried to pull the wool over our eyes, literally stealing from our government, should be defended so doggedly, the point can be made that the people across the way have laid themselves open to criticism.

I know full well that the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell is an honest man. I have no doubt about his intellectual enfranchisement and far be it from me to doubt his moral integrity. I want to make myself quite clear on this point. The fact remains that the government does nothing to prevent being blamed for wrongdoings.

So, I think they had the duty, Mr. Speaker—

(1855)

The Deputy Speaker: The Deputy Government Whip, on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Being as conversant as you are, Sir, with the rules, you reminded the member across the way that it was improper to impute motive. To say that someone is quoting somebody else to do the same thing is just as reprehensible as saying it oneself.

The equivalent—and, Mr. Speaker, you will be very familiar with it—is that one cannot make an accusation in the House by putting it in the interrogative. That makes the affirmation just the same.

The member has questioned my motives. Moments ago in the House he insinuated, under the guise of quoting someone else, that I had been bought off. Those are accusations of a criminal nature. I would suggest the member has very few alternatives. One is to withdraw those words immediately or to make them outside the House and suffer the consequences that go along with them.

I have asked some tough questions in my day, but I do not believe I have said that another member of Parliament had committed a criminal act. I have not said so on the floor of the House or anywhere else.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether or not these actions are acceptable. If not I will have to come back in a few moments—and I give you notice now in preparation for a case of privilege because I believe that this is such.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The best solution, my dear colleagues, is the following. I am certain that the hon. member did not try to accuse another member of such a crime.

I think the best way to deal with this is for the hon. member to fully withdraw his words accusing his colleague of such behaviour. Then, I am sure, if the hon. member agrees, we will get on with the debate.

The hon. member for Chambly.

Mr. Lebel: Mr. Speaker, not only did I not make such accusations but I even praised the hon. member's moral integrity. I even said—you can read the record—that he enjoyed a complete moral enfranchisement. It means that I think he is totally honest.

If he rises against and does not quite understand what I said, it is not my problem but his. But that is not at all what I meant, Mr. Speaker. To make you happy, I will withdraw any insinuation that I did not make but that the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell may have imagined. I withdraw anything that may have offended him, just to make him happy.

[*English*]

Mr. McTeague: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In the same vein comments were made by the member relative to the member for Broadview—Greenwood. I would ask the Speaker to consider that the member retract the words as they pertain to that member.

In the view of the House and in view of what he has just said with reference to the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, he has clearly impugned that member's honour.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Someone told me that the hon. member—and I thank him for his co-operation—has withdrawn his remarks against any other member from the other side of the House. I think that is clear enough.

Again, the hon. member for Chambly.

Mr. Lebel: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any of that, but the thing with which I do not agree, and I hope that I can say it here, is that the members opposite invite criticism by trying to deny any wrongdoing in order to gain time—something that the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood said a while ago and that

Government Orders

was repeated on several occasions in this House—in order to finish with this Pearson Airport business once and for all, and I think that they are going about it the wrong way.

I believe that some people did commit criminal acts and I am not particularly pleased to see the names of my colleagues in this House associated with those of Hession, Doucet, Kolber and the likes. I think that those people chose the wrong way to avoid criticism.

(1900)

We tried everything to bring some transparency to this process but, as hard as it is to understand, our efforts were not even acknowledged. We were misled when we were told that we would have the opportunity to question at leisure witnesses that would appear before the committee which would be struck. When the time came, we could not question the witnesses because, we were told, one would not tell us anything new or another one had already said all he had to say. It was very difficult to draw up a list of witnesses, and most of them did not even show up to testify before the committee, except for one who surprised us and many people when he said: “I think that the government is going about it the wrong way. It should proceed by expropriation”. It is the very first time in Canadian history that we see the government unilaterally break a valid contract. I did not say “legitimate”; I said “valid”.

When I said on first reading that Our Gracious Sovereign had been misled, that is what I was alluding to. I said that the sovereign had come to behave like a shady dealer, going back not only on her word but also on her signature. That is sad for a Parliament that claims to be respectable and for a government that advertises itself in the whole wide world as a model of government. When we stoop to making our sovereign lose face because we did something reprehensible and when the only way to save the boat is for us to unilaterally break a contract, that is no feather in our cap. Frankly, there is nothing there to be proud of.

In committee, someone said: “If you want to cancel the contract, if you want to regain possession, you can always expropriate; that is the legal way to do it”.

In yesterday’s newspapers, Mr. Corcoran wrote: “Liberals are not fond of that process”. First, it might well take longer. It could lead to an in-depth discussion. It could force both parties to prove their claims with regard to damages, and we are likely to hear some truths that the Liberal government opposite would rather ignore. All these considerations led to this famous piece of legislation.

I heard the hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood tell us a moment ago that under clause 10 of the bill, no amount is payable in relation to any lobbyists’ fees. The hon. member for Broadview—Greenwood, I know, is a man of experience. He is not a newcomer on the federal scene, in this House. He should know that, generally, lobbyists are never directly hired by those

who give them a task to perform. There is a much simpler way to proceed: the person who has something to negotiate with the government hires a law firm, which hires a lobby to do the work. It is often a fine, honest job, but sometimes dirty work as in this case. But the law firm passes on as legal expenses everything that the lobby cost it and, as those who lost out on this project are now doing, they present a bill for \$175 million to the Minister of Transport and say, “This is what cancelling the contract cost us.” Of course the federal government will not pay any lobby directly by cheque; it will not pay Mr. Doucet or any other lobbyist.

(1905)

But of course the legal expenses or lawyers’ fees—whatever you call them—the bill from those people will be charged to the Government of Canada, when we already have a national debt of \$535 billion. I see some Liberals who do not even raise an eyebrow anymore when we mention such frightful figures; \$535 billion is a joke, it is not much when you are a good Liberal; you always get out of it.

Nevertheless, we have missed the boat. We have failed to tell the Canadian people: “Yes, there was malfeasance, yes, some friends of the regime may have profited from it, but we will find out the truth, we will bring it to light and the guilty will be punished. And the government will act in the best interests of the people.” Cancelling the contract is only one aspect of the shady deal; we should have gone much further, found out the truth, those who are at fault, those who misled our Sovereign and know what motivated them.

That is all I had to say on this subject. I find it sad that we are preparing to pass on third reading a bill that will leave doubt in the minds of millions of Canadians and Quebecers.

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I find the comments made by the hon. member from the Bloc Quebecois depressing. It is very sad to see someone allude to remarks made by Franco-Ontarians from my riding. The hon. member seems to be implying that these people are not prepared to accept something which everyone in Ontario knows, namely that this agreement was really a joke.

The hon. member knows that. Our party recognized that fact, during the election campaign and also when it formed the opposition. I find it very hard to believe that the hon. member, who just referred to the enormous deficit and to the national debt, did not get the numbers and figures mixed up regarding the bill sent by that organization.

[English]

My question is a simple one. It is unfortunate the member has had to impugn the integrity of some of the members in a roundabout way. I do not think the member has made a case. This contract was rejected whole-heartedly by the people of Ontario, the people of Toronto. Why does he think that democratic voice should be ignored by this government?

Government Orders

[Translation]

I imagine that this is an opposition which respects democracy. Maybe I used the wrong approach; maybe I did not have the appropriate information.

Mr. Lebel: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should have listened, because I said at the beginning that, of course, there is no option other than to cancel this contract. Everyone agrees on that, particularly residents from the Toronto area, because they are no longer concerned, and that is very understandable. I did say that and I repeat it again, but I am also saying that this is not enough.

When the bill refers to a cancellation, it is not an outright cancellation. In law, a principle says that *quod nullum est nullum producit effectum*. In other words, what is void is of no effect. If the Pearson Airport contract was retroactive to its date of effect, and was cancelled by right, *ab initio*, it would be void and of no effect. So, why are we giving it putative effects? Why are we trying to reward or compensate people who, for the most part, are responsible for their own misfortune? If they suffered a prejudice, it is through their own fault. That is what it means in law.

Are you really asking me this question in good faith? Yes, the contract was cancelled, as everyone wanted. However, everybody also wanted the government to catch the culprits, go to the bottom of this saga and find out what happened. You are carefully avoiding this aspect of the problem. You are saying that since the contract was cancelled, as everyone wanted, then the government did its job. To me, this is a strange way to fulfill your mandate.

(1910)

[English]

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak on Bill C-22 which deals with the potential compensation package for those involved in the Pearson airport deal that was struck by the previous government.

Of course, being among the many Canadians who have flown across the country on more than one occasion, we are all familiar with Pearson International Airport. We realize it is the major air link out of central Canada. It attracts a lot of attention and therefore it should cause us to take note of some of the consequences of the way we handle this deal and this compensation package.

This is an important bill not only for its content but also for its message. The cancellation of the Pearson airport deal, one of the first actions of the new government, symbolized the commitment of a new generation of politicians to reject old-style politics. The Pearson airport deal represented all that was wrong

with the Mulroney era, backroom dealing, favouritism for the politically connected; and an advancement of individual self-interest at the expense of public interest.

This measure was a necessary first step in demonstrating to Canadians that this Parliament is committed to listen to the people and to make the public interest its first priority. Bill C-22 has not been adequate to clear away the foul air and the dense fog which surrounds the Pearson airport deal.

People are losing faith in elected politicians and are reluctant to place their trust in them. This mistrust is undermining the legitimacy of our political institutions, including this very House. It is the responsibility of this Parliament to restore people's faith in government. Both the Reform Party and the Liberal Party realized the seriousness of this public disillusionment in their election campaigns.

The Liberals acknowledged the importance of restoring integrity to government in their red book. I would like to quote a sentence or two from the red book: "The most important asset of government is the confidence it enjoys of the citizens to whom it is accountable. If government is to play a positive role in society, as it must, honesty and integrity in our political institutions must be restored".

I completely agree with that statement. It is very similar to the sentiments of my own party. The Reform Party is concerned though by the signs that the Liberal government's commitment to restoring integrity to government is indeed faltering. Let me give a few examples.

First there is a concern of cases being documented of improper use of government aircraft and limousines. There is concern of the government's refusal to compel the release of polls. The minister has discretion in the decision of whether or not to release them. There is the government's delay in introducing the lobbyists legislation. It is just coming down the pipes of government now but it should have come down a considerable time ago so that it could have been implemented by this time.

There is the government's delay in appointing an ethics commissioner. Then there is the government's awarding of advertising contracts to political friends. The list goes on. There is the government's insistence in funding an industrial theme park in Shawinigan, the Prime Minister's riding, even though it is doomed to fail. I might also mention the failure of this government to reform the MPs' pension plan, a real bone of contention with Canadians.

The government must remain true to its commitments. When the people of Canada voted to defeat the Charlottetown accord and when they voted to send 52 Reformers to Ottawa, they were sending a message to all politicians, Reformers included. The old way of doing business is no longer acceptable. Canadians are demanding an end to elitism and to patronage.

Government Orders

It is the responsibility of the opposition to hold the government accountable for its actions. That is why we in the Reform Party will continue to demand that the government live up to the principles it campaigned on. We continue to demand that the government conduct its business according to the highest ethical standards. We will continue to demand that the government conduct its business in a fair, more transparent and more responsive fashion. To this end we will insist that any compensation package negotiated resulting from the cancellation of the Pearson airport deal be done openly, fairly and with the public interest at heart.

(1915)

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs)): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties, and I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That, in relation to the third reading of Bill C-22, an act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, the question be deemed to have been put, a recorded division deemed demanded, and the vote deferred until Thursday morning, June 16, 1994 immediately following the conclusion of the ordinary daily routine of business.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

The House resumed from June 6 consideration of the motion that Bill C-37, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, today's youth are getting a lot of press and for good reason. The workers, the taxpayers, the writers, the teachers and even the police of tomorrow are still children today. Our future, all the hopes and dreams of our society are bound up within our children.

When talking about the future I have to face the fact that someday I will be a senior citizen and the quality of care I receive will depend directly on the character of today's children. All of us have a clear and vested interest in our own future and in making sure that our children grow up to be responsible and caring.

That is just one reason why it is so disturbing to encounter the rash of grisly crimes that have been perpetrated by teenagers all across this country. If young criminals are the fringe element of our youth, does it mean that youth in general are also changing, only less so? What kind of generation are we raising? We found in the press that crime itself does not seem to be rising but we know that youth crime itself has skyrocketed. It seems that our

youth are becoming more and more involved in antisocial activities.

Even if a person has been brought up poorly there is no excuse for committing crime. Even a 10-year old generally knows right from wrong, knows they are not supposed to steal cars or knife someone. Even young people when they do wrong must be held accountable after the damages are done.

Some children reach a state where they are so hardened they become a danger to society. That is why I am pleased to see that the mandate of the act we are discussing tonight is changing under Bill C-37. The bill recognizes that the protection of innocent people in society is more important than the one who is actually doing the wrong and that putting the protection there is putting the protection where it belongs.

I am also pleased that the government is raising some 16 and 17-year olds to the adult court for serious crimes. Some of these young people are fully aware of what they have done and fully intend on doing worse. Society needs protection from them. A few years spent in custody certainly is not enough to protect society from the worst of these types of individuals.

The problems with this bill that we are discussing are not so much with what is in it. The problems are with what is left out. Along with a great many Canadians I was especially dismayed at the things that were left out of this bill. The Reform Party justice committee submitted a long list of positive suggestions that had been ignored by the government.

(1920)

Reformers are disappointed that the scope of the act will not be broadened by this bill. Any young person under 12 who commits a serious crime is obviously a deeply disturbed child but there is no recourse under the act, no way to make sure that these children are placed in an environment where they can receive a good education and be taught some positive values.

The law just lets them drift back into society in troubled situations and that spells trouble in the future, both for the child and society. The child learns only one lesson. He can be as cruel as he or she wants without any consequences whatsoever.

In the interests of future protection the court should be able to prescribe education and some kind of rehabilitative treatment through the act for those offenders 10 and 11 years old.

Parents of young offenders should have to account for the crimes of their children. Switzerland has a code of responsibilities as well as a code of rights. Families are held accountable for the wrongs of their young people and that would probably be a more effective deterrent to youth crime than any other law Parliament may pass. We need more parental responsibility in Canada through the Young Offenders Act.

Government Orders

Another aspect of the act that would bring home the gravity of crime and increase the sense of responsibility of young offenders is victim restitution. It would be healthy for a young person to have to work to repay his victim. I am glad to see that the minister has left this option open under the act and I would like to see it become a standard requirement and not just another vague option.

I want to address another issue in the context of the Young Offenders Act that touches on an important preventive aspect of the law and that is the health of the Canadian family.

I have four children. In bringing them up I have found that there is something they need and if they cannot get it they will not grow up to be right and that is that they need some love. To starve a child of love is like denying that child food and water. An unloved baby will die. A child without enough love will wither inside and become enraged at the world. The child knows that he deserves love. The child resents that his deepest longings are unmet and for years, maybe for the rest of his life, that child will let everyone he meets, including the police and society, know that he was unloved.

Love is a very loose word. I realize I am talking in bigger terms than just the act but I think this is very important. Love is very hard to define but love must be expressed in some kind of action. It is not always nice or easy. Love does what it takes, even hard things, to reach the goal of the best interests of the child.

Part of showing that love and care is physical attention. A child may know that mommy and daddy love them but if mom and dad are never around the child begins to wonder. Actions speak louder than words.

The second thing is teaching. Kids only spend six hours a day in school. The real school is outside the classroom. Parents need to spend time teaching young people the basic skills of life and moral values. To teach them carefully is to show them love.

The final aspect of love that is often not thought of and is just as important as the other is discipline. If children do not have discipline they will starve for love. If parents allow a child to develop in any way the child wants, the child's negative anti-social traits may, or will, flourish along with the rest. When a parent loves a child he or she will correct the child, will steer that child away from harmful attitudes and actions.

Sometimes that may require a spanking and I support the right of the parent to do that in a reasonable way. But in large part the failures of the children are really the failures of their parents to love them and show them the proper way that I have described. That is borne out in the statistics. Most young offenders come from problem homes where they have been consistently mistreated, and most important, unloved.

When we come to the Young Offenders Act, the law, as the Minister of Justice has so ably pointed out, is really powerless to provide that which the child really needs the most. The law cannot love someone. It can only point out the wrong that has been done and punish it.

The answer of course is to enhance the family in Canada. The government needs to support and encourage close families as a measure to prevent the criminal behaviour of children. The Young Offenders Act only deals with kids after the damage is done.

(1925)

The government can stand out front and pull out law and order through the act but it can also put its shoulder behind the family and push law and order by taking measures to help parents and kids be together more often.

The Young Offenders Act is only half of the solution. Every instrument of public policy including taxation measures must be brought to bear to strengthen the well-being of families in society. Strong, close families will produce kind, responsible children who will contribute to society.

That is one reason why the Reform Party has been talking about the family so much in the last few weeks. It is in everybody's best interest to make the family strong. That is also why our justice committee advocates more parental responsibility and victim restitution.

These things take place within the context of a family so that there are more powerful tools than the impersonal institutional tools used by the law. Nothing can replace the relationship between parents and children.

I would draw the attention of the House to a story in the *Globe and Mail* of May 24 that talks about violence and other serious problems with young offenders which are endemic in the New York City public school system, so much so that they have to install metal detectors at the doors.

The principal of one of the schools said: "More and more the parents of these children turn out to be people who have had unsatisfactory experiences in school and do not provide the stable home life they need". One of the prerequisites for a young person growing up today is to have at least one and preferably two parents who love him openly and without reservation. The answer is echoed back again. We need to strengthen the family.

Allow me to close by quoting a poignant story about a young offender from a book by Philip Yancey. He quoted a story of a boy of 12 or 13 who in a fit of crazy anger and depression got hold of a gun somewhere and fired it at his father who died not right away but soon afterward. When the authorities asked the boy why he had done it, he said it was because he could not stand his father, that his father demanded too much of him, that he was always after him. It was because he hated his father.

Government Orders

Later, after he had been placed in a House of detention somewhere a guard was walking down the corridor late one night when he heard sounds from the boy's room and he stopped to listen. The words that he heard the boy sobbing out in the dark were: "I want my father, I want my father".

When we talk about young offenders, what we are really discussing are thousands of personal tragedies. Children grow up in poor homes, homes where parents do not love, do not teach, do not correct and the child is untamed and angry at heart. The child does not even realize it but inside he wants all these things desperately because these are the things that tell him that his parents love him.

The Reform Party of Canada says: "Let us stop the tragedies". Toughen the Young Offenders Act and strengthen the family. On one hand, confront evil head on with a tough law. On the other hand, keep trouble from developing in the first place by enhancing the child's family environment.

This comprehensive type of policy will require more commitment both by the family and the Young Offenders Act than has been displayed through Bill C-37. I and the Reform Party do not lack the will to bring real positive change to our justice system.

I urge the government to consider both sides of this equation. Strengthen the family and give us a tough act as well.

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I listened with deep interest to my friend from Fraser Valley East.

Some of the things he had to say certainly deserve our consideration. Let me suggest for members a scenario. I mentioned it before and I mention it again because I happened to have worked with young offenders.

Over the period of time I worked with them, I came across young people. Because I was interested I asked: "What kind of home environment did you come from?" Sometimes a youngster would tell me "I cannot remember how many homes I have been in" because he had been in 15 to 30 different homes.

The individual whom the member mentioned is enraged. He is bitter. He is upset with the world and does things that you and I would not normally do nor would the members of your family.

I had another fellow who ran away. He came to me during the fall of that year. I asked him what had happened. He had gone home to North Battlefords and was greeted by his father who asked: "What are you doing here?" He said: "I ran away". Then his father said: "You have 15 minutes to get everything you own and don't ever come back to this home". He was a 15-year old youngster.

(1930)

We have to measure it all in the context of the bill before us. My concern is that in our rush to improve the legislation we are really not looking at the cause of the problem. The cause of the problem is in the home. We have single parent families and latchkey children. The mother likely has to leave early in the morning and is not home until late at night, and the kids are on their own. Where I taught I saw them early in the morning and late at night. I was more than happy to look after them, but that is not what society is all about.

With all these concerns before us what kind of recommendations did members of the standing committee bring forward to start with a cure rather than extend the sentences? I appreciate what is being said. I think 16 and 17 year olds committing those kinds of crimes know what they are doing. Let us put them in adult court. However I want to catch those youngsters before these things happen. A 10 and an 11 year old in Regina inflicted some horrendous things on 7 and 8 year olds.

I agree with you. What does the system do before they arrive at the incarceration stage to deal with the problem?

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the member for Souris—Moose Mountain. I again request that all members put their remarks through the Chair. When the pronoun "you" is used it should refer to the Chair rather than to another member.

That rule is designed to keep the pressure down in the House. It is not that the people in the chair feel they have to be a part of every conversation.

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his comments. I defer to some of his experiences. I have not been in charge of a group home or do not have his level of experience.

There are a couple of issues here. One is the broader picture I was trying to paint of what we do to prevent these situations from occurring. The Young Offenders Act or any piece of legislation deals generally with a law breaking problem. This act will only deal with half the equation. The other part is how we strengthen families.

We have been talking a lot about that in the last week. We have been trying to address the problem of how to help three million families with one parent who would like to stay home with the children. How can we help them and be a preventive measure? How do we ensure we have a taxation system that does not discriminate against them? That is part of the answer for those three million families. Maybe we could help them out.

Government Orders

Another specific example is that we think there is a more creative role for restitution in these situations. That is more of a traditional role. This will not make the front pages but I remember a couple of instances with my four children when they were very small. We would walk through the grocery store and they would pick up candy, almost not knowing what they were doing. We would get out to the car and see it and say: "We are going to have to take that back to the manger and explain what happened". The kids were just dying inside but it was a wonderful lesson. They never forgot it. It was not a mean thing. They begged me not to do it but we took them back and in a sense made restitution. It was a lesson for them.

Even until they are 10 or 12 years old that lesson can be brought about. The courts could maybe help with it. They could say: "You spray-painted the side of this building. Now you are going to have to clean it". That is part of the deal. It becomes much more personal; it becomes a lesson. It may be preventive work.

I have talked about parental rights where we encourage parents to play an active role. I talked briefly about spanking. I know spanking is almost a taboo subject, but I am encouraging parents to use discipline in a loving way to correct behavioural problems in their young children.

Something we have to be careful about is that when the justice minister is reviewing section 43 he does not take away the positive influence of some parents on their children.

(1935)

I will leave it at those three points and if there is another question I will be happy to answer it.

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I will make sure that I direct the question through the Speaker.

With regard to what the member has said, has he looked at peer review in terms of where these young people have to meet their peers? I have seen the restitution kind of thing because we have these programs in Saskatchewan. If it has to go back to the victim and you have to go and confront them, maybe there is some merit in it, but if we are just going to have them put in some social time then I have some real concerns.

I will cite one other item. The member may want to quickly respond. They brought a fellow from the Northwest Territories down to Regina to be incarcerated for burning a post office in the Northwest Territories. After six months there he was the best criminal, if I can put it in that perspective, the best known in the group. When he first came he could not handle the situation. He sat in the corner. Because they had educated him so well he was

faced with a new reality, instead of going back to where he should have been in a social milieu which he could handle.

How would the member handle those kinds of situations?

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, the member is absolutely correct on the restitution issue. Unless restitution is offered to the victim of the crime then it really becomes another penalty issued under the thumb of the court. It is very questionable how much good that does or whether it does any more good than many other types of penalties.

When you look the little old lady right in the eye right after you have busted her window and you have to sit there and kick the dirt and apologize to her face it is the one chance that may have some meaningful rehabilitation. The member is right in that case.

Obviously the object of most of our efforts needs to be to keep people out of jail and out of incarceration, but at times there is no alternative. I am pleased to see that the act says there comes a time when the protection of society has to take over. I am not sure exactly when that point comes but there does come a time.

A short while ago in Vancouver an 11-year old boy on a local television station was brazenly interviewed because there is no way of dealing with these people. He said: "I joy ride in cars. I joy rided in 20 or 30 cars". He wrecks them, totals them. I do not know how he comes out of this uninjured but he goes through this process and now he is on CTV news. He is talking away saying he likes it and that he is going to do it again tomorrow.

The parents are begging the police or the courts or government or somebody to help them with this kid who probably needs some professional help but also needs to be told that this is wrong, wrong enough that he is going to lose some of his privileges, including maybe his freedom for a while.

I do not know how to address that problem. When you throw criminals together or you have a group of criminals together and you throw someone who is a neophyte into the crowd then bad news can come from it.

However, there comes a time, such as in the case of this 11-year old who said that he was going to go out and wreck another car tomorrow night because he likes it and it is fun.

There comes a time when you have to say that after 20 or 30 cars that for the protection of society, even though it is a poor second rate way to deal with the problem, we are going to have to remove him from this situation, try to get him some professional help, we cannot allow it to continue indefinitely. This individual may cause hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage before he is 12 years old.

Government Orders

I realize this is a poor second best, but the time comes—and this bill does address that—when we have to look after society and protect it from someone doing malicious damage.

(1940)

Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I must say I am very encouraged by the level of debate occurring right now in the House. I do not know whether it is because of the lateness of the hour and we are a little tired or that it is a hot sticky day, but a lot of good common sense is coming out on all sides. I am looking forward to hearing the debate following second reading, when it hits committee, where the thought processes, the amendments and the proposals will be fleshed out.

I am privileged to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-37, an act to amend the Young Offenders Act and the Criminal Code. I want to thank my colleague, the Minister of Justice and the Attorney General of Canada for keeping the promise he made to the Canadian people to introduce changes to the Young Offenders Act this month.

Bill C-37 signifies an important first step in a two-stage strategy. I would like to underline the fact that this is only the first step in the reform process. As we all know, the Young Offenders Act has not been substantially altered since it was first proclaimed almost a decade ago. Given the changes that have taken place in our society over the past 10 years, it seems only fitting that the Young Offenders Act should meet with substantial reform in the context of a new government committed to making immediate and long term changes to the youth justice system in Canada.

Although there seems to be little doubt in people's minds as to the need for youth justice reform, there are no easy catch-all solutions to the problems that youth crime presents to our society today. As stated by the minister himself: "There is no miracle solution, no panacea". All we can do is take meaningful and conscientious steps in the process of reforming our youth justice system.

The legislation before us today is exactly that. It is a meaningful and conscientious step toward keeping our communities safe, rejecting violence in our society and holding those who break the law accountable for their actions.

I say the legislation is meaningful because it makes a serious statement about the need to deter young people from perpetrating violent crimes. By doubling the maximum sentences for young offenders convicted of first degree murder from five to ten years and increasing the sentence for second degree murder to seven years, the government has shown that it recognizes the importance of deterring young people from serious crimes.

The increased sentences are also indicative of the government's commitment to the many parents, students, teachers, law enforcement officers and youth crime victims with whom many of us have met and who have drawn our attention to the growing

public concern over violent youth crime in Canada and the need for public protection.

The proposed legislation also attempts to hold young people accountable for their actions by dealing with 16 and 17 year olds charged with serious offences in adult court unless they can show a judge that public protection and rehabilitation can be achieved through youth court.

This provision does not alter the criterion used to determine whether or not youths should be in adult or youth court. However it does shift the onus from the state to the individual. The legislation will also increase the amount of time that young offenders convicted of first or second degree murder in adult court to seven and ten years respectively before they are eligible for parole.

As I stated earlier, this legislation is both meaningful and conscientious. I use the term conscientious to describe the attention the Minister of Justice has paid to the need to ensure that there are improved measures for information sharing between professionals who must deal with young offenders and rehabilitation and treatment of young offenders.

I would like to emphasize the latter portion of the statement. It has been said time and time again that one of the best ways to ensure public safety is through criminal rehabilitation. The proposed legislation before us is reflective of that very ethos. Currently one-third of young offenders are sentenced to custody.

(1945)

Fifty per cent of these cases are for non-violent property offences. These statistics are indicative of the fact that Canada has one of the highest incarceration rates in the western world.

Since research has proven that non-violent young offenders are more readily rehabilitated when treated in the community, sheltered from serious violent offenders, it makes sense for us to look at alternatives to unnecessary and sometimes counterproductive custody.

In addition to the potentially harmful effects of unnecessary incarceration, there are large financial implications for the taxpayer as well. We are told that custody can cost anywhere from \$70,000 to \$100,000 per year per young offender. Clearly the government has a responsibility to the taxpayer in terms of ensuring that our correctional system is cost effective as well.

By pursuing more community based alternatives to custody, we will be able to fashion a more effective and progressive youth correctional system.

As mentioned in my opening statements, this legislation is not perfect and is not the end all and be all of criminal justice reform either. In fact, this is only the beginning. Bill C-37 lays the groundwork for further improvement of a youth justice system. Furthermore, as mentioned by the minister, the proposed legislation will be complemented by a thorough, open minded and critical examination of the Young Offenders Act and its pro-

Government Orders

visions to be conducted of course by the House of Commons standing committee on justice.

Indeed, this legislation is a step, and I want to underline that, in the right direction. I am confident that with co-operation and support for meaningful and conscientious legislation such as this we will be able to improve our youth justice system and enhance the level of public safety for all Canadians.

I thank my constituents for the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could have the member respond more directly on the issue of considering the possibility of having the age of operation of the Young Offenders Act changed to become 10 to 15 inclusive rather than the current 12 to 17. That particular issue seems to be at the basis and the heart of all the hurdles and various permutations that are in the current bill, the exception is made because it appears that the act is applying to the wrong age group.

Could the member expand on that possibility?

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. I do not profess to be an expert in this field. I have close friends, even relatives, who are involved in this particular system of youth justice and it is a very sensitive area. In fact, it is a very complicated area.

The minister spoke about there being no panacea, taking that idea and shifting that thought process to whether it is going to accomplish that much more, whether we are going to be safer in the streets or safer in the local Beckers store or gas station outlet if we lower the age to 10.

I do not know because I am not an expert. I am very much looking forward to being an observer of the work of the justice committee when this bill leaves this House and goes to committee stage because it is there that we will be able to bring forward the experts in this particular field.

We will be able to get the caseworkers before us. We will be able to get those individuals who deal directly with young offenders who can tell us whether it is going to have any kind of impact on an 11-year old to incarcerate that youngster, and then it depends on the level of the crime that youngster has committed.

(1950)

I was 11 years old, this is a personal story, and I went into a pharmacy a few streets over from where I lived. I used to live, for my constituents, on Binkley Road near Binkley United Church. Just a few blocks up was Hollywood Street and next to Hollywood Street was Jessop's pharmacy. I used to go there quite often to pick up things for my mother.

I walked into Jessop's and leaned over the counter to pay the lady. She turned around and put her money in the till. I reached over and I picked up a chocolate bar and put it in my pocket. I left the store thinking I had accomplished something pretty fantastic. I got away with taking a chocolate bar and did not have to pay for it. It was incredible really. I got on my bike and went home.

When I got home I gave my mother whatever it was and she asked me: "What is that?". It was a chocolate bar. Bless her heart, she was smart enough to ask how I bought that chocolate bar. I said I bought it. She said: "You do not have any money to buy that chocolate bar. How did you get that chocolate bar?". I said: "I bought it, I bought it". I was lying through my teeth.

She persisted and persisted. Finally I had to tell her that I had taken the chocolate bar. I told her that I had leaned over and, it did not jump into my pocket, but I helped it into my pocket. She phoned the pharmacy and said that her son, Stan, would be dropping by in a couple of minutes to return something that he had taken. I was made to jump on my bicycle and go back to Jessop's pharmacy and speak to the owner of the pharmacy and return that chocolate bar and apologize for having taken it. I could not have felt lower at that moment.

I recall this story only because my colleague had mentioned being young and taking something and the punishment fitting the crime. What punishment? I had to return it but to me that was a hell of a punishment. It was humiliating. I went on later to work for Jessop's pharmacy as a delivery boy. It is kind of a neat story.

I guess the point I am trying to relay is that for me as an 11-year old who took a chocolate bar and was made to go back and not be punished but to realize the crime was forever burned into my memory and I stayed straight.

What we are trying to do when we go to committee is evaluate the process that says maybe that kind of restitution is enough for particular individuals. We have the experts who are well schooled to determine whether that kind of punishment or restitution is enough.

For some it is going to be a lot tougher but to lower that age limit and to determine that is a good age limit because we will lower it and put more into criminal justice pay back, I do not know. I am not an expert but I know there is certainly a different degree in the treatment of some children over others. On whether lowering the age would be a better thing to do, I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Forseth: Mr. Speaker, my colleague was talking about the acknowledgement of the fundamental review of the Young Offenders Act which will be taken up by the committee. He mentioned experts.

Government Orders

One of the situations we have is that the current Young Offenders Act was largely given to the nation from the experts. I would ask him what kind of reading he gets from his riding as to what the community says about the operation of the justice system in his community, specifically the experts of the local high schools, the young people who observe their friends who get involved with criminal acts and then they observe in the school what happens to them. That kind of reference should also be looked at, not necessarily always the top down experts of case workers and so on.

Perhaps he could comment a bit about how the young people in his community feel. What is their attitude as to how workable the current justice system is?

(1955)

Mr. Keyes: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

In my constituency like his constituency and the constituencies of most members of this House, Canadians are very concerned about youth crime. They want responsible legislation to deal with the problem of youth crime.

In answer to the first part of the hon. member's question, a decade ago when the Young Offenders Act was formulated I am sure the legislators who sat down and took this process and went through the process of committee, report stage, third reading and finally legislation, never for a moment thought they would be dealing with 16 and 17-year old murderers. I sincerely think they just did not give it that much thought. They did not possibly think there would be adults who actually contracted young people at 15, 16, 17 and 18 years old to carry out horrendous crimes. It was probably unfathomable. I cannot imagine them thinking that might happen. I bet it was never even considered.

It was the right legislation of a decade ago. We quickly learned that there is an element of adults in our society who pathetically will take advantage of young people. In this particular horrendous case it is usually crimes of murder.

I am certain that at the time when this legislation was constructed it was thought to be complete enough as it existed. Obviously a decade later we learn that it is not. We learn that it is incomplete. We learn that it is need of reform. Times change. I am proud to be part of a government that is flexible enough and responsive enough to recognize the need for that change and to do something about it.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak in the continuation of this debate on the Young Offenders Act which in fact is a bill to amend the Young Offenders Act and which holds a great interest for many Canadians.

When the Minister of Justice introduced this bill on June 2, he pointed out that the purpose of the bill was to simply amend a few very specific sections of the law, that is the law on young offenders, in order to put into effect the promises made by the Liberal Party in its election platform in its red book. Consequently, Bill C-37 that is before us today only deals with a very limited number of changes to the Young Offenders Act. At the same time when the Minister of Justice was introducing this bill he said he would refer the entire Young Offenders Act to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs in order to have a complete review of that act.

The minister when writing to me as chairman of the justice committee asked me to make arrangements to carry out that complete review before the early months of 1995.

I want to let Canadians know that as chair of the justice committee we will make a sincere attempt to hear all sides on this issue and we will hold hearings. It seems fairly certain that the hearings on the bill will all take place in Ottawa. However, we would be pleased to hear from a wide range of Canadians and Canadian associations who have an interest in the bill.

(2000)

Once we complete hearings with respect to the bill, we will conduct a much wider range of hearings on the entire act, not only with respect to the provisions in the legislation itself but on the extent and causes of juvenile crime or youth crime in Canada and the various forms of correction or rehabilitation for youths.

At that stage we would like to hear not only from parents and school authorities but also from associations of young people, people who deal with probation and parole, those who work in youth corrections, people who are expert in child psychology or youth psychology, groups of people who were victims of youth crime and have had to deal with the threat of youth crime.

In other words, we would like to hear from a very wide range of associations, institutions and Canadians who have an interest in or are expert in the subject of youth crime. I want to assure the Canadian public that we will approach this in a balanced way and make an honest effort to hear from every side of this issue.

In the bill that is before us, the minister deals with four major issues. He proposes increasing the sentences for young offenders who are convicted of first and second degree murder. In this respect he extends the penalties for young offenders from what is now five years to ten and seven years respectively.

Second, he proposes that 16 and 17-year old youths charged with serious personal injury offences be sent to adult court for trials on their offences unless they can prove that they can be better dealt with in youth court. In other words, he is reversing the onus of proof as it now stands.

Government Orders

Under the present law, while the Young Offenders Act deals with young people from 12 to 17, those who are over 14 can be sent to the adult court on an application by the crown attorney. The youth court judge tries to determine whether or not that young offender should be better dealt with in the adult court. The minister is proposing that for 16 and 17-year old youths, the onus of proof be reversed and that those 16 and 17-year olds be sent to adult court for their hearing unless they can show otherwise.

He is also proposing improved measures for information sharing between professionals such as school officials, police and so on. As members know, there has been some criticism that the school boards or the school authorities did not know when they had serious young offenders in their midst. The minister is doing something to try to correct that. He is also making proposals to encourage rehabilitation and treatment of young offenders.

I personally have some concern with some of these changes. I was involved in the development of the Young Offenders Act that we now have. We spent several years researching the provisions of that act and consulting with the public. The consultation went on for several years. The provisions that we put in it were put in according to our best judgment at that time, which is more than 10 years ago.

The law came into effect in 1984 but the process started well before that. I have some concern about these provisions but nevertheless I recommend that we support the bill at second reading. It will be sent to committee. There will be hearings. We will hear views that might support these measures. We will hear views from some people who will oppose them and we will hear views from those who might want to amend them and put something else in their place.

However, at this stage this bill should be supported. There are other provisions in here that I think have universal support. There are others that some people have concern with. We should be aware of the tendency on the part of some Canadians and some members of the House to believe that by simply lengthening sentences and making them more difficult or more harsh that we are going to solve the problem of youth crime, that by simply changing a few lines of the Young Offenders Act, we are going to correct some of the situations we have seen recently in some of our Canadian cities.

(2005)

I have pointed out in other debates on criminal justice where that approach has been taken. It has been taken principally in some of the southern states in the United States where they believed and they introduced measures to lengthen sentences and make them harsher, that they were going to protect the public from crime, they were going to reduce victimization. They did not do that. They pursued that approach in the states of Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Georgia.

I hear that approach suggested very often by members of the Reform Party and some other members in the House. They say get tough, lengthen the sentences, make sure you teach people a lesson in prison. That approach has been taken in several of those states to which I have referred. As a matter of fact all those states have brought back capital punishment and carry it out frequently.

What are the results? In Louisiana where capital punishment has been brought back and this hard line, this tough approach, has been taken, the murder rate is 17.5 per 100,000. In Florida, where the same thing has been done, the murder rate is around 12 per 100,000. It is the same with Georgia and Texas where the rate is well over 10 murders per 100,000. In Canada where we have not traditionally taken that approach and in several of the northern American states where that approach has not been taken, there are much lower rates of violent crime and much lower rates of murder.

For example in Canada the murder rate is 2.6 murders per 100,000, which is much lower than those states in the United States which have taken that approach. I might say that those states in the United States have the highest rates of violent crime and murder in the western world.

I am not suggesting that because Canada does not have these harsh penalties and does not have capital punishment is the reason for our lower rate of crime. I think the reason is that we have approached crime in a more holistic way, in a much broader approach. When we see a problem of serious crime our reaction is not simply to lengthen the sentences and make them harsher and make all the crime go away and we will be protected from violence.

Our general approach when we see situations of violent crime is to ask what are the causes of that crime, why are these young people behaving so badly and to get to the reasons and the causes of the situation and then direct our cures at those causes. We may have to lengthen the sentences from time to time and to change our method of correction within the prisons. As a matter of fact I firmly believe in a corrective approach, especially with young people. That was the reason for the Young Offenders Act. Young people are more apt to be corrected to change their lives. They are more pliable than the older, hardened criminal. That is why we have a Young Offenders Act and that is why we have special approaches under the Young Offenders Act.

The Minister of Justice has urged that we should not rely on simplistic solutions. We only delude ourselves and fool the Canadian public if we believe that by simply lengthening the sentence and being tough that we are going to cure the problem and protect them from crime.

I hear these same people say the rights of the victim should prevail over the rights of the criminal or the offender. Of course that is true. The purpose of the law is to prevent crime from taking place. The purpose of the criminal justice system is to protect the public from crime, to diminish the number of victims.

Government Orders

That hard-nosed approach that has been tried in those southern states that I referred to has not protected the public. They have many more victims than we have in Canada. We hear of ridiculous situations where people are executed in the morning in Miami and some Canadian or some German tourist gets off the plane in the evening and is murdered in some silly murder right at the airport. This goes on frequently.

(2010)

They are not protecting the public by that short-sighted, simplistic approach. Certainly it takes more time and more resources, but if you are serious about preventing crime, if you are serious in wanting to reduce the number of victims, then you have to put some time and resources into it.

You are not going to reverse a situation where there is an increase in crime—and I will deal with that in a minute—by simply amending clauses in a bill. I am not opposed to amending the law. It has to be done. It has to be done in the Young Offenders Act, but to suggest that will be the main solution to the problem is delusion and it is fooling Canadians.

Recently in the drive-by shooting that took place here in Ottawa, they found that one of the young people who did the shootings had been bounced from one foster home to another, had a very abused childhood and so on.

I understand there was a similar case in the west of Canada. Once they looked behind the actual situation which happened on the day when the crime took place and started asking questions, they found out that there was some pretty horrible situations with respect to some of these offenders. Not to excuse the crime, but if you want to really correct the situation, if you want to protect the public, if you want to reduce the number of victims, if you are really concerned about victims, you have to improve your criminal justice system and you need a broad based approach.

The minister is only proposing certain measures in a limited range in this bill. These are part of the Liberal Party platform and are found in the famous red book which we put to the Canadian people in the election last fall. The minister recognizes, and our party recognizes, that many other changes might be required. That is why he has referred the entire act to the justice committee for an extensive review.

By the way, I do not think I mentioned this in my remarks at the very beginning, but in the second phase when we are reviewing the entire act, the committee will travel to different provinces, to major centres, to hear from the grassroots of the country. While we want to hear from the national associations, we also want to hear from local groups and local associations and so on.

In speaking to the Canadian people, I would like them to know right now that if they wish to present briefs or send us their views by letter or otherwise, they could write to myself or other members of the committee, the chief spokesmen of the different parties, requesting the right to be heard or to submit a brief. Obviously we will not be able to hear from thousands of people, but we will be able to hear from a good many of them. We intend to hear from a good many and those who we cannot hear in person, we will take note of their briefs and study them seriously.

We will be publicizing the cities that we will be visiting in the fall to hear from Canadians on this subject and providing them with the dates and other information so they can prepare to approach us.

In speaking about dealing with youth crime and with the causes of youth crime, I referred to the levels very briefly. We have just learned in several reports from StatsCanada and from other sources that the level of youth crime has not increased over the last few years. It is pretty much what it has been going back 5, 10, 15 years. However, what usually catches the attention of the public is that there have been some very spectacular, horrible crimes committed by youth. These have caught the front pages of our newspapers. They have happened in several parts of the country. They have had a very serious impact on the people in those cities.

(2015)

Of course the perception left with the people in those centres is that youth crime has increased substantially, that it is out of control and that some quick and hasty measures have to be taken. I agree that measures have to be taken but, as I say, they should be taken with some intelligence, some purpose and with hopefully some effectiveness.

I have heard already from some of the groups on this issue. For example, I have heard from the Church Council on Justice and Corrections. It has urged a delay on the passage of these amendments to the Young Offenders Act until the completion of the broad based review. It would prefer that the broad based review come first.

The Deputy Speaker: The Time has expired. Unless there is unanimous consent, the member will end his speech. Is there unanimous consent to have him continue?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I will finish up in a few minutes. The Church Council on Justice and Corrections would prefer that we proceed with the major review first and then look at this bill afterwards. Perhaps we will be hearing from it in the committee.

Government Orders

I have also heard from the Elizabeth Fry Societies of Canada. They emphasize preventative initiatives and community based alternatives rather than a more restrictive sanctions approach.

With respect to the longer sentences, one could support the longer sentences if during that period of time that we have those young people under our care and control we do meaningful things to help them correct their behaviour. If we have them under our care and control and do nothing with them, then it is a useless exercise.

I have also heard from the Canadian Criminal Justice Association. It says that there is a danger in tailoring legislation to the most extreme, rare and unusual cases while ignoring the vast majority of youths who commit far less serious offences.

It says that an approach involving crime prevention, public education and resources for rehabilitation is far more important to addressing juvenile crime than more prisons and longer sentences. It also urges a postponement of the amendments until there is better statistical evidence for proposing new amendments or more severe sanctions.

I will bring my remarks to a close in simply saying let us send this bill to committee where we can have a more intense and serious examination of its provision with dialogue with many Canadian groups.

In doing that we should remember that while this legislation is passed by the Canadian Parliament, the federal Parliament, the administration of the Young Offenders Act is totally under the jurisdiction of the provinces.

It is the provinces that must provide the youth court judges and the youth courts. It is the provinces that train, supply and hire the probation officers. It is the provinces that must set up the correctional centres or the secure detention centres for youth, for those who go to those centres.

There is a big financial cost involved. I point that out to remind Canadians that this is not just a federal matter, but it is a matter we have to work very closely with the provinces on.

Mr. Paul E. Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, it is once in a while good to hear some admissions in this House. It is good to hear that the member says he is taking responsibility and admitting that he had a large part in the passage of the Young Offenders Act.

We have a public that has very little confidence in the juvenile justice system. The member is on record now for accepting responsibility for the passage of the Young Offenders Act. I think Canadians should know that. I will address his remarks in which he talked about the comparison with Louisiana.

(2020)

I believe that basic analysis is rather false. The cultural differences are very great. The sociological issues are not parallel. It is absolutely apples and oranges. I think he is grasping, trying to justify his own personal philosophy.

Is he suggesting that the current system is working just fine and that the juvenile system has the confidence of Canadians? I ask the member not to mischaracterize the thrust of the Reform Party's comments on the issue and put forward how we have suggested a more community accountability model of justice.

I will end with a question. He is outlining a series of more consultation across Canada. What is being done to reveal the thousands of submissions that were made last winter by ordinary Canadians who poured out their hearts and souls in all kinds of paper submissions that were sent to the justice ministry? How is that going to be brought to bear in future deliberations on Young Offenders Act amendments?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend asked several serious questions. Yes, I was in part responsible for the Young Offenders Act. I started with the consultations and the discussion on it and put forward the first proposals.

Just like the bill that will be passed by the House, everybody who deals with it in the House of Commons and votes for or against it has some responsibility. No one person in our political system has full responsibility for any piece of legislation. I would suggest that those who vote for the bill before us, Bill C-37, will have responsibility to a certain degree along with the minister. I admit to some responsibility for the last act. I fully supported many of the measures in it and I still support many of the measures.

With respect to the comparison with Louisiana, there are some cultural differences between Canada and Louisiana. There are some cultural differences between Nova Scotia and British Columbia. The fact of the matter is—and I have done a lot of study on it—that the people in those states were saying the sorts of things I hear from the hon. member and his party: "If we get tough, if we give long, harsh sentences, we will protect ourselves against crime". To that extent it is no different from what I hear up here: in other words that hard, tough, long sentences are the solution.

In that respect I say they were not successful in protecting their own people. They have not been successful in Louisiana in protecting their own people. If we follow that example here and simply rely on those simplistic approaches to the problems, we would be no more successful in protecting our Canadian people.

Is the Young Offenders Act working just fine? No, it is not. I fully support the minister in a 10-year review. We need a review. We should review all legislation after a 10-year period.

Government Orders

By the way, in the late seventies and early eighties there was universal agreement in Canada that the Juvenile Delinquents Act was not adequate. It was passed in 1908. We had basically the same legislation from 1908 to 1984. Obviously it was out of date. We tried to update it and there was a lot of consensus in the country with respect to the Young Offenders Act.

When the member says the Canadian public does not want it, maybe that is what is being said to him on a broad basis where he comes from. However I must tell him that I am from Montreal and I do not hear the public in Montreal telling me to the same extent he says they are telling him in British Columbia that they are not satisfied with the Young Offenders Act. I guess they want changes, but when he says what the Canadian public wants he talks about his own public and not our public because we do not get the same reaction.

We have heard from many of the Bloc Quebecois members that they are speaking for many of the views in Quebec. In that respect I support many of those points of view. What the Canadian public wants is not just what the Reform Party hears in its parts of the country.

With respect to consultation, many submissions were made to the last government and to the last Parliament with respect to the Young Offenders Act. It is this Parliament that has the responsibility of passing the laws now. This Parliament has an obligation to consult with the Canadian public now. The hon. member is a member of the justice committee. I do not know if he is speaking against consulting with the Canadian public. I do not think he was saying that but I am a bit confused by his remarks.

(2025)

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the comments that were made, and to members on the other side, if you had the opportunity to incarcerate young people between the ages of 12 and 16 and you had to lock them up, that in itself is shock therapy. I had that opportunity and it was not something I looked upon pleasantly nor do I want to remember it.

With regard to the Young Offenders Act, there are two features we have to come to grips with. It is not necessarily that we have to move down to incarcerate the 10-year olds, but we have to come to grips and deal with the problems which confront these 10-year olds.

From the member's experience and knowledge, has he looked at outward bound programs and something within the school structure? We could start to take some of the measures that would hopefully cure the problems before they got to the 12-year old and we started incarcerating them.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I fully agree that the outreach approach is an important approach. It is by doing those kinds of things that we will bring down the rate of youth crime.

Looking at areas of the United States, Canada and western Europe which have cultures similar to ours, the areas that have low rates of youth crime and low rates of delinquency are where they pay a lot of attention to their young people, to their home life, to school life, to recreation, to sports, and to outward bound programs. When people do get in trouble they look immediately for ways of correcting them, not simply punishing them.

Many of us are fathers and mothers. We try to balance our approach with respect to our children when they do things wrong. We do not simply treat them in a harsh, cruel manner and expect that will change their behaviour. We try to reason with them. We try to teach them. We show them some affection. I think that is how we have to approach 10 to 15-year olds and so on.

It is true that when some youth are nearing the age of 15 or 16, in some cases but not in all they are verging on adulthood. That is why even the present law provides that those people could be transferred to adult court. There were always provisions for a transfer to adult court. I support those provisions for those very hard tough cases, but for the great majority of young people the approach suggested by the hon. member is the correct one.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments about some of the things that have gone on, especially in the question and answer period following the member's presentation.

I appreciated the comment he made that we should review legislation every 10 years or so. That is a wise policy in general. I know that sometimes it is just to update language and so on. However I encourage him and the government to be very careful about entrenching things in the Constitution, as in some of the other bills we have been doing lately because they will be impossible to review but that is just an aside.

I do however take some exception. I have to contradict what he said that in his constituency there is no concern for the Young Offenders Act. I could perhaps postulate on a few reasons.

I happened to be passing through Calgary a month or so ago. Edmonton and Calgary were joined together in a radio broadcast. Thousands and thousands of people were concerned about the criminal justice system and its ineffectiveness in dealing with some of the issues we have been talking about on this bill.

In my own constituency we held a meeting on criminal justice issues. We had a forum with several experts from the Parole Board, the police, and so on. There were 350 people in a small hall and we turned many more away. The press were there, television, radio, and all of the newspapers were represented.

There was a huge concern. It was the biggest single issue concern in the riding.

If the hon. member is not receiving statements of concern in his own Montreal riding I could postulate on a couple of reasons. One reason may be that they have given up. Maybe they have been trying for a good number of years to get the member to make some changes and to admit to some basic philosophical differences.

(2030)

Maybe they have tried time and again to get some things pushed through and brought to the House of Commons. Maybe there have been times when they have been trying to force the Liberal Party to accept some of the omissions or errors in the past. Maybe they realize that 80 per cent of the people at least would like a say in a capital punishment debate issue. Maybe when they see poll after poll indicating people are concerned about things and there is no reaction on the other side, perhaps they have given up.

When we raise these issues in the House of Commons it is not because I have a personal vendetta against the Young Offenders Act but we have been told by our constituents that it is not working.

I propose to the people from the hon. member's riding that if they are not getting the reaction or the action that they feel they need then maybe they need to write to the justice minister. Maybe they need to write to a member on the opposition side.

To think people are not concerned about the Young Offenders Act in the member's riding means that there is either an inadequate attempt to get that information or perhaps the constituency members have just given up.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, first of all I did not say there was no concern but the concern is not to the level that you hear out of western Canada and from the Reform Party and it is not just me. We have heard the speeches of all members from Quebec and I think Atlantic Canada. We do not get the same reaction there that you have in western Canada and to say the Canadian public feels this way is not correct. The Canadian public does not feel the same way in all parts of the country.

While there is concern in my riding, the concern expresses itself in exactly the opposite approach. The approach is not the simplistic cure all with simple amendments to the act that you hear coming from the Reform Party members.

The people in my constituency seem to support a more holistic, comprehensive approach in dealing with crime and not simply longer sentences, harsher sentences and so on. There is concern. I hear from them.

Adjournment Debate

I must point out to the hon. member that I have run in nine elections. I have won nine consecutive elections and I put front and centre in every election what I believe in with respect to criminal justice and the people in my constituency know what I believe in and generally support me. This was discussed in the election last October.

All I am trying to say is I do not deny what he hears in his riding but I get a bit upset when certain members of his party say Canadians feel this way. I think if they are going to be honest and correct they should say: "Canadians in my constituency feel this way". Maybe they do.

I would not want to interpret what people are saying in Alberta or British Columbia. The member has not only heard from me but from other members from Quebec including from the Bloc Québécois and they have a different approach and reaction on these things from what we hear from some of the Reform Party members from the west and central Canada.

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs)): Mr. Speaker, there have been consultations among the parties and I believe you will find consent for the following:

That the debate on the motion for second reading and reference to committee of Bill C-37, and on the amendment proposed by Madam Venne, be now adjourned.

Debate on the motion for second reading and on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert could in this way resume tomorrow after the House has given third reading to Bill C-28 or on another day in any other case.

I also think you would find consent to call it ten o'clock p.m.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I must divide this motion into two. Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to call it ten o'clock p.m.?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

Adjournment Debate

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I rise in response to a question I asked earlier this week to seek further clarification on this question from the government.

I had raised the issue of the varying perceptions of the responsibilities, in particular the moral and ethical responsibilities, incumbent on the Government of Canada to negotiate land claims legislation, in good faith in particular in reference to the Yukon land claims legislation and self-government legislation which is before this House. Indeed the government has followed through.

(2035)

There have been some public perceptions put out there and some expressed in this House that in fact the negotiation of such land claims and the policy related to this negotiation is perhaps some kind of whim that we are trying to give people something which they do not deserve.

Certainly it is my view and of the New Democratic Party, that in fact the lands of First Nations in this country were not won in a war by the European population. They were seized by the population as immigrants came to this country. There has been a longstanding historical obligation backed up by a number of court cases and indeed implicated in our Constitution that these just claims be negotiated and be addressed.

I would say in this respect that one of the very essential elements of a negotiating process which in the case of the Yukon has been a three way process, the territorial government, the federal government and the Council for Yukon Indians, is that people come to this on an equitable premise. Indeed they come as we like to say on a level playing field. That means in my view that everybody comes with the same equipment, comes equally armed with the same ability in which to enter that negotiation.

I would suggest that the policy of the previous Conservative government was in error when it forced aboriginal groups in the Yukon to enter negotiations on the premise that they would have to repay the costs of their negotiation. If we are basing land claims and self-government negotiations on the premise that this is an historical obligation, then clearly as I say people should come to the negotiation with equal responsibilities but equal rights. To make it incumbent upon for example the Council for Yukon Indians that out of their compensation settlement they must repay the loan I think has a very strong aspect of inequity. It reflects I would hope with the new government that it was the former government's policy.

I would hope that the new government, which I must add has shown good faith in negotiating land claims in my own constituency in the Yukon, will come with a different view of the equity principle in negotiation.

In speaking tonight I want to seek further clarification from the government about the premises on which it comes to land claims and self-government negotiations, whether it in fact sees this simply giving aboriginal people something or whether it comes to it from a premise of respecting the inherent rights of Canada's First Nations and how it sees that further being acted upon.

It is one thing to have expressed views, expressed the rhetoric about equity and fairness. It is another to see it implemented in legislation, in agreements and in redressing not only the historical wrongs that have taken place in the history of Canada toward Canada's First Nations, but some of the very misguided policies of the previous Conservative government that put in place conditions which were clearly inequitable.

I would be interested in the government's response and further clarification of these issues to my question earlier this week.

The Deputy Speaker: I must thank the hon. member for Yukon for coming in early to do this question. It was extremely kind of her.

Mr. Tony Ianno (Trinity—Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the question raised by the hon. member for Yukon on June 10 regarding the negotiation of comprehensive land claims.

Settling these provides certainty for aboriginal and other Canadians to the ownership and management of lands and resources.

The Government of Canada since 1973 has had a policy of seeking negotiated settlements with aboriginal groups in respect of their land based aboriginal rights.

This policy recognizes that it is important to resolve the debates and legal ambiguities associated with the common law concept of aboriginal rights and title. Courts including the Supreme Court of Canada have confirmed the existence of aboriginal rights and endorsed negotiations as the best way to respond to them.

This is the case even where as in the *Sparrow* decision some discretion has been provided for accommodating aboriginal rights and title. Negotiation provides greater flexibility to develop workable arrangements that respect the interests of all parties of society than does leaving the outcome to litigation.

Negotiating claim agreements or modern day treaties with aboriginal people is the best way we have found to resolve conflicts between aboriginal and other Canadians where aboriginal peoples assert rights over land and natural resources and to recognize longstanding aboriginal interests. Claims agreements also promote aboriginal self-sufficiency which will decrease or eliminate dependency on government programs.

Adjournment Debate

The alternative to negotiated comprehensive settlements is the high cost of litigation, confrontation and negotiation over individual actions. This would simply prolong the history of bitterness between aboriginal and non-aboriginal people in Canada.

It is clear that it is not possible to reach agreements that deal with land and resource rights within the provinces without the participation of provincial governments. That is why the federal government enters into negotiation of comprehensive claims south of 60 only when the provinces are willing participants.

Just as the federal government negotiates on a policy basis, so do provincial governments. The involvement of territorial governments is also important in the negotiation of claim settle-

ments in the territories as they have an important and growing responsibility in the provision of government services to all residents.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

[*English*]

This House stands adjourned pursuant to the order made Thursday, June 9, 1994 until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 8.41 p.m.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 15, 1994

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Ukrainian Catholic Women's League of Canada

Mr. Lastewka 5335

Association québécoise des pré-retraités et des retraités

Mr. Crête 5335

Justice

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) 5335

Atlantic Canada

Mr. Culbert 5335

Financial Markets

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe) 5336

Referendum '94

Mr. Ringma 5336

St. Georges Anglican Church

Ms. Clancy 5336

Gun Control

Mr. Knutson 5336

The Stanley Cup

Mrs. Terrana 5337

Rwanda

Mr. Paré 5337

Taxation

Mr. Strahl 5337

Saskatchewan

Mr. Taylor 5337

Trade

Mrs. Barnes 5338

The Vancouver Canucks

Mr. Dhaliwal 5338

Royal Canadian Legion

Mr. Malhi 5338

Bosnia

Mr. McWhinney 5338

Atlantic Freight Rate Subsidy

Mrs. Wayne 5338

National Action Committee on the Status of Women

Mr. Bryden 5338

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Policy on Lobbyists**

Mr. Bouchard 5339

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 5339

Mr. Bouchard 5339

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 5339

Mr. Bouchard 5339

Mr. Young 5339

Social Program Reform

Mrs. Lalonde 5339

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5339
Mrs. Lalonde	5340
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5340

Small Business

Mr. Manning	5340
Mr. Manley	5340
Mr. Manning	5340
Mr. Manley	5340
Mr. Manning	5340
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5341

Rwanda

Mrs. Debien	5341
Mr. Ouellet	5341
Mrs. Debien	5341
Mr. Ouellet	5341

Taxation

Mr. Grubel	5341
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5341
Mr. Grubel	5342
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5342

Lumber

Mr. Bergeron	5342
Mr. MacLaren	5342
Mr. Bergeron	5342
Mr. MacLaren	5342

Goods and Services Tax

Mr. Silye	5342
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5342
Mr. Silye	5342
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5343

Marine Safety

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	5343
---------------------------	------

Mr. Young	5343
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	5343
Mr. Young	5343

National Public Service Week

Mr. Bellemare	5343
Mr. Eggleton	5343

The Family

Mr. Abbott	5344
Mr. Peters	5344
Mr. Abbott	5344
Mr. Peters	5344

Gun Control

Mrs. Venne	5344
Mr. Rock	5344
Mrs. Venne	5345
Mr. Gray	5345

Lighthouses

Mr. Duncan	5345
Mr. Young	5345
Mr. Duncan	5345
Mr. Young	5345

Astral

Mr. Patry	5345
Mr. Dupuy	5346

Forestry

Mr. Pomerleau	5346
Ms. McLellan	5346

Discrimination

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	5346
--------------------------------------	------

Mr. Dupuy 5346

Presence in Gallery

The Speaker 5346

Point of Order

Correction

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) 5346

Privilege

Comments during Question Period

Mr. Campbell 5347

Mr. Silye 5347

The Speaker 5347

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken 5347

Sulphur Dioxide Emissions

Ms. Copps 5347

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) 5348

Mr. Abbott 5349

Committees of the House

Finance

Mr. Walker 5350

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Mr. Boudria 5350

Human Resources Development

Ms. Minna 5350

Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1994

Bill C-42. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 5350

Mr. Rock 5350

Grandparent's Day Act

Bill C-259. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 5350

Mrs. Jennings 5350

Criminal Code

Bill C-260. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted 5351

Ms. Meredith 5351

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs

Motion for concurrence 5351

Mr. Boudria 5351

(Motion agreed to.) 5351

Business of the House

Mr. Boudria 5351

Motion 5351

(Motion agreed to.) 5351

Petitions

Assisted Suicide or Euthanasia

Mr. McWhinney 5351

Rights of the Unborn

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) 5351

Human Rights

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier) 5351

Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia	
Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	5351
Protection of Children	
Mrs. Hayes	5352
Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia	
Mrs. Hayes	5352
Income Tax Act	
Mrs. Chamberlain	5352
Retired People’s Income	
Mr. Fillion	5352
Human Rights	
Mrs. Jennings	5352
Rights of Grandparents	
Mrs. Jennings	5352
Ethanol Plant	
Mr. McGuire	5352
VIA Rail	
Mr. Guimond	5352
Violent Crime	
Mr. Calder	5353
Gun Control	
Ms. Meredith	5353
Assisted Suicide and Euthanasia	
Mr. Penson	5353
National Energy Board Act	
Mr. O’Brien	5353
Waste Disposal Sites	
Mr. Adams	5353

Killer Cards

Mr. Adams 5353

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Boudria 5353

Motions for Papers

Mr. Boudria 5353

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Pearson International Airport Agreements Act

Bill C-22. Motion for third reading. 5353
Mr. Robichaud 5353
Mr. Fontana 5354
Mr. Guimond 5357
Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) 5360
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) 5361

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger) 5364

Message from the Senate

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger) 5364

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Pearson International Airport Agreements Act

Bill C-22. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading 5364
Mr. Jackson 5364

ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger) 5365

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Pearson International Airport Agreements Act

Bill C-22. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading 5365

Mr. Nunez	5365
Mr. Loubier	5366
Mr. Boudria	5368

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Non-confidence motions

Consideration resumed of motion and amendment	5369
Mr. de Savoye	5369
Mrs. Jennings	5370
Amendment to the amendment	5372
Mr. Fillion	5372
Mr. Boudria	5373
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	5374
Mrs. Jennings	5375
(Amendment to amendment agreed to.)	5376
(Amendment, as amended, agreed to.)	5376
(Motion, as amended, agreed to.)	5376

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Pearson International Airport Agreements Act

Bill C-22. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	5376
Mr. Lebel	5376
Mr. McTeague	5378
Mr. Hermanson	5379
Mr. Robichaud	5380
Motion	5380
(Motion agreed to.)	5380

Young Offenders Act

Bill C-37. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading	5380
Mr. Strahl	5380
Mr. Collins	5382
Mr. Collins	5383
Mr. Keyes	5384

Mr. Forseth	5385
Mr. Allmand	5386
Mr. Forseth	5389
Mr. Collins	5390
Mr. Strahl	5390
Mr. Robichaud	5391
Motion	5391
(Motion agreed to.)	5391

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Aboriginal Affairs

Ms. McLaughlin	5392
Mr. Ianno	5392