



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 099

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, September 28, 1994**

---

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, September 28, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### YOUNG ENTREPRENEURS

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur):** Mr. Speaker, 12 university students from my riding of Restigouche—Chaleur had a chance to live a wonderful experience this summer in the young entrepreneurs program.

Each of these students created a business plan and next year during the second phase of this project they will create their own small business.

[*Translation*]

Under a Canada–New Brunswick agreement on the development of entrepreneurship, 16 young people had the opportunity to put into practice some of the skills needed to set up a business. I congratulate these young people on their desire to contribute to the economic future of our country.

[*English*]

I would also like to congratulate the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, the Department of Human Resources Development and the New Brunswick Department of Advanced Education and Labour for participating in this important program. Education and training are the key factors in the development of young people in Canada.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### TAX REFORM

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford):** Mr. Speaker, the Ontario Minister of Finance has suggested that provincial sales taxes be transferred to the federal government, and the provinces be given a larger share of income tax in return. It is ridiculous to

think that Quebec would agree to give up the area of taxation and its \$5.7 billion in provincial sales taxes.

It is also ridiculous to think that all the provinces share the same economic reality. Blanket solutions will no longer work. Furthermore, some provinces, such as Alberta and Newfoundland, have already pointed out that Ontario's proposal did not reflect their situation. The Bloc Québécois is proposing a much more flexible solution, which would make it possible to eliminate considerable overlap. They suggest transferring the GST to those provinces who request it, with an equivalent reduction in provincial transfer payments.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in this House today to address a very serious issue, the current threat to freedom of speech in this Parliament.

We are witnessing the decline of dialogue when a member in this House can be accused of hate mongering for expressing what she feels are the views of the majority of Canadians and which are rooted in her personal convictions.

No member of this House should be afraid of expressing their point of view because of a threat of being labelled as a bigot. Nothing shuts down dialogue and the freedom of debate more quickly than labelling.

It is extremely important to all Canadians that in the shaping of public policy alternate points of view must never be suppressed but must be allowed free expression.

Members of this House must never fear to speak out in defence of the views of their constituents, the convictions of their conscience or on behalf of the concerns of Canadians.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### CULTURAL DIVERSITY

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis):** Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, a young high school student in Montreal was sent home because she was wearing a hijab, the traditional Islamic veil, and a long tunic not considered acceptable according to the school's dress code.

*S. O. 31*

[English]

Our schools play an important role in teaching our youth tolerance and acceptance of individuals regardless of race or culture.

[Translation]

All Canadians, regardless of their ethnic origin, religion or political affiliation have the right to have access to public institutions, including schools. The Parti Québécois government must take the necessary action to ensure a climate of tolerance and harmony for all citizens of Quebec.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### DAVIS INLET

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank 217 constituents of the riding of Oxford for taking the time to sign a petition relating to the conditions in Davis Inlet.

These petitioners are asking that the federal government honour the commitment it has made to improve housing, sanitation, and education in order to enable a community healing process to occur and thus realize the vision of the Innu with respect to relocation to Sango Pond.

I am pleased with the work the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is doing to improve the living conditions for all those who live in the Davis Inlet community.

\* \* \*

#### SELWYN TAM

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to recognize the accomplishments of Selwyn Tam of Vancouver East.

At the recent Commonwealth Games in Victoria, B.C., Selwyn led the Canadian wrestling team to one of its finest showings ever with an outstanding gold medal performance in the 52 kilogram weight category.

Selwyn, the defending national senior champion, had a stunning 10 to 0 score in the final bout.

Selwyn is to be commended for his hard work, talent and dedication. Selwyn's contribution to the sport of wrestling has been generous and exemplary. He has given much to further the ideals and principles that sport embodies.

Selwyn is a truly remarkable athlete. We are all very proud of the entire Canadian team and of Selwyn Tam particularly.

Congratulations again.

[Translation]

#### THE ECONOMY

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister should not worry so much about how foreign investors perceive the Quebec sovereignty issue. He told us repeatedly that the sovereignists were responsible for the increase of interests rates in Canada.

(1405)

Yesterday however, members of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Montreal were told otherwise by two renowned American analysts. Mr. Ravi Bulchandani, vice-president of the New York brokerage firm Morgan Stanley, and Mr. George Russell, editor of *Time International*, said that the Canadian debt was a greater concern to American investors than the sovereignty of Quebec.

I suggest to you that the Prime Minister should stop blaming the sovereignists for the economic problems of Canada on the erroneous basis of foreign investors' concern and get down to the task of resolving the debt problem.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot):** Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister of Justice expressed his total disregard for the principles of democracy that govern this country; the we know best attitude still prevails. You can change the name from Tory to Liberal but the game seems to remain the same.

The GST, FTA and NAFTA, to name a few, were shoved down the throats of Canadians by virtue of the fact that the we know best attitude was a hallmark of the Tory government. Now the Minister of Justice has effectively put his government in the same category by publicly proclaiming that any proposed gun legislation will not be determined by a head count. The justice minister does not take a head count. He is not influenced by numbers nor the message behind them.

Democracy does not prevail because the philosophy of the Liberal cabinet is that it and not Canadians knows best.

What can Canadians do about this atrocity? Their only recourse is to wait until the next election and remove this government from power as decisively as they removed the Tories from office in the last election.

\* \* \*

#### SCHIZOPHRENIA

**Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 2, I will have the honour of taking part in

a walk for schizophrenia. This event which coincides with National Mental Illness Awareness Week has been organized by dedicated volunteers in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

The goal of this walk is to generate greater public awareness for schizophrenia, an illness that affects one in 100 people. I had the pleasure of working in the psychiatric mental health field for 27 years and am pleased to have the opportunity to extend my support to this worthwhile cause.

I ask all members of this House to join me in congratulating those who have made this event a reality. I urge all of my colleagues to work in their ridings to bring greater awareness to schizophrenia and to promote mental health issues.

\* \* \*

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues and to all Canadians the recent StatsCan statistics on spousal assaults.

Domestic violence is a harsh reality which we can no longer choose to ignore. The report published by Statistics Canada found that one in three abused wives said they feared for their lives at some point in their relationship and that one in five abused women said that the assaults occurred while they were pregnant.

These figures are horrifying. A man who uses his size and strength to assault or otherwise abuse a woman is not only a coward but a criminal. I challenge all Canadians to speak out at every opportunity, declaring that there is no excuse for abuse.

It is time all Canadians worked together to eliminate spousal abuse once and for all.

\* \* \*

#### ARGENTIA NAVAL BASE

**Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West):** Mr. Speaker, this week the U.S. naval base at Argentia, Newfoundland closed its doors. The negative impact of this closure on the historic town of Placentia will be far reaching. In addition to the number of people who will lose their jobs, we will have to deal with the severe economic impact on the business community as well as social and, last but by no means least, the environmental concerns.

I want to express my gratitude to this government and particularly to the minister of fisheries for their positive response to my efforts on behalf of the people of Placentia area.

I want also to assure the residents of Placentia that I will continue my efforts on their behalf in making sure that there is a very rigorous campaign to address the redevelopment and reuse of the base facilities.

[Translation]

#### PARTY FUNDRAISING

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, my hon. colleague from Richelieu introduced a motion to make party fundraising healthier in Canada. Our motion was somewhat successful in that it was supported by members from all parties. I wish to thank them for their support.

(1410)

Nevertheless, I was shocked and even outraged to see members of the Liberal Party of Canada representing Quebec oppose this motion. They are familiar with the provincial public financing legislation in operation in Quebec since 1977 and should appreciate this basic democratic tool. By voting against the motion we tabled in this House, they show how little they care about the democratization of politics in Canada, which certainly does not do them credit.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### ROYAL BANK OF CANADA

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to two worthy initiatives that will help guarantee Canada a place in the new economy.

Recently the Royal Bank of Canada committed \$25 million to a venture capital fund. Along with its partners an alliance was formed that will provide capital to bring neuroscience breakthroughs to the market. This commitment marks the first time a pool of venture capital has been raised to fund the neurosciences.

In addition, the Bank of Commerce appointed a vice-president of learning organizations and leadership development. The function of this position is to provide a means of measuring intellectual capital.

We have reached the time when banks and other institutions will not measure worth exclusively in terms of tangible assets. Rather, the assets of the future will also be based on intellectual innovation and invention.

As of 7.32 this morning the national debt had reached \$532,190,587,211.96.

\* \* \*

#### CHILD POVERTY

**Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing):** Mr. Speaker, when it comes to child poverty in Canada the latest statistics produced by the Canadian Council on Social Development are startling.

The child mortality rate is twice as high among poor families as among richer families. The high school drop-out rate for

*Oral Questions*

children from poor families is 2.5 times that for children from non-poor families, the list goes on and on. The statistics are getting worse, not better.

Tomorrow this House will discuss my motion M-261 which states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of reaffirming its commitment to seek to achieve the goal of eliminating poverty among Canadian children by the year 2000.

This motion was passed unanimously in 1989.

It is my hope that this Parliament and this government will once again reaffirm its commitment to the national fight against child poverty. It is important that Canadians know there is a commitment to this fight as well as policies which will seriously address it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**GUN CONTROL**

**Mr. Benoît Serré (Timiskaming—French River):** Mr. Speaker, last week, thousands of farmers, hunters and sportsmen, including many Quebecers, came to Parliament Hill to express their concern about new firearms legislation which would affect legitimate gun owners.

Members of the Bloc Québécois were notably absent. Nevertheless, I know that at least ten members privately oppose such controls, but they do not have the nerve to stand up and defend their constituents' rights and privileges. They prefer to toe the party line and follow their leader blindly. Who will defend the interests of Quebec's rural regions in the House of Commons?

I call on all farmers, hunters and sportsmen in Quebec to put pressure on Bloc members.

\* \* \*

[English]

**THE REFORM PARTY**

**Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, last night CBC "Prime Time" exposed secret documents from Reform Party brass which seek to impose the party's right wing agenda on its membership at Reform's national convention in Ottawa next month.

While no surprise to me, no doubt the membership of the so-called party of reform will be alarmed by evidence of such old style politics. Reform campaigned on a promise to speak for the grassroots. Less than a year later the Reform Party brass has reneged on that promise, choosing instead to impose on the grassroots of the party resolutions and policy.

The Reform Party inner circle will impose its secret right wing agenda on its membership, like abolishing the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

As I recall, or is that recall—oops, a bad choice of words—such old style politics was to be strictly verboten.

(1415)

The party of teledemocracy stands exposed. To abolish free speech press one. To abolish free assembly press two. To recall your Reform MP press three.

**The Speaker:** Welcome to wonderful Wednesday.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**1992 REFERENDUM**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said in the House last week that, and I quote: "no trace of any commitment was found" to reimburse Quebec for the expenses incurred in the referendum on the Charlottetown Accord. The truth is that there are not just traces but documents, including a letter dated December 15, 1993, from Mr. Bourassa, the Premier of Quebec at the time, to the then Prime Minister of Canada. This letter followed three other letters on the same subject to the federal Minister of Finance.

Why did the Prime Minister hide these letters from the House and the public?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I did not hide anything from the House. I said that in the government's files I found no commitment by Mr. Mulroney's Conservative government indicating that it would compensate the Government of Quebec. I was aware that requests had been made, and I did not make a secret of that. Some were made publicly. I knew that Mr. Bourassa had talked about this in the National Assembly. But what I did not find is a commitment from the federal government. I got in touch with Mr. Mulroney to ask him whether he had made a commitment. I wrote him a letter about this, and I am waiting for his reply.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I may refer everyone to *Hansard* for September 22, where the Prime Minister says that no trace of any commitment was found. He knows perfectly well that to prove the existence of a commitment, one needs witnesses, and when the witness is one the parties, the case is clear. The letter dated December 15, 1993, which Mr. Bourassa sent to the Prime Minister, contains clear and irrefutable evidence of an agreement between Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Mulroney.

For the benefit of the Prime Minister, I will read an extract from this letter, in which Mr. Bourassa says: "The Chief Electoral Officer of Quebec has established that the direct cost of the referendum for the Government of Quebec as \$47.2

*Oral Questions*

million. That is the basis of our claim for federal compensation, which was transmitted to the federal Minister of Finance by Mr. Gérald-D. Lévesque on May 7, 1993." The letter goes on to say: "Unfortunately, no payment could be made before Mr. Mulroney left." Now for the crucial passage: "although Mr. Mulroney indicated last March that Quebec would be fairly compensated in this respect". How can the Prime Minister deny the existence of an agreement, considering Mr. Bourassa's own very clear testimony which he put down in writing?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Gérald-D. Lévesque wrote to the government about this. I am aware of that. The Minister of Finance also discussed the matter with the Minister of Finance of Canada. This is about a request, a claim made by Quebec. It is not a commitment. A commitment exists when the federal government agrees to pay. However, there is no indication in any document that the government agreed to do so. If conversations took place between Mssrs. Mulroney and Bourassa, I would be delighted to know what they were about. I called Mr. Mulroney, who did not give me an answer, but perhaps the Leader of the Opposition, who knows Mr. Mulroney very well, could call him and ask him whether he gave his consent, yes or no.

(1420)

**The Speaker:** I would ask hon. members to make their questions and answers as brief as possible.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, Robert Bourassa, in the course of his duties as premier and bound by his oath of office, testifies in this letter to the existence of an agreement and a commitment made by his counterpart, the federal Prime Minister. That is the truth.

On September 22 in this House, the Prime Minister challenged the Bloc Québécois to give him, and I quote: "proof that my predecessor and the previous government made a commitment, and we will gladly pay". Here is the proof. Now, pay.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, I would not advise the Leader of the Opposition to go back to practising law, if he makes statements like that.

He says that Mr. Bourassa said that Mr. Mulroney—whom you know very well, who took you at your word and then you went back on it—told him such and such a thing. I do not doubt that Mr. Bourassa wrote the letter, since I read it. However, I asked the Privy Council to go through all the documentation. Was there anything in writing? Did a discussion take place in cabinet or elsewhere to confirm this letter? I was told that nothing could be found.

I called Mr. Mulroney and I told him: Mr. Mulroney, I am sending you a letter with a request to clarify the situation. He said that he would reply very shortly. I said in the House that if

there was a commitment, it would be respected, and if there was no commitment, you can blame Mr. Mulroney.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1993, Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa wrote the Prime Minister of Canada, the hon. member for Saint-Maurice, to confirm the existence of a verbal agreement between himself and the former Prime Minister of Canada. This letter was signed and dated December 15.

Following the questions Bloc Québécois members have been asking in this House for several months on this subject, could the Prime Minister not have shown good will by checking with Mr. Mulroney, right after Mr. Bourassa made the request, if he really wanted to be fair to Quebecers? Should he not have done so a long time ago instead of waiting for the opposition to force his hand a few days ago?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, the opposition says that there was an agreement. In my opinion, any agreement requires the consent of both parties. We found no evidence that the former government gave its consent. We recently asked Mr. Mulroney. We asked Privy Council officials and others who worked with these former first ministers, and they told us that there never was a commitment.

I went one step further: I called Mr. Mulroney himself. I talked to him on the telephone and he told me that he would confirm his position in writing. Once we know his position, we will take action. If he made promises to Mr. Bourassa, I will be very happy to honour them. If he did not make promises at the time and personally refused to pay when he was leading the government, I am not responsible for the actions of another government that did not want to pay. I was not involved in this matter.

I would like to say to the opposition that Alberta and British Columbia also wanted to hold provincial referendums but, under the circumstances, they preferred, to avoid the costs involved and to be sure they would get paid, to have the referendum held under federal legislation.

(1425)

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval):** Mr. Speaker, given the attitude of the officials surrounding the Prime Minister who have been playing hide-and-seek for several months in this matter and the fact that the Prime Minister of Canada questions the very word of the former Quebec premier, does the Prime Minister not agree that his attitude, far from being a sign of co-operation with Quebec, points to a conspiracy against that province?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, a prime minister cannot act alone. The opposition would be the first to blame me if I took on financial commitments without cabinet and Treasury Board approval. Of course, if I give my word, they will honour it; on the other hand, legally, without a cabinet decision and Treasury Board approval, there can be no government commitment.

*Oral Questions*

If Mr. Mulroney made a personal promise to Mr. Bourassa, I will go before my Cabinet to ensure that the word of the former Prime Minister is honoured, even though he did not act prudently. If he promised something without having it approved by Treasury Board and the government then in office, I will not act illegally without the approval of cabinet, Treasury Board and my party.

\* \* \*

[English]

**SOCIAL SECURITY**

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, may I divert the attention of the House to something Canadians really care about?

Canada's social programs are not sustainable at their current levels. In fact estimates by the Auditor General and the Superintendent of Financial Institutions show that within only 15 years Canada's social security system plus interest will exceed 100 per cent of all government revenues.

Is the minister going to reduce spending on social programs or raise taxes?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member well knows, the money that the federal government spends, along with funds spent by provincial governments, is the most important investment we can make because we are investing in the people of Canada.

We are helping young children to have a better life by making sure they are nurtured. We are helping young people get an education so they will have the skills for the future job market. We are providing security for older workers and we are helping our senior citizens.

As a country we have to stay strongly committed to the provision of an effective and improved social security system. This is the reason we will next week be putting forward a series of options, directions for Canadians to take a look at so they can become involved in the important debate as to the kind of social programs we want, how we will pay for it and how we make sure we improve them. That is the reason we are doing it.

I hope the hon. member will actively participate in that debate, unlike some of her colleagues who are saying let us not have a debate at all.

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, seniors and those planning to retire want to know if their government pensions are safe and secure and who will pay for the programs that retiring Canadians have been counting on?

Will the minister's action plan deal with the reality that there will be a 40 per cent increase in the number of senior citizens in the next 15 years?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, the social security review that we will be launching next week deals primarily with matters of the workplace, with matters of lifelong learning and income security.

(1430)

The hon. member should recall we made very explicit in last February's budget that programs pertaining to the question of old age security and the Canadian pension plan were not being touched as part of this review.

The Minister of Finance clearly indicated that we would be preparing and releasing a discussion paper to show what the demographic changes would be and what the long term impacts would be on some of our income security papers. That kind of analysis is now under way. It is the kind of thing that has to be shared with all Canadians to make sure we can reason together on very important issues.

Once again I invite the hon. member to participate in a constructive way in that debate.

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North):** Mr. Speaker, the minister should realize that Canadians cannot prepare an informed response to his action plan unless they understand the financial consequences.

Will the minister help all Canadians deal with this reality by providing detailed financial projections next week with all the elements of his action plan?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I could begin right at this moment to give Canadians one set of analyses. I heard the hon. member, in a press conference the Reform Party held, talk about a cut of \$15 billion in social programs. A \$15 billion cut would mean the total elimination of all assistance for children, all social services for seniors and all assistance for higher education from the federal level.

In other words, the Reform Party's fiscal program would wipe out assistance for children, young people and workers. We do not need that kind of fiscal program.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CHILD POVERTY**

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

In its report released yesterday, the Canadian Institute of Child Health says that one child out of five lives in poverty in Canada. The Institute, which conducted a similar public study in 1989, concludes that child poverty and its harmful effects have increased.

Will the Prime Minister recognize that, beyond all the nice rhetoric, the only measure taken by his government was to contribute to the impoverishment of Canadian families by substantially reducing UI access and benefits, thereby forcing the unemployed and their families to rely on welfare?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the House that one of the major results of the changes we made to the unemployment insurance system in the legislation last spring was to provide assistance for an additional 27,000 low income families with children. We substantially increased their UI benefits.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, we are talking about children's health. My question is: Does the Prime Minister realize that his social reform, which is designed to get into these programs—and that is the only measure announced—will in fact impoverish families already living below poverty level, in very difficult conditions, and also have harmful effects on children?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, I have asked members of the House to wait until we table the paper before they begin making judgments on the various propositions.

However I can tell the hon. member very clearly that the issue of child poverty is a very central concern of the government. It will be seriously addressed in the discussion paper. We will use that occasion to engage Canadians from one end of the country to the other in a major debate on how we can better mobilize resources to put an end to child poverty by the end of this century.

(1435)

It is a commitment this party made when it was in opposition. It is a commitment we make as a government to begin to bring Canadians forward on a serious debate about how we can deal with the problem of children and their parents.

I would ask the hon. member to use her best offices as a member of that party to provide a constructive and positive contribution to that debate.

\* \* \*

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked for an explanation of questionable practices

#### Oral Questions

within the defence department. Most glaring was a \$327,000 contract in connection with the deputy minister's office.

This figure could in fact be much higher. A departmental answer to an access to information request suggests that additional costs have been camouflaged by splitting invoices between several agencies.

Does the Prime Minister agree that this is an unusual practice? Will he tell us how much money was involved in these purchases, and if those figures are not now available will he commit to making them public when he has them?

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the allegation and the question are centred around the Lagueux report, an audit done in national defence in 1992. I was briefed on it and I have to report to the House.

On the evidence that I received this morning I have to report that there is no evidence of wrongdoing whatsoever.

**Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, there are many discrepancies revealed in the Lagueux report that indicate poor management practices within the department. People inside and outside the department are aware of the allegations and are unhappy with the implications.

In the interest of morale and confidence in the system will the parliamentary secretary commit the government to commissioning an outside, unbiased, professional investigation to settle the matter once and for all?

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, if you accept my answer to the first question then obviously the answer to the second question has to be, I regret, no.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### CENTRES OF EXCELLENCE FOR WOMEN'S HEALTH

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

In the report on poverty, women's health problems are mentioned. The Minister of Health announced the establishment of a centre of excellence on several occasions: during the throne speech, in January; during the budget speech, in February; in the House, on March 8; in Montreal, before the Canadian Medical Association, on August 16; and finally last week, at the gynecologists' convention.

When will the Minister of Health stop announcing that the centres of excellence will be established shortly and act?



*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, as soon as the plans are finalized, I will be delighted to let everyone know.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec):** Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the delay in implementation is due to the fact that the minister is unable to convince her colleagues to allocate the funds for centres of excellence for women's health?

[English]

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, the centres of excellence for women's health are well on the road to being announced. The terms of reference are being worked on. I will be very happy when they are all completed and the centres are operational across the country.

\* \* \*

**LAND ENGINEERING TEST ESTABLISHMENT**

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, for 50 years the land engineering test establishment, known as LETE, has provided one-stop shopping for Canadian army design, development and testing.

In 1993 the chief of defence staff gave LETE a departmental commendation for the completion of 50 high priority tasks supporting peacekeepers in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia.

LETE has saved Canadian soldiers. Will the Prime Minister confirm that in fact there are no real savings in the closure of LETE and that others will fill LETE's crucial role at the potential expense of Canadian lives?

(1440)

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, in response to his question I assure the hon. member that the Canadian forces have not and will not place their troops at unnecessary risk with inappropriate or unsafe equipment.

As the member knows, the closure of LETE on September 1 will not result in reduced standards or reduced responsiveness to the army's needs.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian public is demanding accountability from the government; it wants the facts.

The remarks of the parliamentary secretary do not represent the facts. The facts are that DND is sending some of LETE's sophisticated equipment as a gift to the United States army test and evaluation command, according to their fax which I have in my possession dated September 22.

Will the Prime Minister tell us how defence can justify LETE's closure as a cost cutting saving when we will now have to pay the Americans to use our own equipment?

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, the thrust of the hon. member's question is very good. He talks about the facts. I will give him the facts.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Mifflin:** If he wants the answer he is going to have to listen. The fact is that the essential activities previously conducted by LETE are being carried out in house and through separate contracts. For contracted work, where feasible, Canadian companies will be considered as a matter of course.

I again assure the House the closure of LETE, if he wants the facts, is expected to save \$11 million annually.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**REGISTERED RETIREMENT SAVINGS PLANS**

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. In spite of constant questioning on the part of the official opposition about what his plans really are regarding RRSP taxation, the Minister of Finance still refuses to rule out that possibility. His attitude gives more cause for worry to middle-class taxpayers who rely on RRSPs to prepare a decent retirement for themselves.

I give him yet another chance to put their worried minds to rest. Why does he refuse to undertake not to tax RRSPs, in order not to further increase the tax burden of the middle class?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, one can wonder who is causing worry—I believe this is the third time this week that the hon. member has asked the same question. The Bloc Québécois must have run out of questions to ask.

I was very clear on this issue. If there is to be a pre-budget consultation process, the Minister of Finance must not rule out any possibility or idea. We do not want to hinder the process. I made it very clear that if I answered this question, it would lead to another and another, eventually rendering the consultation process useless. So, I do not intend to comment on specific suggestions because I want to give the people of Canada the chance to tell us what they want.

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue):** Mr. Speaker, questions arise because there are no clear answers. Does the Minister of Finance not recognize that by taxing RRSPs, he would actually be creating inequity between those workers who have registered retirement savings plans subsidized in part by their employers and those who have none, such as self-employed workers, farmers and fishermen?

[English]

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, it is very important to preserve the integrity of the consultation process.

All of us in the House are involved in a unique experiment. We are opening up the whole process of budgetary consultation. We are getting rid of budget secrecy.

That really means the Minister of Finance should not comment on individual suggestions. If he does so, he will eventually make the process impossible because the budget will have been given well before its official date.

I do not intend to make specific comments on specific suggestions because I want the process to work, and that is what Canadians want.

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton):** Mr. Speaker, my question is with regard to the Canadian military personnel that served in the Persian gulf war. It is reported that Canadian personnel were administered a drug to combat potential nerve gas attacks. Many are now complaining of severe side effects referred to as gulf war syndrome.

(1445)

Can the minister please inform the House of the progress being made to help these deserving Canadians.

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this question because it involves the long term health and welfare of the Canadian forces personnel.

In direct response to the question, we have had 12 people with symptoms similar to those voiced by the United States forces personnel. They have been seen by a Canadian forces doctor and are currently experiencing no difficulty whatsoever.

As the minister has previously stated in this House, we have not been able to determine a causal link between the chemical biological warfare agents used in the gulf and the symptoms experienced by the Canadian forces members. In fact we find evidence to the contrary.

I want to reassure the House that there is no scientific evidence that the drugs that were administered to the Canadian forces members had harmful effects. On the contrary. In fact, the

#### Oral Questions

body of evidence that exists would show that everything attests to their safety and their use.

#### PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Once again we are seeing the federal government playing politics with the economic well-being of Canada. The users of terminals one and two at Pearson airport are languishing in outdated and overcrowded facilities while the government's fatally flawed Bill C-22 is passed back and forth like a football between the Liberal dominated Commons and the Tory-run other place. This is economic planning at its shameful worst.

Can the minister advise this House what action he is taking to ensure the economic well-being of Pearson airport while this political football game continues.

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I and I am sure many members of the House and especially people who understand the importance of Pearson International Airport to the economy not only to that area of Ontario but to the entire country are looking forward to this afternoon and tomorrow because I understand that members in the other place have already indicated that they are looking very much to the position of my colleagues in the Reform Party.

I think if they support this bill we will be able to get it through the Senate and do what we have to do with Pearson which is get on with the business of running Pearson.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister's response did not tell us what he has planned for Pearson.

Under the minister's national airport plan we will not see the commencement of construction on a new facility until at least 1998. This is not acceptable. I cannot believe the minister is prepared to tell Toronto it will have to wait until past the turn of the century for needed facilities.

What is the minister doing to shorten this unacceptable delay?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with the premier of Ontario with respect to this matter. As the hon. member will know, the new Canadian airport authority at Pearson will have representation from the Government of Canada, from the province of Ontario and from various municipalities in the metropolitan Toronto area.

We have done that now. We will have concluded the transitional requirements but we are faced, and I want to tell my hon. colleague this, with a very serious problem. We have identified the people. We have the structure all set to go but our friends in

*Oral Questions*

the other place would like to stick Canadian taxpayers with a bill for \$445 million and I want to see this afternoon if the Reform Party is going to put its votes where its mouth is.

[Translation]

**SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM**

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

On March 9, the minister indicated in this House that he wanted to review old-age security programs. Following the general outcry caused by this announcement, the Prime Minister decided that the review would be limited to the Canada Pension Plan and RRSPs. This review was to be tabled last June but the government has clearly delayed it.

My question is this: Can the minister tell us why the government has delayed announcing its intentions by tabling the review promised for last June?

(1450)

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, we are presently speaking with a number of groups and organizations throughout Canada, particularly as they represent seniors, to get their point of view.

I want to use the opportunity to correct one very mistaken statement I know the member made inadvertently and that is that we said that we would be doing anything about old age pensions. We never said that. We said we would be preparing a paper to look at the long range income security issues facing Canada.

That was a commitment made in the budget and that is it, period.

[Translation]

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Does the minister still intend to slash programs for seniors in order to finance other federal government programs? Will we have to wait until after the Quebec referendum to know the answer?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Mr. Speaker, it never was our intention, it will not be our intention, *la réponse est non*.

\* \* \*

**HAITI**

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, last week the Prime Minister's government committed to send troops and RCMP to

Haiti. Yesterday RCMP chief superintendent Mr. Pouliot stated that retraining the Haitian police force would take from seven to ten years.

Since the Prime Minister is asking Canadian soldiers and police to risk their lives in the chaos of Haiti and Canadian taxpayers to finance it, will he at least tell us his plan, the costs and how long we can expect to have Canadians in Haiti?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that Canadian commitments through the United Nations are well known and well supported by the overwhelming majority of Canadians.

Indeed it is clear that when Canada responds to a request by the United Nations we follow the longstanding practice to serve wherever we are asked and particularly to serve in an area close to our own country in our own hemisphere.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, there is not enough maple syrup in Canada to cover the waffling of this government.

Since we cannot get an answer on any kind of a plan for Canadians, we do not know what it is going to cost and we do not know how long they are going to be there, could we at least find out the commitments, who they have been made to, what we have committed and why those commitments cannot be explained to the Canadian people?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the hon. member has all the numbers he wants. In fact they have been part of the estimates. There have been witnesses before a parliamentary committee who gave all the indications. For the benefit of the hon. member I will send him a letter giving all the numbers that he has already.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**TURBOT FISHERY**

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, the Minister of Fisheries encouraged Gaspé fishermen in their plan to catch turbot; last March, at the Boston Seafood Show; in April, with his Quebec counterpart and in July, the minister himself admitted it in an interview with the Canadian press. However, on July 20, with only a few hours' notice, the minister denied the Gaspé fishermen access to the resource, even though they had just invested more than \$700,000.

Does the minister admit that his about-face alone is responsible for this summer's turbot saga, which led to the arrest of the Gaspé fishermen, their being fined and losing investments of hundreds of thousands of dollars?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, the member continues to make an assertion that he knows to be absolutely false; that is the notion that the Government of Canada ever gave any consent or ever requested that people expend funds in anticipation of or with a guarantee of a licence to be subsequently let to fish turbot. The member knows that, not just because I have dealt with it publicly and in the House but because the member was privately briefed by me three times and on four occasions was briefed by my officials. On each occasion he expressed an understanding of the need for conservation.

(1455)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, clearly, the minister did not answer the question. Since the minister cannot deny having supported the plan, does he promise today to fully compensate the Gaspé fishermen who spent more than \$700,000 and whose only mistake was to take a man at his word?

*[English]*

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday the whole planet recognizes the need for conservation. The whole planet acted on that need at a UN conference. All the members of NAFO acted on that need at a NAFO conference. All the people associated with the fishery in Canada, current stakeholders, people who are already in the turbot fishery, have taken anywhere from 60 per cent to 100 per cent cuts in that stock, yet this member continues to insist that one group of fishermen only in Atlantic Canada, and there are hundreds affected in many provinces, ought to be compensated.

The member knows that the proposition he has put is laced more with a concern out of political advantage than with a concern for conservation. The member ought to grow up and be responsible.

**The Speaker:** My colleagues, we should be very careful not to attribute motive of any kind, at least motive which is less than acceptable. I would ask that in the questions and in the answers that perhaps we carry a greater amount of respect one for the other.

\* \* \*

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice regarding discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include freedom from discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation as promised in the red book?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Mr. Speaker, this government remains committed to exactly such an amendment and we will introduce a bill to that effect.

I should say in response to the member's question that in doing so we will not only fulfil a commitment and provide for a matter of fundamental justice, but we will also bring the federal statute into conformity with eight provincial human rights acts, some of which date back to 1977 on that topic. We will have the federal law conform with what the courts have in any event been reading into the act for many years.

In the view of this government it is about time that our federal statute reflect the reality in Canada.

\* \* \*

**PNEUMONIC PLAGUE**

**Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod):** Mr. Speaker, pneumonic plague has been a problem in India. Can the health minister tell us what she is doing to reassure Canadians?

**Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the hon. member's question and to inform the House of the steps that have been taken to respond to this issue.

Last Friday night I and my department issued a travel advisory to all Canadians pertaining to travel to India indicating that they should not travel in certain areas or that if they absolutely have to, they should see their doctor prior to leaving the country.

I have been meeting with my officials to make sure that we continue to be very vigilant and monitor what is happening. I have asked that all flights from India be met at international airports. There is an emergency response plan in place.

(1500)

That being said, there is a very small risk to Canadians at this time. I have asked that a yellow card be issued to all international passengers on flights originating in India, and to ground personnel at airports in order that they may have the proper information to deal with this issue.

\* \* \*

**AIDS**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast):** Mr. Speaker, we have the Minister of Health taking action on a disease that is treatable and not likely to spread in Canada. Canadians expect that.

However, I find it ironic that the minister of immigration has refused the Reform Party's repeated calls for HIV testing for immigrants, a disease that is fatal, invisible and costs hundreds of thousands of dollars to treat.

*Routine Proceedings*

When will the minister of immigration stop treating HIV/AIDS as a politically protected disease and put the health and safety of Canadians at the top of his priority list.

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, the health and safety of Canadians is already at the top of the list for all ministers and government departments. That is our first priority.

Second, the member of Parliament knows that after 18 years where the medical inadmissibility chapter of our process has not been touched that I have asked for a full review.

It is blatantly unfair and irresponsible for this member to simply select one element. The government will proceed with a full review in a comprehensive and factual way.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Edward Roberts, Minister of Justice and the Hon. John Efford, Minister of Work Services and Transportation from the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

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

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS**

**Mr. Bob Kilger (Stormont—Dundas):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the joint parliamentary delegation's visit to Australia from June 26 to July 4, 1994.

This visit took us to four communities: Canberra, Longreach, Brisbane and Sydney. As guests of the Australian Senate and House of Representatives, we were provided with the opportunity to meet and discuss matters with numerous parliamentarians, many of whom were ministers, both at the federal and state levels. Our discussions covered a wide range of topics: international affairs, including APEC, GATT, NAFTA, UN peacekeeping, economic and taxation issues, including the GST, aboriginal affairs, federal-state relations and employment, agricultural and educational issues, just to name a few.

I know I speak for all the members of the delegation when I say that we felt as if we were still at home in Canada because of the numerous similarities between our two countries.

Let me conclude by drawing the House's attention to a recommendation put forward by an Australian counterpart, the hon. Andrew Peacock. Mr. Peacock felt very strongly that because Canada and Australia have so much in common and so

many areas in which expertise can be shared and exchanged, some form of mechanism or association should be created to ensure that this type of exchange between Australian and Canadian parliamentarians takes place on a more frequent and regular basis.

(1505)

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express our gratitude to the Hon. Michael Beahan, President of the Senate and your counterpart, the Hon. Stephen Martin, Speaker of the House of Representatives for being such gracious hosts; Mrs. Carol Richardson, Australian Parliamentary Officer, who worked so hard and successfully on our program; and finally to Mr. Michael Berry, Canadian High Commissioner, and Mr. Gardiner Wilson, Canadian Deputy High Commissioner, who provided the delegation with much appreciated advice and support.

**The Speaker:** Now that is what I call a comprehensive and fine report.

\* \* \*

**COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, in accordance with its responsibilities under the standing orders I am pleased to report to the House that the Committee on Procedure and House Affairs has studied private members' business and has reported that one motion and one bill should be made votable.

Accordingly, I have the honour to present the 33rd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs which is deemed adopted when it is laid upon the Table.

I also have the honour to table the 34th report of the Committee on Procedure and House Affairs which deals with the allocation of rooms for the day for the presentation of the Auditor General's report for 1994.

If the House gives its consent, it is my intention to move concurrence in the 34th report later this day.

\* \* \*

**ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES ACT**

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-275, an act respecting the protection and rehabilitation of endangered and threatened species.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill is to protect biodiversity. It is aimed at identifying, protecting and rehabilitating endangered and threatened species and is a step toward the overall protection of Canada's biodiversity.

In addition to identifying, protecting and rehabilitating flora and fauna in Canada when threatened or endangered by human activity, the Minister of the Environment would also have powers to develop and implement programs to restore the

populations of threatened and endangered species to self-sustain the numbers.

Combined with the Canada Wildlife Act, strengthened by amendments in June of this year, this bill is intended to help ensure the protection of Canada's biodiversity and to enhance the biodiversity convention adopted at the UN Conference on the Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

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

\* \* \*

#### LESTER B. PEARSON DAY ACT

**Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-276, an act respecting Lester B. Pearson Day.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of tabling a private member's bill, the purpose of which is to honour the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson for his contribution to Canada, the international community and world peacekeeping by designating the second Monday in February of each year as Lester B. Pearson Day.

I hope that all members will support this bill which aims to recognize a truly remarkable Canadian.

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

\* \* \*

(1510)

#### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

##### PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent I intend to move concurrence in the 34th report of the committee. I believe there would also be consent to dispense with the reading of the report.

I move that the 34th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

[Translation]

##### ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons)** moved:

That the members of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development and the required staff be authorized to travel to Toronto, Quebec City, Montreal, Akwesasne, Bathurst, Halifax, Vancouver, Edmonton and Winnipeg between October 17, 1994 and December 2, 1994.

#### Routine Proceedings

(Motion agreed to.)

[English]

##### FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons)** moved:

That a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans be authorized to travel to Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories during the month of October 1994 to undertake a study of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and that the necessary staff accompany the sub-committee.

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

**Some hon. members:** No.

\* \* \*

#### PETITIONS

##### RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am proud to present a petition containing 2,600 signatures on behalf of the constituents of Wild Rose.

These petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection that is enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

I respectfully submit this petition on this day.

##### DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

**Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville):** Mr. Speaker, I have a very extensive petition signed by hundreds of people from all across Ontario, including places like Kemptonville, Vanier, Nepean and so forth.

The petitioners call on Parliament to recognize the public threat of dangerous offenders and to amend the Criminal Code to have such offenders detained indefinitely on warrant expiry, when it is believed they may cause serious physical or psychological harm or death of another person.

It is a pleasure for me to present this petition today.

(1515)

##### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions I would like to present under Standing Order 36.

Whereas the majority of Canadians believe that the privileges which society accords to heterosexual couples should not be extended to same sex relationships, and whereas societal approval including the extension of societal privileges would be given to same sex relationships if any amendment to the Canadian Human Rights Act were to include the undefined phrase sexual orientation as a ground for discrimination, these people petition Parliament not to amend the Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would

*Routine Proceedings*

tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the prohibitive grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

## ABORTION

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, my next petition to Parliament is with regard to abortion.

The petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

## EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, the next petition is with regard to euthanasia and concludes by saying that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow aiding or abetting suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

## LIBRARY BOOK POSTAL SUBSIDY

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** Mr. Speaker, my final petition comes mainly from the constituents in the Stockholm area of my riding who have a concern regarding Saskatchewan's public libraries.

They would like to draw the attention of the House to the following: that the library book postal subsidy is necessary for the continued operation of interlending services among libraries and plays a vital role in the distribution of cultural materials; that cancellation of the subsidy or changes in the amount of the subsidy would result in severely hampering public access to information housed in libraries outside the resident's immediate area; that maintaining the subsidy is a more effective, more efficient use of public funds than any other alternative. Therefore your petitioners call upon Parliament to continue the library book postal subsidy and ensure that there be no further erosion in the resulting library book postal rate.

## LAW OF THE SEA

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, this is a petition signed by a large number of Canadians from many provinces including Ontario and Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia.

It calls upon Parliament to urge the Government of Canada to ratify the law of the sea. Among the many reasons given for this very important step, Canadian failure to ratify the law of the sea by November of this year would jeopardize Canada's eligibility

to participate in the law of the sea dispute settlement tribunal and decision making council.

## ABORTION

**Mr. Tony Valeri (Lincoln):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and the privilege to table two petitions from my constituents in the riding of Lincoln pursuant to Standing Order 36 and duly certified by the Clerk of Petitions.

The first petition calls upon Parliament to act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code of Canada.

## ASSISTED SUICIDE

**Mr. Tony Valeri (Lincoln):** Mr. Speaker, my second petition requests that Parliament retain the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide or euthanasia.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House to present petitions signed by over 100 constituents from Williams Lake, 100 Mile House, and Lillooet, British Columbia.

My constituents call upon the government not to amend the Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or homosexuality.

They also call upon the government not to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include sexual orientation in the prohibited grounds of discrimination.

I present this petition with my concurrence.

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my honour to table a petition signed by 196 people from the town of Maple Creek in my riding. The text is that whereas except in police states there is no evidence that the incidence of criminal or suicidal misuse of firearms is impeded by restrictive legislation, whereas Canadian citizens are already overburdened by unnecessary and ineffective gun control legislation, we humbly pray and call upon Parliament to desist from passing additional restrictive legislation with respect to firearms or ammunition and to direct its attention to the apprehension and adequate punishment of those who criminally misuse firearms or other deadly weapons.

I heartily concur with this petition.

(1520)

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my duty and honour to rise in the House to present three petitions duly certified by the Clerk of Petitions on behalf of the constituents of Saanich—Gulf Islands and surrounding area.

*Routine Proceedings*

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to ensure that the present provisions of the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms prohibiting amendments to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships, homosexuality and the undefined phrase sexual orientation remain in force.

## EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I wish to present two petitions today on behalf of the constituents of Simcoe Centre.

The first is on the issue of euthanasia. The petitioners request that current laws regarding active euthanasia be enforced.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is requesting the Government of Canada not to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitioners are concerned about including the phrase sexual orientation. Refusing to define the statement leaves the interpretation open to the courts, a very dangerous precedent to set.

## MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have the pleasure to present the attached petition. It has been signed by 4,801 of my constituents.

These petitioners draw the attention of the House to the following: that everyone has to be accountable for the mounting debt burden; that members of Parliament should demonstrate self-restraint to the citizens by cutting back on their lavish pensions; that the qualifying time period for an MP's pension is far too short; that the eligible age to receive an MP's pension is much too young; that by MPs setting such an example of restraint the tolerance of the citizens would be more forthcoming.

Therefore your petitioners call upon Parliament to enact legislation to change this pension plan.

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to present two petitions from Simcoe North totalling 100 petitioners supporting the status quo with regard to firearms ownership.

[*Translation*]

The petitioners ask the government not to impose any new restriction regarding firearm acquisition certificates. They also

ask Parliament to instruct the judicial system to implement current laws more strictly.

[*English*]

I believe we should all focus our attention on the real root causes of crime which are embedded in discrimination, poverty, familial dysfunction, inadequate parental responsibility and a myriad of other socioeconomic problems rather than focus on firearm control, the effectiveness of which is very questionable at best.

[*Translation*]

While the safety of our communities concerns us all, I think that the problem is put out of proportion. The fact remains that Canada is no more violent as a society than before and that criminal acts against people are not increasing uncontrollably. To instill fear in people's mind without any regard for the facts is despicable.

[*English*]

## LEONARD PELTIER

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough):** Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from more than 400 persons from all over Ontario collected by people in Peterborough riding which concerns the extradition of Leonard Peltier from Canada to the United States.

These petitioners point out that the information provided at the time in the mid-seventies with respect to Mr. Peltier's case was fabricated by the U.S. authorities and that since that time new information has emerged that indicates that Leonard Peltier was not guilty of the crime for which he has spent the last 18 years in prison.

Therefore these petitioners request that Parliament hold an external review of the 1976 extradition hearings and that Mr. Peltier be brought back to Canada for asylum.

I am pleased that in response to this and previous petitions the Minister of Justice is conducting a review.

## GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt):** Mr. Speaker, today I rise in my place pursuant to Standing Order 36 to deliver two more petitions on the subject of gun control.

The petitioners are seriously concerned about the lack of respect the government is showing for the integrity of law-abiding responsible gun owners. They are opposing further legislation for firearms acquisition and possession and call for strict guidelines and mandatory sentences for the use or possession of a firearm in the commission of a violent crime.

I concur with my petitioners.



*Government Orders*

(1525)

[Translation]

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, question No. 61 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 61—**Mr. Axworthy:**

Does the government plan to spend money through public and private agencies, on communications relating to initiatives undertaken by the Department of Human Resources Development from January 1, 1994 to December 31, 1994, and if so, how much?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification):** Yes; \$13.95 million.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The question as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary has been answered.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

[English]

**MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I ask that the notice of motion for the production of papers stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Shall all notices of motions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AGREEMENTS ACT**

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport)** moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours that this House disagrees with the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-22, an act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport.

He said: Mr. Speaker, today I am proposing that the House of Commons respond to the Senate's message, which proposed amendments to Bill C-22, by indicating the complete rejection by this House of its amendments to a bill which seeks to cancel the contracts entered into by the previous government concerning the redevelopment and ownership of terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport.

Bill C-22 was designed to cancel the agreements between Her Majesty and the T1 T2 Limited partnership. These arrangements were entered into, as everyone knows, during the dying days of the last government now nearly a year ago. The agreements turned over the development and operation of terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson international for 57 years to a group of private developers.

The agreements were examined and were found not to be in the public interest. The facts in arriving at this determination can be stated very succinctly. The agreements as I indicated were signed just weeks before an election. They did not contain a cancellation clause when the government of the day had to know it was going to lose the election and the deal was being widely questioned. The agreement was for 57 years, 20 years more than the normal amortization period for buildings and the time normally associated with the recovery of this kind of an investment.

The after tax rate of return has been estimated by some at 14.2 per cent. However, this figure does not take into account profits the individual partners would have realized on contracts they held with the partnership. The actual rate of return for the partners in this deal would be more in the order of 28 per cent.

The original tender period was for 90 days, then it was extended to 120 days. The submissions that were received covered thousands of pages of technical and financial information because the process in effect had granted an enormous advantage to those companies that had lobbied the government for the project. They had made their preparations and they were ready when the tender call was issued.

One of the proponents had commenced lobbying to achieve the privatization of these terminals in mid-1989, had submitted an unsolicited proposal, offered policy advice to then ministers of the crown. Surely this is not a normal tendering process or acceptable practice.

The Leader of the Official Opposition, now the Prime Minister, indicated clearly before the election and while this deal was being consummated that the deal would be reviewed.

I could go on with the list of unusual elements in this process that Mr. Nixon described in his report as flawed. I do not really think it is of much use at this stage. We have gone through it over and over again.

*Government Orders*

I want to point out today that Canadians generally and voters in the metro Toronto area particularly understood the flaws in the deal were enough to reject it, and they did so massively. That is one of the major and principal reasons why the Liberals took every seat in metro in that election last fall. If no one else understood it, the voters knew a tender process is generally designed to provide a winner and some losers. The previous government cooked up a process which produced a winning loser and losing winner. Rather than permitting the merger of a financially strapped winner with a wealthy loser, as it turned out, a new tender call obviously would have been what was appropriate.

(1530)

One of the hired guns for the consortium has described Bill C-22 as an act worthy only of a banana republic. I contend quite the contrary because Bill C-22 provides for the correction of actions that are characteristic of what goes on in so-called banana republics.

*[Translation]*

The government is firmly committed to reject the ways of the former government. This transaction is riddled with interference by lobbyists, favouritism, behind-the-scenes wheeling and dealing, manipulation of legitimate private interests and disregard for public service impartiality. As a whole, it is unacceptable.

The government intends to protect the country's interests and the taxpayers' dollars. We believe that matters that can jeopardize our economy and our competitiveness as a country should be negotiated under a transparent and accessible process.

In legislating an end to these agreements, the government took several factors into account: the need for a quick decision on future requirements at Pearson, once these agreements were set aside; the government's commitment to put public interest before favouritism and the quest for excessive profits; and the fact that the private sector would have gained control of one of the most important assets in the field of transportation by means of an arrangement that would have generated unreasonable profits for a favoured few.

*[English]*

On July 13 I announced a national airport policy that would ensure the existence of a safe, efficient, competitive network of airports across the country and would be managed in the best interest of Canadian taxpayers and the travelling public.

However the opportunity to benefit from the advice and competence of dedicated people representing regional and local interest is being denied to Lester B. International Airport, owing to the cloud that these agreements cast.

There are some in this place who would have us believe that if the matter is before the courts for years somehow we could do what would be done in the other airports across the country through Canadian airport authorities. One would have to be very naive to think that any group of citizens would take on the operation of terminal 1 and terminal 2 while all the threat of litigation and all that could imply hung out there for months and in fact years, knowing the size and the magnitude of the problem.

Terminals 1 and 2 at Toronto Pearson airport need upgrading. I agree with my hon. friend opposite on that. The parking garages are in a deplorable state. Safety and security are being put in question. The list is long of what has to be done at Pearson. The opportunity to provide travellers with newer, safer and more modern services is being denied to users of Pearson.

We have stated time and time again that it is our intention to treat the T1 T2 Limited Partnership in a fair and equitable manner considering the circumstances. We have recognized that not all the partners were involved to the same extent in this flawed process and that private sector companies not part of the consortium should not be unduly penalized.

We have asked that the partnership submit their out of pocket expenses as well as those of third parties. We wish and we undertake to see to it that all parties are repaid funds they have spent consistent with good business practice, but we will not compensate for lobbyist fees and charges.

(1535)

I am aware of the need for public accountability on the matter. I know members of the House of Commons, the Auditor General, the public accounts committee and the interested parties, the people who have the taxpayers' interest at heart, will review whatever decision is made by the government to pay those legitimate out of pocket expenses. I welcome that thorough review because I understand my responsibilities in the matter.

Members of the House of Commons must understand that the out of pocket expenses were for financiers, planners, engineers, managers and designers. Not a single dime was spent on steel, concrete, lumber, escalators or other services normally associated with airport operations. Clearly the out of pocket expenses did not enhance the value of the property or provide any benefits to the taxpayer or the traveller.

Responsibility to the taxpayer and fairness toward T 1 T 2 Limited Partnership and third parties is what Bill C-22 is about.

Let us take a look at the amount of the bill the Tory majority of members in the other place want to foist on Canadian taxpayers. The consortium has replied to our request for its appropriate out of pocket expenses by submitting claims to the Canadian people for approximately \$445 million. Of this amount, \$415 million represent loss of profits to the consortium or its partners in various third party capacities. The consortium is not interested

*Government Orders*

in fair compensation; it wants to sting the Canadian public for over \$400 million.

I have to ask all colleagues in the House and Canadians if they think the Conservative majority in the other place is being responsible when it says it is not concerned about the consequences of its action as far as money goes. It claims that all it is interested in is the principle of the bill. How can anyone be so irresponsible with taxpayers' dollars?

I thank my Liberal colleagues in the other place. We have been through a lot on the bill; a lot has been said. I have the greatest respect for those members in the other place, including independent members who mounted a stout defence of the legislation and have spoken eloquently to protect the interests of Canadian taxpayers. I know those people with their hearts and their heads in the right place will rise to the occasion again.

As for those who presently hold the majority they cling to in the other place, their method of dealing with the issue does not improve my opinion of them, which should not come as a surprise to anyone.

I sincerely believe Canadians in every part of the country who support every political party represented in the House will be outraged when they understand the size and the amount of the bill the Tory majority in the other place is planning to drop on them. The bill for their defeat of Bill C-22 will be \$445 million.

**An hon. member:** What is the Reform Party going to do?

**Mr. Young:** Since my colleague refers to it, are my friends in the Reform Party prepared to go along? I have listened carefully in the months we have spent in the House together. Time and time again we disagree on some issues, but on one issue I think we have a lot in common. I have tried to do some things at Transport Canada that will improve services to the Canadian public but reduce the burden on the Canadian taxpayer. I think we understand what we are trying to achieve together.

It is not just a question of principle or of letting people go to the courts or of trying to have due process and all the rest of the things we hear talked about. We are talking about Canadian taxpayers faced with cuts being levelled at them by every government in the country, no matter what their political stripe. Cuts are being requested of us by members of the official opposition and the Reform Party. We understand that.

I cannot believe anyone would agree with those in the other place who say they do not care that their amendments would put at risk hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. Do they believe or does anyone believe Canadian taxpayers should be asked to compensate developers for 57 years worth of lost profits because they cooked up a deal with the Conservative government that days later lost every seat in the greater Toronto

area and only held on to two of them in the whole country? Tory senators do not want us to settle for out of pocket and reasonable expenses. They want \$445 million on this last trip to the trough for their friends.

(1540)

I cannot believe that at least some of the Conservative senators in the other place will not understand that Parliament cannot condone this outrageous raid on Canadian taxpayers.

[*Translation*]

The leader of the Liberal Party, now Prime Minister of Canada, warned all the parties not to sign the agreement. If the promoters were so sure that this was a good deal for Canada, why did they not wait and try to convince a new government and the public? Was it because they knew their friends were going to lose if there was no cancellation clause in the contract?

[*English*]

Our government is pledged to dealing with the private sector in an open, fair and responsible manner; but we will always take the taxpayers' interest into account. Our decision to cancel this contract came after a clear and absolutely unequivocal signal to all parties that abuses of the political process and practices we consider to be unacceptable would not be tolerated. Last minute deals worth hundreds of millions of dollars rammed through the system in many instances against the will of members of the public service will not be rubber stamped.

The facts I have outlined today and the details we have learned in our negotiations to compensate out of pocket expenses have all contributed to my resolve to see the bill passed into law unamended.

The House passed Bill C-22 to ensure the future of Pearson International Airport. The government is willing to consider paying an amount up to \$30 million. It is a lot of money. We understand our commercial obligations and the need for the crown to respect appropriate undertakings.

We have looked at the claims and we think a fair analysis of reasonable business practices will allow us to compensate up to \$30 million to both the developers and third parties for the reasonable out of pocket expenses that are at the core of the bill.

The majority in the other place wants the Canadian taxpayer put in the position of having to fork over maybe \$445 million. The distinction is simple. The House recognized the need to right a blatant wrong. The House recognized the need to formally make the odious contract null and void. The House recognized the need to return the parties to their pre-contract status and to cover their legitimate out of pocket expenses incurred in the ordinary course of business.

*Government Orders*

The other place, I regret to say, in its majority decision to bring in these amendments has ignored the interest of Canadians. It has amended the bill so as, if we accepted those amendments, to force the dispute into the courts where no one in the House or in the other place would then have anything to say about them. Then it would be a matter for the courts to decide on legal interpretation and on argument how much the bill would be for Canadian taxpayers.

I am not prepared to run that risk. I hope a majority of my colleagues in the House and a majority of senators in the other place will not run that risk either.

One has to ask whether the Tory scheme all along was to ignore what was patently obvious in October 1993 and to set the scene to make one last snatch at the public purse. Quite a money grab it would be. If the majority of the other place perseveres and wins this case, this scheme could result in the biggest rip-off in Canadian history, \$445 million of taxpayers' money.

(1545)

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my friends through you that the government is not going to play Russian roulette with the Tory majority in the other place with half a billion dollars of Canadian taxpayers' money on the table. That is simply not an option.

This deal resembles what might have been done in a banana republic by a dying government during its last gasps. There is no doubt and I readily admit it that this bill is an extraordinary measure to bring before Parliament but I do not believe that anyone in their right mind would deny that this was an extraordinary deal and it has to be undone.

It is time to get on with the business of providing the country with a safe, efficient and affordable national airport system with Lester B. Pearson International Airport at Toronto at the centre of this hub.

It is time to get on with the future of Canada's largest and most important transportation facility and it is time that the Conservative majority in the other place recognized that Canadians understood that this was a bad deal and agreed that it has to be dealt with resolutely.

We intend to ensure that Canadian taxpayers are not going to get a \$445 million bill from the consortium and their friends in the other place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Commons from all parties to join with us in sending a clear message to the Senate that Parliament will protect the interests of Canadians and that Bill C-22 must be passed without amendments.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, before I begin my speech, I would like to address a few comments to the minister before he leaves. I hope that he will find it in his code of ethics to hear what I have to say despite his busy schedule. I would like to address three points of his speech.

First of all, if it were not for the calendar in front of me confirming this is September 28, 1994, I could have sworn we were back in 1990, when the Liberal opposition in this House was criticizing former Conservative Prime Minister Brian Mulroney for appointing new senators to ram the GST bill through the other place. An action considered offensive.

Now the shoe is on the other foot, with the Conservatives in the majority in the other place. The Liberals did make use of their majority in the Senate when the time came to oppose the GST bill. This is the first comment I wanted to make.

My second comment is that throughout the election campaign, the Bloc Québécois candidates stressed repeatedly—I know I did 250 times a day in my riding of Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans—the fact that Liberal or Conservative, it is one and the same. We have proof of that today in this debate and when we hear the minister's remarks about the Conservative majority in the other place.

The third comment I wanted to make concerns the answer the minister gave me when questioned in a meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport. He said I knew full well that as part of the Auditor General review process, all compensation granted could undergo scrutiny. I just want to point out to the hon. minister that all this auditing by the Auditor General takes place after the fact. After irregularities have been detected, the Auditor General tables three books confirming they took place, but nothing can be done about it. That is why the Bloc Québécois called for the creation of a royal inquiry commission that could have shed light on this whole matter.

(1550)

The minister revisited this issue in his speech today and apparently said that various institutions would shed light on this but only after the fact, after compensation has been paid. Of course, if no compensation is paid, the problem vanishes.

On June 14, I addressed this House at the second reading of Bill C-22 and asked that a royal commission be mandated to shed light on the contract awarded to Pearson Development Corporation. I put all my heart and energy in that speech, because I really thought it was my last opportunity to sensitize the House to this deal which was, if not illegal, at least highly questionable.

*Government Orders*

Although I disagree with the amendments proposed by the Senate, I am still happy to have another opportunity to rise in this House to try once again to shed light on a deal the current Prime Minister himself promised to cancel before he was elected, but I cannot understand how the deal can be scrapped without getting to the bottom of this, once and for all.

I must tell you that I had several opportunities in the Standing Committee on Transport to state, and I repeat it in this House, we heard a few witnesses who agreed to appear before us, before the transport committee. Still, even today, Canadians, Quebecers and transport committee members cannot really say that all the light has been shed on this deal.

My argumentation will revolve around three main themes. First, the interference of an unelected house in an elected house's decisions; second, the compensation to be paid to Pearson Development Corporation; and third, the steps to be taken to shed light on this shady deal.

Since the beginning, since Bill C-22 was tabled, the Bloc Quebecois, of which I am the transport critic, has been against paying any compensation to the developer before we find out the truth about this deal.

Under the bill passed by the House of Commons, the developer cannot go to the courts to obtain compensation from the government. The Minister of Transport—remember the clause in Bill C-22—reserved the right to set the amount of any compensation to be paid. That is why we are still opposed to the principle of Bill C-22.

The other place rose up against this bill and declared that the position taken by the House of Commons was unconstitutional. It has asked that Clauses 7 and 8 of the bill be deleted. As you may recall, these clauses prevent the developers from initiating court proceedings. What right does an unelected house such as the other place have to reject the democratic decisions made by this House whose members have been democratically elected by the people?

I could perhaps take this opportunity to comment on the actions of a representative of the other place appointed by the government party, a former president of the Liberal Party, former leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba, former Leader of the Opposition in Winnipeg, former killer of the Meech Lake accord, who bluntly stated that the elected members of this House were people with little education or at least less education than the members of the other place. I say to this representative of the other place that we at least have been elected by the people and not appointed because of our friendship with the Liberal Party of Canada, as she was.

That is outrageous and offensive. It really shows the urgent need to abolish the other place, especially since it has been using senators appointed by the Conservative government that was repudiated by the people in the last election to prevent demo-

cratically elected members of Parliament like myself from making essential decisions.

(1555)

I mentioned earlier that the Bloc Quebecois is opposed to any compensation to Pearson Development Corporation as long as all the facts surrounding this issue are not known, and I want to tell the members of this House why it is important to shed light on this case.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I represent my party on the Standing Committee on Transport. It is important to point out that, contrary to what Mr. Greg Weston wrote in the *Ottawa Citizen*, it is the Bloc Quebecois which submitted to the transport committee a list of 18 witnesses to appear before that committee, this after our request for a commission of inquiry was turned down by the House of Commons.

Contrary to what Mr. Weston wrote in the same newspaper, the Bloc Quebecois is also the one which tabled motions to subpoena those who had refused to appear before the committee. It is unfortunate that a journalist would not recognize the good work done by the Bloc Quebecois in its role as Official Opposition. Instead, that person chose to give the credit to the Reform Party which, as the hon. member for Kootenay West—Revelstoke admitted, simply could not believe what was happening.

I want to confirm once again that the Bloc Quebecois did submit a list of witnesses that it felt should be heard by the transport committee. That list contains 18 names. Here are those names, as well as the reasons why we wanted these people to testify and shed light on the whole issue.

The first person on the list is Mr. Peter Coughlin, President of Pearson Development Corporation. The second one is Mr. Leo Kolber, a Liberal representative in the other place, who was an administrator of Claridge when the agreements were signed, this according to the *Financial Post Directory of Directors*. Mr. Kolber had organized, at his residence in Westmount, a \$1,000-per-guest reception attended, among others, by Mr. Charles Bronfman, where the current Prime Minister of Canada showed up, in early October of last year, right in the middle of the election campaign.

The third person we wanted to hear was Mr. Herb Metcalfe, a lobbyist with Capital Hill, as well as an official of Claridge Properties and a former organizer for the current Prime Minister of Canada. There was also Mr. Ramsey Withers, a Liberal with close ties to the current Prime Minister who was Deputy Minister of Transport when the call for tenders was made for Terminal III at Pearson airport, as reported in the *Ottawa Citizen*, on September 26, 1993. And there was Mr. Otto Jelinek, a former Conservative minister who is now president of the Asian affiliate of the Matthews group.

Then, there was Mr. Don Matthews, who was president of Brian Mulroney's nomination campaign in 1983; he is also a former president of the Conservative Party and a former president of the Conservative fund-raising campaign, as reported in the *Ottawa Citizen*, on September 29, 1993. We also wanted to hear Mr. Ray Hession, a former Deputy Minister of Industry and senior civil servant at Supply and Services, where

*Government Orders*

contracts are awarded—sometimes, maybe, to friends of the government, since it might be helpful during an election campaign. He was appointed president of Paxport and hired all the lobbyists who were to work on the privatization project for Paxport Inc. This Mr. Hession left his job as president in December 1992, after Paxport's bid was accepted by the federal government. He was to be replaced by Don Matthews's son, Jack, as reported in the *Ottawa Citizen*, on September 26, 1993.

There was also Mr. Fred Doucet, a Conservative lobbyist and Brian Mulroney's former chief of staff. He was also a senior advisor during Kim Campbell's campaign and was hired by Jack Matthews five days after Mr. Hession left his job as president. Three weeks later, Paxport created a consortium with its rival, Claridge Properties. Then there was Mr. Jean Corbeil, a former Conservative transport minister, who signed the agreement while all the attention was focused on the leaders' debate, during the election campaign. He had been Minister of Transport for less than three months but, already, there were information leaks to the effect that he was bent on privatizing Pearson airport.

Then there was Mr. Robert Nixon, the investigator appointed by the current Prime Minister, who recommended that the contract be cancelled and who is a former Treasurer of Ontario under the Liberal government of Mr. Peterson, as well as a former leader of the Ontario Liberal Party.

(1600)

There was also Ms. Kim Campbell. Internal documents given to her last August supposedly described the risks associated with the transaction, and in particular the fee increase for carriers, which would have cost taxpayers a lot of money.

We also asked the Standing Committee on Transport to summon the current Minister of Transport, and this request was agreed to.

We made all those requests not only to get the information I referred to earlier, but also to prove that, despite the fact that lobbyist fees are not compensated under this bill, taxpayers will still have to pay part of the expenses incurred by the corporations to make up for the lost tax revenues due to the corporate tax exemption for lobbying services.

What we wanted to ask the minister and what we did manage to ask him was: How can you justify the involvement of taxpayers in a patronage transaction? This fact alone justifies a public inquiry.

Also, the Minister of Transport himself stated that lobbying services should not be tax deductible, as reported by the *Ottawa Citizen* on March 9, 1994.

We also wanted to hear from Air Canada representatives, who were involved in this deal, since the government negotiated a decrease in rent for the next few years in return for a commitment by the corporation to remain at terminals 1 and 2 at the Pearson airport in Toronto.

We asked to hear from Mr. William Rowat, assistant deputy minister at Transport Canada, who was appointed by the past Clerk of the Privy Council to help move things along. You have to remember that he was appointed in March of 1993.

We also asked to hear from Mr. Bob Wright, closely tied to the Liberal Party of Canada, who is negotiating, secretly of course, the compensation to be awarded to the consortium.

We wanted to hear from the Toronto Airport Authority, a public agency similar to the Aéroports de Montréal organization, which wanted to be considered as a potential manager for Terminals 1 and 2, but claims to have been intentionally overlooked by the Conservatives.

We asked to hear from Ms. Huguette Labelle and, finally, from Mr. Robert Vineberg, Pearson Development Corporation's lawyer and board member.

In each and every one of these 18 cases, there were discussions in the committee on transport as to whether or not to call these witnesses before the committee. If the Liberals have nothing to hide, why did they refuse systematically to summon the people on our list so that we could clarify this deal?

Let us start with Mr. Robert Nixon, a key player in this issue. Mr. Nixon was the one who carried out the inquiry into Pearson Development Corporation at the request of the current Liberal Prime Minister. Last November, he recommended that the deal signed by the Conservatives and the Pearson Development Corporation be declared void.

Yet, the Liberals have refused to ask Mr. Nixon to appear before the committee on transport. Our resolution was defeated, four to two, by the Liberal majority. Is this normal? Do they have something to hide?

As for Mr. Robert Wright, who is no less important than Mr. Nixon, the answer of the Liberal majority in the committee was the same: "No." Believe it or not, only six of the 18 people I invited were heard by the committee. These were Mr. Ray Hession, the current Minister of Transport, Mr. Peter Coughlin, Mr. Don Matthews, someone from Air Canada and Mr. Robert Vineberg, representing Pearson Development Corporation.

*Government Orders*

I have used up all arguments to convince my colleagues from the committee to subpoena people on the Bloc Québécois's list of witnesses. At that time, I remember very clearly the chairperson of the transport committee, the hon. member for Hamilton West, telling me: "Come on, sir, you know perfectly well that this is a procedure which has not been used in Canada since 1917 or 1918". But that was totally false. I sincerely hope that the chairperson of the Transport Committee did not knowingly try to mislead me because I checked and I found that that procedure was used in 1989, in 1990 and in 1992 to summon witnesses.

(1605)

There was even one instance, in 1989 or 1990, when the present government House leader used that special procedure to summon witnesses to appear before the committee. I sincerely hope that the chairperson of the Standing Committee on Transport was not acting in bad faith.

I will give you another example. I told the committee members that since Leo Kolber was a parliamentarian from the other place, he would surely co-operate with us given his duties. Furthermore, at the time the contracts were signed, the *Ottawa Sun* reported that on October 10, 1993, that parliamentarian was a member of Claridge's board of directors and owned 60 per cent of the shares in Pearson Development Corporation.

You have to admit that he was a key witness who could have helped us shed some light on the matter. On top of that, the *Ottawa Citizen* reported on November 9, 1993 that the same member of the other place had given a reception at \$1,000 a plate in his Westmount residence at the beginning of October, a reception attended by Mr. Charles Bronfman, among others, and by the present Prime Minister who, at the time, was in the middle of his election campaign.

If I had the time, I could also talk about the cleaning up of political party funding. We saw again, as recently as yesterday, that some people preferred to receive contributions from large firms rather than to have a clean election fund. The Bloc's position is clear and that is why the hon. member for Richelieu moved such an amendment.

I could give other examples. All those arguments that I put forward were useless since my request was denied by the Liberal majority on the committee. I could also mention the case of Mr. Otto Jelinek, a former Conservative minister who is now president of the Asian subsidiary of the Matthews group. The answer was the same as in most other cases. The Liberal members on the Transport Committee told me that it would be premature to subpoena Mr. Jelinek since he intended to appear voluntarily.

You will understand that, given the refusal of my Liberal colleagues to summon the people who could have helped this House understand the situation, I have no choice but to say that

this matter is not transparent. I wonder if the Liberals are protecting the same people as the Conservatives or some other people. I also wonder if it is possible that the friends and backers of the system contribute to the election funds of both old parties.

What is troubling is that Canadians still do not know all the facts as to why the contract was awarded to Pearson Development Corporation. And I find it sad that the Liberal majority is enjoying hiding the truth.

It must also be pointed out that if the Bloc Québécois does not know all the facts, it cannot be expected to decide on the validity of the financial claims made by each of the concerned groups.

When we look at the Nixon report, some words leave us with a bitter aftertaste. We could wonder what Mr. Nixon meant when referring to malversation in connection with lobbyists. Did he have any real evidence of this? Do you know anything about it, Mr. Speaker? If you do not know, I do not know either. No witness knows. Nobody but the opposition seems to want to know about it on the Hill. But then, who does know? We are being asked to make a decision involving the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars when nobody really knows what the Nixon report meant.

The Minister of Transport spoke about criteria governing compensation claims. Could the minister make these criteria public? If he has nothing to hide, I am sure he will not hesitate to do so.

Mr. Speaker, you are a lawyer and you know very well that due process was not followed by Mr. Nixon. In French law too there is the rule of *audi alteram partem*, the right of both parties in a case to be heard. I am sorry, but this rule does not seem to have been followed, no more than due process, by Mr. Nixon.

(1610)

It is unfortunate that the minister should rely on a report full of half-truths to request—and that is what he is doing under clause 10 of the bill—the authority to spend tens of millions of dollars.

When will the minister launch a public inquiry to get right to the bottom of this matter? Several Liberal members approved of this inquiry, but they were gagged and had to toe the party line.

If the government motion is passed, obviously the bill will be passed too, but would the Minister of Transport agree? For want of a public inquiry, I ask him once more to have the Standing Committee on Transport examine any agreement and make recommendations before he signs it. If the minister says that the agreement was rejected because it was not acceptable for Quebecers and Canadians, why not give elected representatives the opportunity to make the necessary recommendations? The government would demonstrate its openness. Otherwise, a feeling of frustration will linger, and doubts will remain in our mind and that of the public in Quebec and Canada.

*Government Orders*

The best way to protect reputations is visibility and openness, and a public inquiry. Of course such an inquiry will be costly and will take time, but I ask this House if democracy costs something. Is democracy too costly? Are the costs more important than living in a democracy? I am sorry, but democracy is priceless. You cannot put a price on getting the facts and spending taxpayers' money wisely.

However, if the minister refuses to conduct a public inquiry because of costs and delays, he could ask a parliamentary committee to do it. Does the minister realize that the whole tendering process was botched? Consequently, will the minister take the necessary steps to prevent such a fiasco from happening again?

The government could refuse to order a parliamentary committee or the Standing Committee on Transport to conduct a public inquiry; this would bring us back to square one. If that happens, can the minister tell us how long the compensation claims process will take? As we know, the Nixon Report mentioned obscure dealings by lobbyists. Since these schemes were not revealed to the public, can we fear that such scheming will taint the compensation process?

At the transport committee hearings, when Robert Vineberg, Pearson Development Corporation's lawyer, appeared before us, I had prepared some very tough questions. If you do not believe me, you need only refer to the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Transport. It is an aberration. We had written to the representative, Mr. Vineberg's client, who told us that Mr. Vineberg would answer for him. I asked Mr. Vineberg over and over again if he was speaking for his client and he assured me that he was not, that he was speaking in his own name and that he could not speak for his client.

What happened was that two people were not only mocking us to our faces, but were arguing back and forth and we never got an answer. Mr. Vineberg is a well-known member of the legal profession here in Canada and I asked him four questions: Should an already flawed contract—because the rules of assent were flawed from the beginning—provide for compensation in case of cancellation? Would he agree with a public enquiry? Would his firm willingly submit financial analyses? Finally, I made a brief comment saying that those who live in glass houses should not cast stones.

(1615)

I will not quote the answers because not one of them is worth repeating in this House. We would also have liked to get answers to other questions. For example, while he was involved in the case, had he ever been aware of any malversation in connection

with lobbyists or of civil servants or political personnel being too closely interested in the Pearson issue? Also, did he agree with the profit analysis in the Nixon report which indicated a 14 per cent profit after taxes? I also asked him if he did not find it a little bit strange that bidders were only given 90 days to prepare their bid for a 57-year contract worth \$1.6 billion? Are such things normal and reasonable in a democratic society? We have to wonder. The answer is obvious. There is not one Canadian who will find that it makes sense.

I am only relating some of the juiciest parts of what Mr. Vineberg said. I understand that Canadians and Quebecers will be able to read the whole thing in the minutes of the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Transport. It is a jewel in its own right, but the answers are not worth repeating in this House.

I could go on talking all day long about this famous Bill C-22 and the proposed amendments. I have already spent a lot of the taxpayers' money to convince this House to satisfy Canadians by keeping them informed of ongoing negotiations between the government and Pearson Development Corporation.

When I talk about money spent, I am talking about the transport committee's hearings, and the salaries of federal civil servants, researchers and MPs. This is a lot of money spent to achieve very little. I would like to add that my party and I agree with the government's motion to reject all the amendments presented by the other place. I am in agreement with the government but for different reasons.

First, as I mentioned earlier, I cannot accept that non-elected individuals try to have the upper hand on decisions in this country. Second, I cannot accept that the Pearson Development Corporation be given compensation for any loss incurred before April 13, 1994 since the circumstances surrounding the awarding of the contract were flawed to start with. This being said, if we reject the amendments proposed by the other place and adopt the government's motion, a doubt will always linger in the minds of Canadians for lack of a public inquiry.

Once again, I plead with my hon. colleagues to allow a royal commission of inquiry to get to the bottom of this so that trust in our leaders may be restored.

*[English]*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** We will now proceed to the other stage of debate where members will have 20 minute interventions, subject to 10 minutes questions and comments.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Liberals may not have as much support in caucus for this motion as they might like us to believe. I am sure being good members of the old style party of the past that they will vote the party line as they are told. I understand that they cannot find anyone else to speak to this debate. I am really sad if that is the case because I have some questions I would like to ask and have answered here today. We will have to make of the process what we can.



*Government Orders*

This whole business of Bill C-22 and the Pearson development contract was a very questionable process at best. We question the type of lobbying that was done, the allegation at least that there was an excessive amount, the close links that those lobbyists had with the Prime Minister's Office and a lot of the actions that the government itself took, the short duration, using one of the bidders to provide a lot of the parameters for the bid in the first place, the way it was signed at the last minute when it was known that the Tory government was on its way out. It was a very questionable deal. There is no argument on that at all.

We have a backroom deal. One of the problems is the government is offering us a backroom solution to this problem. That is not acceptable.

(1620)

We have not heard a single piece of evidence stating specifically what improper, illegal action was taken by the bidder in this process. That is what we are trying to get to the bottom of.

My colleague in the Bloc tried to get to the bottom of that. We tried to get witnesses in and had very little luck with it, either co-operation from the witnesses or for that matter co-operation from the government in subpoenaing those witnesses.

On the other hand, it is said that during the time this was signed the leader of the Liberal Party said that if he got in this deal would be cancelled. That is not what he said. I want to clarify that. He stated that he would hold an independent public inquiry into this entire process.

I have talked to the principals involved in this consortium. They said that did not hold any fear for them. They welcome a public inquiry into this. They will open their books to anyone, as they did when this so-called public inquiry took place. They said the have nothing to fear, they have done nothing wrong.

What happened with our independent public inquiry? The government hired Mr. Robert Nixon. Is it really an inquiry when from start to finish in finished report the whole thing took 20 days? It took place largely behind closed doors. We were not able to suggest who he might talk to. Several of the people the industry thought would be the obvious people for Mr. Nixon to talk to did not get called in. There was no opportunity to cross examine the evidence that was put in. Whether or not it was a fair inquiry or a public inquiry does not seem to be answered.

To decide whether the inquiry was independent we have to look at who Mr. Nixon is. Mr. Nixon is the former leader of the Ontario Liberal Party. Mr. Nixon was the chairman of the 1987 Liberal task force on Pearson Airport. Mr. Nixon is the father of a sitting Liberal member. Immediately after he put in his report

in 30 days, Mr. Nixon was named as chairman of the atomic energy commission. Independent?—I hardly think so.

There is another allegation. I think it is fair to bring the allegations into this House because all we have heard about this contract are allegations. In Mr. Nixon's so-called independent public inquiry there was no evidence. There were only allegations of possible improprieties, of possible wrongdoing. There was not one shred of hard evidence brought forward by Mr. Nixon.

The allegation that is floating in industry right now from many sources is that there are two Nixon reports, one Mr. Nixon actually wrote and one that was written for him and actually submitted. Do I have proof of this?—no, I do not, any more than the proof we have seen of the wrongdoings by the Pearson consortium in this whole deal. Allegations are all we have seen.

Then the Standing Committee on Transport decided it would hold hearings and we would have a chance to air all this out and find out what went wrong. As my colleague in the Bloc stated, many people were asked to come before the committee but very few of them showed up. This did not help the case of the consortium.

I was not very pleased that a lot of these people who claimed that they were hard done by did not come forward to defend themselves. We also did not get very much co-operation from the Liberal government in trying to ensure that we got those people in.

There were a couple of other interesting events. Aside from the people we asked who did not come there were several principals who asked specifically to come to the hearing and were denied. These were people like William Pearson, the president of Agra Engineering, George Ploder, president of Bracknell Corporation, and Scott McMasters, president North America, of Allders International Canada. One of the principal investors in this whole contract was denied the right to come before the committee. Why is the government trying to hide what truly happened in this whole process?

The topic of the return on investment being excessive has been brought up, while we have heard figures that are all over the scale.

(1625)

The government was first alleging 18.5 per cent. Today we heard some figures going up to 28 per cent. The reality is this was examined by a firm I think the House would agree is credible. I am so overwhelmed by some of the stuff the government has done that I am at a loss for words on some of this. The firm I am talking about is Price Waterhouse. I do not think anybody here is going to question the integrity of Price Waterhouse. It said 14 per cent return.

*Government Orders*

It is really interesting that the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce was one of the tentative investors in this. It invested at what looked like a 18.5 per cent return on that investment. When it dropped to 14 per cent, which is exactly what Price Waterhouse says it was, CIBC pulled out because it was not a good enough return for the risk involved in this type of investment. Maybe the government wants to suggest that CIBC is not credible, I do not know. It has not answered that.

Included in this particular bill is the fact that there should be no compensation for lobbying fees. If there was something illegal about the way this corporation lobbied the government then certainly it should not get compensation for any illegal activity whatsoever, no matter what.

If the lobbying was legal according to the government and we like many others do not like the fact that there is lobbying, then until such time that the rules are changed it is the same as somebody driving down the street at 90 kilometres an hour in a 90 kilometre zone and someone pulls out from a side street in front of them and gets hit; an investigation after deciding that 90 kilometres is too fast on that street. You do not charge the person who was doing 90 kilometres because he was doing it in accordance with the law, even if it was too fast for that street. That was not his fault. You change the speed limit but you do not do it retroactively. That is what the government is looking at in this particular case.

It talks of third party contract liability. It is going to allow a few dollars to compensate the principles in this for third party contract liability. Third parties do not have a contract with the government. They have a contract with the Pearson consortium. They can sue in court for whatever amount they care to sue for. It could well exceed \$30 million figure the minister threw out here today and there is absolutely no way for the principals in this to pay it. They have that much money out themselves, whether it is by regular and proper activities or whether it is some proper activity, notwithstanding they have already spent in excess of that. Now all of these third parties are supposed to be included in the settlement of \$30 million. It may or may not be appropriate. We have not seen the figures.

There is an ongoing problem with terminal 1 and terminal 2 and the government has not told us what its alternative to this contract is. I tried to find that out from the minister today in Question Period. We did not get an answer, which of course surprises me. It is Question Period, not answer period. That seems to be a very common thing, we do not get answers from the government to our questions.

This is something that should be brought out if we are going to deal properly with this entire business evolving around the Pearson airport.

We are looking for something that is very open, very public and very honest. The government is looking to make a secret compensation deal behind closed doors. The minister was asked when he came before the standing committee if he would make this process visible.

I proposed an amendment both at committee and at third reading here in the House to say we would support this bill if instead of hiring another independent person linked to the government who was going to collect all these claims from the consortium, the minister could decide whether he was going to pay, who he was going to pay and how much he was going to pay them. We asked if he will make these figures public, if we will be privy to these figures and the process used to get to them. His answer was about as vague as it was here today dealing with T1 and T2.

He said they might be able to release some of the figures, but they are not sure because cabinet is involved. The minute we involve cabinet we could wrap the figures up for 20 years and know absolutely nothing about what went on. Under those circumstances there is no way to ensure fairness has taken place.

(1630)

Today in his address the minister said that the threat of litigation was holding up a new solution. No, it is not. We can have all the solutions in the world telling us what to do. There is absolutely nothing that is holding up some alternative solution to the Pearson airport problem with terminal 1 and terminal 2. All the minister has to do is agree with what is being proposed in the House back from the other place. The contract will be cancelled; it will be over. The fact that litigation is going on in court will not hold up new solutions.

We are looking for a court review of the entire process. That was not our solution; that was not what we desired. We wanted it done in the House through the Standing Committee on Transport where the entire process could be brought forth.

One of the risks that actually happens if it goes to court is that the government could end up reaching a settlement and we would never know the true story about what happened in the Pearson bid process. That is not something we desire.

To turn around at this point and simply close the door, to let the minister decide he will pay what he wants and there will be no recourse and no argument, the public will never find out who was at fault in the process.

Was it the people who bid? Was it the Tory government and the way it was done? Or, do the Liberals have a large part in some of the problems that went on here? As it turns out they talk about the Tory cronies coming to the trough, but in the later stages of the proposal there were as many, if not more, Liberals involved in both the consortium and the lobbying. Is that what the government is really trying to hide?

*Government Orders*

The salvage value of the work being done has not been answered. We want to know what the government has for an alternative process to deal with the problem at Pearson. All kinds of money have been spent on plans, drawings, engineering, passenger load surveys, negotiations with users and tentative contracts that could still be honoured by a new contractor. There is a tremendous value in that, but until we know what it is we do not know what compensation the government should pay out for those things specifically and what the Canadian taxpayer will be able to recoup through the process.

The minister suggested that taxpayers are faced with cuts and therefore we should not consider going into court and allowing the contractors from Pearson to get a large settlement. Is that not interesting? Does that not send a wonderful message out to the business community?

It says that the Liberal government is in trouble with its overspending. The Liberal government has to make some cuts somewhere. It does not particularly care if they are fair or normal as long as they will save a lot of money and as long as someone else can be blamed. That is where some of these cuts will come from.

I do not want to see money wasted by the government any more than anyone else other than probably the government. We bring forward financially responsible proposals and the government seems to want to waste money. It is strange that it would suddenly turn around and want to be financially responsible. It is not proposing financial responsibility.

The matter has to go back to the courts. The courts will decide what went wrong in the process. They will discover whether there was any illegal or improper conduct on the part of anyone involved in the process and they will set the compensation accordingly.

If there was something wrong with the way the consortium lobbied the government it will be identified. The principals will not be compensated for illegal, improper type conduct. If they conducted themselves properly, just because we do not happen to like the way the rules work we cannot punish private enterprise for following the rules of the government. If that happens it sends out a message that no one should do business with the government, and that is not the kind of message we want to send out.

As far as what is going to happen to the bill, the Liberal government has an absolute dictatorship for the next four years. Obviously it can pass anything it wants as long as it can keep its backbenches in order. So far it has been able to do that. We do not know how long it will be able to maintain that, but for now at least it has managed to keep its members voting the way they are told. We have to suppose that it will go back to the other place.

How are we going to deal with it? I am going to meet with the Senate. It is very clear we want a triple E Senate, but as long as we have a Senate there has to be some function for it. If it provides the chamber of sober second thought, which is the function of the Senate, we will work with what we have to work with until such time as we can improve it. We will try to find a solution or an alternative way to bring the matter back to the House yet again until the government deals fairly and properly with the whole matter.

(1635)

We will not support the government's motion.

**Mr. Julian Reed (Halton—Peel):** Mr. Speaker, I was listening very passively to the hon. member's speech until I heard the word "dictatorship". It was like being hit over the head with a two by four. It brought me to attention.

**Mr. Silye:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Quorum, please.

**Mr. Arseneault:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that it is fine to call for quorum but we have many members in committees right now and doing House duty as do other parties. If we start these shenanigans about quorum, we are going to be spending taxpayers' money.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order. A request has been duly made by the member. He has asked for quorum. By recognizing the other member on his intervention I believe we were getting into a matter of debate.

**Mr. Reed:** The time the House was shut down with a quorum call probably resulted in another \$100,000 being added to the national debt.

My comments will be brief. The hon. member mentioned a four-year dictatorship and the government keeping the backbenches in line. He should know that the government was elected in the most democratic process existing on the face of the earth. Whatever he may think about that election forming a dictatorship, I suggest he is dead wrong. If he wants to compare what happens in this country with what happens in any other country on the face of the earth he is welcome to do it. I think he should do it before he makes accusations of the kind.

I assure him the backbench is totally united on the issue. As a member who comes from the metropolitan Toronto area or its periphery and whose constituents work at Pearson, at ancillary industries at Pearson, in the airline industries and so on, I say that a successful outcome to the bill is very important.

**Mr. Gouk:** Mr. Speaker, the term dictatorship suggests when those in power can do whatever they wish. That is exactly what we have. Any time we have a majority party it is the equivalent of a temporary dictatorship. It can be a benevolent dictatorship, if it wishes to get re-elected, but it has absolute power nonetheless. That is where that particular term comes from.

*Government Orders*

The hon. member mentioned the people who work at Pearson and the fact that he comes from Toronto. I assume he was going to suggest they had argued in the political process of getting elected that they were going to challenge the Pearson deal. They did not challenge the Pearson deal. They simply overturned it.

We are talking about contract cancellation. That is not what they are doing. They are trying to pretend the contract never took place. That is not what they said they would do during the campaign. They said they would have a public review. We are still waiting.

(1640)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak again on Bill C-22 and the amendments proposed by the other place.

Everyone in Quebec and Canada knows what effect this shameless attempt at privatizing the airport could have had if it had gone through and who would have had their palms greased as we say in Quebec with such a patronage-prone, foul-smelling plan as that to privatize Pearson Airport.

All the potential transactions, all the provisions of the privatization contract per se and all the people involved in this privatization attempt have not been brought to light yet.

Again, not only did we not get right to the bottom of the matter, but Bill C-22 still contains provisions which could be conducive to patronage, that which the people and Quebec and Canada detest most about the politics of older parties.

When you read in this bill that we continue to leave it to the Minister of Transport's absolute discretion to compensate promoters if appropriate, I find that is absolutely absurd. My colleagues have been pointing this out over and over since this bill was introduced and will continue to do so at every stage, unless the government changes course along the way.

I must say that this government's attitude toward Bill C-22 and privatization is worse than anything we have seen under the Conservatives. The Conservatives at least were upfront. They were open about their patronage deeds and about the fact they greased the palms of their friends, while the Liberals have a more underhanded, almost wicked, way of doing things. But they continue to do it after having rent their clothes, in fact a closet-full of made-to-measure shirts, starting with the Minister of Transport.

On November 29, 1993, the Minister of Transport himself openly told the media that he was thinking about holding an inquiry, an exhaustive inquiry into the ins and outs of this

attempt to privatize Pearson airport. It was after he realized that it was not just Conservatives involved in promoting this project or in the investments connected with the privatization of Pearson, but that there were also friends of the Liberals, who had made contributions to the Liberal Party of Canada, that the Minister of Transport, probably on the advice of his cabinet colleagues, backed down and offered us instead the report by Mr. Nixon, a very close advisor to, not to say a member of, the Liberal Party of Canada.

From the beginning of the debate on Bill C-22, we spent some time cross-checking contributors to the Liberal Party coffers, even Canadian companies who had made contributions, and the principal players involved in Pearson. And we found the connections very easy to establish. It was obvious that somewhere there were people who had such an amazingly underhanded, nebulous influence that it halted the process of inquiry into the privatization, the attempt at privatization of Pearson airport.

Yesterday, the attitude of the Liberal majority to the bill tabled by my colleague from Richelieu on public funding of parties was proof to me that members of the Liberal Party of Canada are just as steeped in patronage as the Conservatives.

(1645)

They roundly defeated a bill that would have applied, at the federal level, the old dream that Mr. Lévesque made come true in Quebec, namely financing parties with contributions from individual citizens of Quebec and Canada who require defended after, who require that those they elect defend their interests and not the interests of the very rich friends of the regime, especially of the lobbyists who previously belonged to former Liberal or Conservative governments. Their attitude yesterday tells me a lot about the inflexibility they have shown every time we asked them to set up a real inquiry process that would fully elucidate the attempt to privatize Pearson.

Why do we need to get to the bottom of it? Because, if we were able, with the fragmentary information at our disposal, to perceive the possibility of ethical problems and patronage in this issue, it may mean that there were many more in the past under the Conservative government and under the Liberal government before that as well. But above all, it means that the incongruities and strange happenings involving very powerful lobbies connected to the main federal parties may occur again in the future.

The taxpayers of Quebec and Canada find that quite costly. They must find out what happened in the Pearson affair and especially they must be assured that such incidents will not recur in future, where friends of the party, former ministers, senators, people who worked very closely with the government as senior officials affiliated with the old parties got rich at taxpayers' expense. That is why it is important to clear this

*Government Orders*

matter up. To find out whether the lobbyists accused of having influence—and we are not the ones who say so; it is in the Nixon report, the Liberal Party's report—the lobbyists accused of having extraordinary influence in this contract, lobbyists like Pat MacAdam, a Conservative lobbyist and friend of Brian Mulroney; lobbyists like Bill Fox, a Conservative lobbyist and college friend of Brian Mulroney.

We have been naming names for a long time now, because they should be ashamed if they have done something wrong, they should be ashamed to continue pressuring the government not to order a public inquiry. As professional lobbyists, they are certainly still worrying about the possibility, perhaps only a slight one because, after all, these people are friends, that there will be a public inquiry that would reveal to Quebecers and Canadians the amazing extent of their influence.

So, I go on because I want to make sure that Harry Near, a Conservative lobbyist and long-time supporter, Don Matthews, a former president of Brian Mulroney's nomination campaign in 1983 and former president of the Conservative Party, Hugh Riopelle, a lobbyist and the strong man in Mulroney's office, and John Llegate, Michael Wilson's personal friend, exert no more untraceable influence. They can lobby in a normal and legitimate manner, but when a Liberal report, the Nixon report, says that they exerted an influence which went beyond the bounds of normal lobbying activities, I think that we should have greater doubts than those timidly expressed in the Nixon report.

This deal did not just involve Conservative lobbyists or people close to the Conservative government. That is probably why the Minister of Transport, who went loudly after the Bloc Quebecois members when they told him the truth, that is probably why the Minister of Transport backed down within the space of a few weeks saying: No, there will be no inquiry, just a short preliminary analysis about the possible financial consequences for the Canadian government if we had privatized Pearson. He realized that friends of the Liberal Party were also involved.

As my colleague, our critic for transport, said earlier, there was Senator Leo Kolber, well-known for his haute cuisine dinner at \$1,000 a plate. During the election campaign, Mr. Kolber invited all those who could have, according to the Nixon Report, a somewhat obscure albeit overwhelming influence on the government to come and meet the next Prime Minister at a private dinner at \$1,000 a plate.

(1650)

Among his distinguished guests was Mr. Bronfman, who was directly involved in the privatization of the Pearson Airport. Also involved in this deal were Herb Metcalfe, a lobbyist for Capital Hill, a representative of Claridge Properties and former

organizer for the current Prime Minister, as well as Ramsey Withers, a Liberal lobbyist with close ties to the Prime Minister.

I think only one or two of these worthy Liberal supporters would have been enough to persuade the Minister of Transport to have a change of heart, since the minister was already not quite convinced that he needed to go after not only the friends of the government, but also of Canada's financial establishment.

The inconsistencies identified by a review and an in-depth examination of the privatization contract should have drawn anyone's attention. I have seen a lot of sales contracts in my lifetime, but none like this one. I have never seen, for example, a central government agreeing, like the Canadian government did, to insert a clause in the privatisation deal in order to cut the duration of the contract in half so that the promoters could avoid paying the Ontario sales tax which would have come to about \$10 million.

In complicity with the Canadian central government, which some people find so praiseworthy, the promoters were able to save \$10 million in Ontario taxes. I think that is a first, that never before did a federal government deliberately cause prejudice to provincial finances as this privatization contract did.

We also saw other discrepancies in the calculation of the basic rent. The agreement said that Pearson Development Corporation would normally pay to the government 30.5 per cent of its gross revenue from the previous year, up to a maximum of 125 million dollars in gross revenue, and that it would pay a rent equal to 45.5 per cent of gross revenue in excess of this figure.

But according to the Nixon Report, and remember it was prepared by a friend of the Liberal Party, the gross revenue was deliberately reduced in the contract because unusual deductions were included which lowered the rent required from the developers in the future. Given those deductions and the omission of all extraordinary income received by Pearson Development Corporation, the rent for airport facilities was reduced considerably.

We also noticed a few things that made no sense, some very innovative clauses in the Pearson privatization contract; it said that even though the federal government would no longer be involved in airport activities after the privatization, it—that is the taxpayers from Quebec and Canada—would assume all of Pearson's debts. The government was no longer involved, but it would have to pay the debts; so I was paying, my colleague was paying, Quebecers and Canadians were paying for all the bad debts of the Pearson Airport. However, as taxpayers, we no longer had any say in the airport's activities.

I could mention other flaws; we did so at the second reading. There is, for example, the absence of any serious financial analysis. Why should we privatize just about the only profitable airport in Canada without requiring some serious financial analysis? In the case of simple one million dollar deals, for the purchase of companies for example, financial analyses and

*Government Orders*

spin-off analyses are conducted. The absence of any serious analysis in the case of a transaction of such a scope simply makes no sense.

(1655)

We could also have talked about the lack of a serious and independent analysis on projected revenue. We could have talked about the lack of analysis of the investors' situation. Those investors' were not very solvent, but with the overall benefits that the federal government was giving them, they were sure to be able to spend the rest of their lives in lavishness.

This attempt to privatize the Pearson airport is highly outrageous. No wonder that Canadian government finances are in such a mess. Why is it that the federal accrued debt will be around \$550 billion this year? Why is it that we have so much trouble reducing the deficit below \$40 billion annually? Why is it that we cannot control our government finances any more and that we are expecting another warning from the International Monetary Fund in the near future?

If there have been other transactions as dubious, as obscure, as appalling as this one, because it serves the friends of the Liberal Party, of the Conservative Party, in fact, the old Canadian parties, I understand why things are going badly in Canada. I understand why government coffers are being drained at an alarming rate and why the Minister of Finance is forced to take unpopular actions that affect the most powerless among Quebecers and Canadians, in order to serve the friends of the party, in the light of the millions of dollars that were in there, that were concealed there. Since there is no political will to get right to the bottom of that deal in order to avoid others in the future, I understand why Liberals tend to be more drastic than Tories used to be.

Ever since the Minister of Transport introduced Bill C-22, the Bloc Quebecois has been criticizing the fact that no public inquiry, no serious analysis has been made by a royal commission of inquiry.

Every time I look at all the benefits that deal had to offer, I keep asking myself: "Will it be better with the bill?" I think perhaps it could not be better, from a certain standpoint, because the Minister of Transport will still be able to bribe some friends of the Liberal Party of Canada, he will still be able to use his discretion to give his friends tens of millions of dollars, if he so desires, to make up for a potential loss without an analysis being made or a royal commission being established to get right to the bottom of the deal.

I am looking at that in comparison with the decisions the Minister of Finance made when he tabled his last budget on February 22 and reduced the unemployment benefits and the credits for senior citizens. Over the last few days, the Minister of Finance seems to be suggesting that the registered retirement

savings plans could also be taxed, but family trusts are still being maintained.

Officials were told not to give any information to members of Parliament about the hundreds of millions that could be concealed there. This is precisely serving the interests of those same friends of the Liberal Party of Canada, or maybe the very rich friends of the Conservatives. It is also serving the 2,000 Canadian millionaires who did not pay a dime in income tax last year.

When I compare that to other decisions of the government, such as the possibility that the Minister of Transport compensate once more friends of the ruling party, I say it is a disgrace. The Liberals should be ashamed of themselves, the Minister of Finance first of all, as well as the Minister of Transport, his accomplice.

As for the Senate amendment, like my friend said, in my view the Senate has no value. It is not a legitimate and democratic authority. Therefore we dismiss everything that comes out of the Senate, good or bad.

(1700)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before moving on to the question and comment period that should follow the speech of the hon. member, it is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Bourassa—Immigration; the hon. member for Mercier—Social program reform; the hon. member for Quebec—National Defence; the hon. member for Red Deer—Haiti.

**Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague just spoke on Bill C-22, the bill to cancel the privatization project of Pearson airport. I would like him to tell us about the millions of dollars that are being spent. It was said earlier that perhaps the Liberal government should give these companies thirty million dollars in compensation rather than wait for court action where they might get more. Could the hon. member tell me whether or not such monies are actually available, that is, if Pearson Airport brings in that much money, how come we have so little money to keep regional airports open, why is it that the Minister of Transport wants to close our regional airports?

These airports mean a lot to us. In remote areas like Northern Quebec, where air travel is the only means of transportation, what are people going to do when they want to travel south? How do we measure the cost? If the Val d'Or airport, for example, is to be closed on the medium term for lack of money, why not divert some of the money from profitable airports, like Pearson and maybe Montreal, to bring some equity nationally and thereby permit us to travel by air?

Maybe my colleague has an opinion on this and on the way to make the system equitable.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Loubier:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Abitibi for his excellent question. I believe there is only one possible answer to that question. For this government, like the previous one, it is not a priority to serve the population of Quebec and Canadians well. Its main interest is not there, as was revealed yesterday by the Liberals' position on public financing. The citizens of Quebec and those of Canada are not the ones who finance those two old political parties. It is rather the large companies, the very rich Canadian minority, and the ones who are served first when an old federalist party comes into office. That is crystal clear.

The logical result of public fund raising is that the first ones to be served when a member, a government comes into office are the citizens. Not friends who contribute several hundred thousand dollars to the party's campaign fund but real citizens with genuine needs. Members of parties who have adopted such a public fund raising serve first of all those electors.

If at the outset you have a predisposition to grease the palms of the very rich and mighty friends of the party, you are less disposed to think first in terms of equal services from coast to coast in Canada or, in the case of Quebec, in the regions as opposed to the big centres. You are also less disposed to think that way, you would rather choose to give \$30 million to the party's friends who may have lost something. We do not know if they have lost or not because there was no inquiry. We are not saying that they are not entitled to compensation, but that we do not know what really happened, since there was no public inquiry into this matter.

Thus, you decide to compensate the Liberal hacks, to maintain the family trusts in which these same hacks invested and still invest year after year without paying a single cent in tax for up to 80 years. You also decide to maintain tax treaties with 16 tax havens around the world, again allowing the wealthiest, the very large and profitable Canadian corporations to file their profits overseas where these are free of tax and to report in Canada their losses made overseas, for example. These are the choices you make.

(1705)

You also choose to cut billions from the unemployment insurance fund, simply because the unemployed are not those who contribute to the Liberal war chest. Grassroot financing is not enough. The Liberal Party turns to the large corporations, their great and rich friends, for financial support. Kolber, Bronfman and friends, these are the ones who hand out the money because they will be served later by the Liberal Party as well as by the Conservative Party. Thus, to me, Liberals and Conservatives are the same: old parties which are against democracy. They are old parties which are against grassroot financing as they obviously showed us yesterday.

Anyway, I am not surprised by the fact that such absurd decisions as the one to close regional airports which serve a specific population are being taken, while, in the case of Pearson Airport, they refuse any kind of inquiry or openness because they are afraid of the truth.

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of Canadians and Quebecers who are listening to us, I will say that my question is unsolicited. In other words this is not, as we say back home, a planted question contrary to what Canadians are used to seeing during Question Period when a government member puts a question to a minister who in turn reads the answer. We see that regularly, but this is not the case.

I appreciated the speech by the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot who, by the way, is a well-known economist in Quebec. I do not know if his fame has reached the riding of Stormont—Dundas which you represent so well, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that in Quebec the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot is renowned.

I ask him if it is true that companies who hired these lobbyists can deduct their fees from their income tax report. Therefore, if compensation is granted in the Pearson deal, and we do not know if it will be, or if it is justified, which we do not know, and if the minister deems that it is, the cost of this tax loss will have to be added to it. I am not sure what words to use as I do not have the same background as the member, but I would like to hear what he has to say about this.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot has two minutes to answer the question.

**Mr. Loubier:** Mr. Speaker, it is true that one was not planted. You may be sure of that.

To answer the hon. member's question: Yes, corporations can deduct lobbying expenses, and Jim will agree with me. Corporations can deduct lobbying expenses, just as they can deduct the taxes they have to pay every year. They can also deduct the cost of hiring experts to find loopholes in the Canadian tax system so that they can shelter hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars every year. We do not know the exact amount, because senior officials at the Department of Finance have been told not to comment.

Yes, I can assure the hon. member for Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans that corporations can deduct lobbying expenses, just as they can deduct fees for consultants and experts to help get them around the tax system and avoid during their corporate duty every year, which represents a loss of hundreds of millions, or even billions of dollars to the federal treasury.

We can afford it, with our cumulative debt of \$150 billion and an annual deficit of \$40 billion. Since we can afford it, that is what happens. Instead of closing these loopholes and tightening up the tax system, the Liberal government, and especially the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, prefer to keep them and make them even bigger—to let \$30 million slip through, as we see in the case of Bill C-22—while hurting those who are

hurting enough as it is, and I am referring to the unemployed, to senior citizens who have worked hard all their lives. Above all, they can do without the very serious threat of attacks on RRSPs and pension plans.

This is unconscionable, immoral and obscene, and the Liberals should be ashamed of themselves.

[English]

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the amendments to Bill C-22 sent to the House from the other place.

The motion before us today is quite simply a slap in the face to each and every taxpaying citizen who felt that the previous government had gone too far by attempting to sell terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson airport to a group of self-interested investors in the dying days of an endangered administration.

(1710)

Contrary to the statements made by some of our friends in the other place, the proposed amendments to Bill C-22 have little or nothing to do with protecting the legitimate collective interests of taxpaying Canadians. No, the motion before us today is about protecting the private interests and profits of a handful of self-interested individuals over and above the collective interests of the unknown hard working taxpayers of the country.

As chairperson of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Transport I can report that due process was served when our committee conducted its thorough review of Bill C-22 last May. In addition to a clause by clause analysis of the bill, the Standing Committee on Transport conducted hearings in order to obtain input on the legislation from individuals directly involved in the Pearson deal.

We heard testimony from several witnesses including Transport Canada officials; Hession Neville and Associates, an organization that put an unsuccessful bid on a Pearson contract; Air Canada officials; and representatives of the Matthews Paxport Trust, Mr. Gordon Baker and Mr. Donald Matthews. Of course we will never forget the colourful and melodramatic testimony of the legal counsel representing the Pearson Development Corporation.

In addition to the hearings, the committee considered the findings of a report on the Pearson deal submitted by Mr. Robert Nixon to the right hon. Prime Minister. On this point it should be noted that Mr. Nixon's report contained the following conclusion. Maybe members of the Reform Party would be interested in what it concluded. It stated:

### *Government Orders*

To leave in place an inadequate contract, arrived at with such a flawed process and under the shadow of possible political manipulation, is unacceptable. I recommend to you that the contract be cancelled.

As stated in the report itself, Mr. Nixon's comments were based on what was considered to be in the best interest of taxpayers, the travelling public and general economic development of the area. That statement captures the very essence of my case against today's motion.

Some of our friends in the Tory dominated red chamber and their friends in the Tory dominated Pearson development deal would like us to believe that Bill C-22 is a Draconian piece of legislation that, among other things, breaches the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Bill of Rights by taking away the fundamental right of Canadians to legal recourse in the courts. Indeed the level of romanticized fiction in that argument is similar to that which might be found on any given day in a cheap supermarket tabloid.

With regard to the constitutional issues surrounding the legislation, it is worth while to examine an approach that has been used by the Supreme Court of Canada when interpreting the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in order to put things in their proper perspective. I am referring to the so-called purposive approach to interpreting the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as stated by Canadian constitutional law expert, Peter H. Russell. He said:

The main thrust of the purposive approach to charter interpretation, fashioned by Chief Justice Dickson in some early cases, is to inquire into the reasons a particular right or freedom came to be valued in the history of western civilization and thereby to identify the interests each right or freedom was meant to protect.

I would like to focus on the latter portion of that statement pertaining to identifying the interests each right or freedom was meant to protect.

In most democratic societies, including our own, it is a generally accepted principle of democracy that with some exceptions the legitimate interests of the collective are held in higher regard than that of individual private interests.

As I stated, however, there are exceptions to the rule: for example, a situation of some sort of social or economic injustice or inequity brought on by such social phenomena as racism, sexism, poverty or any number of things that might characterize a historical disadvantaged or disempowered minority group or individual in our society. Under such circumstances it is incumbent on us to ensure that the interests of the disadvantaged or disempowered minority are not overpowered by that of the majority. If we apply this approach to the current Bill C-22 and its proposed amendment we can see that in fact the government is attempting to act in a forthright manner.



*Government Orders*

(1715)

In this particular instance, by cancelling the Pearson deal through Bill C-22, the government has clearly chosen to protect the legitimate interests of the collective taxpaying populace as opposed to protecting the individual private interests and profits sought by a handful of lobbyists and contractors.

I do not have any sympathy whatsoever for those lobbyists and contractors because the deal they signed in the dying days of the previous administration was simply not in the best interests of the taxpaying Canadian public as a collective.

In short, I challenge any hon. member in the House to prove that the organization this motion is designed to protect, namely the Pearson Development Corporation, represents the interests of a historically disadvantaged or disempowered group. Prove it.

Are these lobbyists and contractors in a situation of significant disadvantage such that the interests of the majority should be over-ruled in this case? No. All members of the House know full well that the motion before us today was created in the interests of protecting the so-called foregone profits of a very small but extremely privileged minority in our society. It is simply a shameful attempt to impede the legitimate purpose of Bill C-22 which is to cancel a dubious contract made under dubious circumstances by a dubious administration that was not acting in the public interest.

Let us not be fooled by the people in the other place who claim to be fighting for the rights of Canadians. Make no mistake. They are fighting purely for the profits of their corporate colleagues.

In closing, I implore the members of the House to take a purposive approach to the legislation in question in order to properly identify which interests are most appropriate to protect in this case. Should we be looking out for the majority of taxpaying Canadians who stand to gain only what they deserve if the motion before us fails, namely justice? Or should we join our friends in the Tory dominated red chamber by giving their colleagues in the Pearson Development Corporation a chance to take the citizens of Canada to the cleaners on a deal Canadians never wanted the previous government to make in the first place.

The choice is clear. This motion has no merit. Let us dispense with it and get on with serving the legitimate interests of our fellow Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hamilton West, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Transport, of which I am vice-chairman, has used his privilege as a member to speak in the House. I made a number of allegations in what I said earlier, and I would appreciate his thoughts on the following: When he told me in committee that subpoenas had not be used to

summon witnesses to appear before a committee since 1917, did he give me the wrong answer? Was he aware of the situation when I showed him proof that this had been done in 1989, 1990 and 1992, for instance, by the hon. member for Windsor, the present government House leader?

Did he purposely answer that this procedure had not been used since 1917 or was he trying to evade the question? Because he knew perfectly well that if we had subpoenaed these people, we would have had genuine answers to our questions.

I have an additional question for the hon. member. If Senator Leo Kolber had been a Conservative, not a Liberal, would he have agreed to be summoned to testify before the Standing Committee on Transport?

[*English*]

**Mr. Keyes:** Mr. Speaker, I would only answer my hon. friend in an honest and straightforward fashion. Beyond that he asked me to bring forward a process which we discussed thoroughly at committee that he knows full well would have extended the debate on Pearson airport for a minimum of months, maybe years, a process that would have Canadian taxpayers watching, being frustrated with it. It would hold back any development, process and progress at Pearson airport.

(1720)

Canadian taxpayers want to see Pearson airport succeed. They want it to become viable. They need that airport for economic reasons, to sustain what we see as an important, viable piece of infrastructure for travel across this country, to connect this country and the world.

I would only answer my friend in the most honest, straightforward manner.

**Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay West—Revelstoke):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Hamilton West. I am glad to see someone from the government side speak that is subject to questioning.

The analogy that the hon. member brings up is very interesting. He said that there were some allegations or possibility of impropriety, so it is in the best interests of Canadians to cancel the deal and not compensate these people. He did not say that it has been properly investigated or if anybody really even created an improper procedure in this whole thing.

It is like being a person associated with somebody who drops dead. We do not know what killed the person, but we charge him with murder because after all he was around somebody that died. We do not even know if a murder happened, never mind whether this person contributed to it. Yet we want to find him guilty. That is what the government is saying in this bill: "We think there are some improper things and if we think there is something improper, then by God there must be something improper, because we know it all". I challenge that.

*Government Orders*

I would ask the hon. member if they are so anxious to cancel this bill because it is such a bad bill, they must obviously have something better in mind. I asked the Minister of Transport today what he had in mind, what he was going to replace this contract with, what he was going to do about the problems at Pearson airport terminals 1 and 2.

The government must have something better in mind. I would like to hear from the hon. member what will replace this bad deal that is better?

**Mr. Keyes:** Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. member's staff has not kept him abreast with what has been going on in government but the Minister of Transport has a national airports policy which has been released that should be of profound interest to this member and the Reform Party.

It takes away from the particular group that I spoke of, a very eclectic group of lobbyists and contractors and the profitability they might make, into a so-called Canadian airport authority, which has representation not just from government but from the community that it serves. It will give that opportunity to all the citizenry, not just around that airport but around that entire region, to have input into the process of decision making for the airport.

Guess what? It is not a revelation. It is quite simply input by the community. What do they need done at this airport? This is what they need done. Who is going to pay for it? They are going to pay for it with good old fashioned, common sense business practices. That is something else the government stands for and which I hear being touted by that party opposite.

On top of that I find it passing strange that we have a Reform Party, a third party in the House who stand opposed to—or in favour possibly of—this motion, when the motion says that we are looking at ensuring there is an opportunity for that eclectic group of contractors and lobbyists to strip away from the Canadian taxpayers a potential of over \$400 million. This comes from a Reform Party, a third party that is concerned with cutting taxes, with ensuring that the debt comes down, with ensuring that the deficit is worked at. They stand and want to support this motion to possibly open the door to give \$400 million to these contractors. It is incredible.

(1725)

**Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise again to speak on Bill C-22.

Before I begin my main remarks I would like to correct a statement made earlier in the House today by the minister. I think the words the minister used were that the Liberals were elected to cancel this deal. I do not think that is quite accurate. I think they were elected to review the deal. That is what they

were saying during the campaign, not to cancel the deal but to review it.

**An hon. member:** I heard the Prime Minister say that. Review the deal and act accordingly.

**Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre):** Not to cancel the deal with no regard for potential costs or the delay at Pearson airport, or due process. Let the record be straight, that was not what the Liberals were elected to office to do.

The decision was made to cancel a project of this magnitude on the basis of a hurried 30-day investigation. The decision was made to cancel a project of this magnitude, in 30 days, without any input from the people involved.

It smacks of a knee-jerk reaction to try to show a government in action, without due regard for the taxpayers of this country. They are the ones who are going to end up paying the bill that we are looking at here.

Unfortunately the solution to this problem has the potential to cost the taxpayers some hard-earned tax dollars that will further increase our deficit. And they are mostly wasted tax dollars because it will do nothing to improve Pearson.

I say mostly because I believe that by going through the courts and opening up this whole mess to the public, we will be doing something to restore some of the trust that has been lost between voters and all politicians. To me anything we can do to remove the cynicism that has developed between the voter and the politician is something at which we should seriously look. That is what we are talking about here.

A major part of the dilemma the government is facing in the debate is the "trust us" to do what is fair and reasonable behind closed doors. The message during the campaign, the message I was getting and I am sure many members were getting was that the trust that had once there had been lost and needed to be regained. We have to re-establish that trust. This bill does not do that.

Members may or may not agree with that, but the fact there were 205 new members elected to the House of Commons says to me very clearly that the voters were not happy with the old politics and wanted some changes in this place. There is no better way to achieve that goal than to open up this process to full disclosure. Let us review the facts that brought us to this point.

First of all, we have a deal that was negotiated by the previous Conservative government behind closed doors. It was signed during the election campaign in the full knowledge that it was going to be reviewed. It was not just a Conservative deal, it is a deal that involved friends on both sides, Liberals and Conservatives.

Second, we had a shady deal and now we have a shady review. Without questioning the abilities of Mr. Nixon who was asked to do the review, if we really believed in restoring the voters' trust and confidence in politicians, whoever was going to do this

*Private Members' Business*

review absolutely had to be non-partisan. It had to be done by somebody who was completely removed from involvement in the political arena. That was not the case here and that flawed review did nothing to restore the trust and confidence I am talking about.

Third, the review raises many questions about the process and puts into question the names and reputations of many people and firms. An implication is that perhaps the law has been broken.

In spite of this damning report this bill does nothing about giving those involved whose names and reputations have been put into question the opportunity to remove that cloud. Yet it does say that in spite of this secret and perhaps unlawful deal they will pay some compensation to these people. They are going to give them some money, but they are going to do it behind closed doors.

If this deal is only half as bad as the Nixon report suggested, not one penny of taxpayers' money should be approved for payout.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** The member will certainly have the option of continuing his remarks to the maximum of 20 minutes when this piece of business returns to the House.

It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should ascertain whether current levels of immigration are sustainable in periods of high unemployment and slow economic growth or recession, and if it finds these levels to be unsustainable under such circumstances the government should develop a means of expeditiously adjusting immigration levels in response to economic conditions.

He said: Mr. Speaker, since you have just read the motion I will not read it again. I happen to care very much about the precise wording of the motion. It was worded as carefully as one could in an attempt to hit the target. I would like to explain to the House where the genesis of this motion came from.

Once every four or five years members of this House go back to the people to seek re-election and others to seek election. During that process we have a very healthy experience of meeting the electors and hearing their concerns, not just by telephone or letters but right at their front doors. That is where they tell those seeking re-election and those seeking to be

elected for the first time exactly what the score is from the perspective of the voter.

During the 1993 election I was dutifully electioneering in my riding with several other candidates from other parties. At that time we believed we were in the tail end of the recession. Statistically it is fair to say that we were and at least in my riding of Scarborough—Rouge River we were waiting for the economy to spin up again.

Many of my constituents asked me about the levels of immigration. They said if the unemployment rate is 11 per cent now it surprises them that we are taking in more immigrants this year than we did the year before and that the immigration levels are increasing.

My riding is 55 per cent immigrants. It is actually an immigrant receiving community and we are very proud of that. It is a very healthy, vibrant community and that augments our lives there considerably. There was a high level of intake of new Canadians.

(1735)

A constituent said to me that she sponsored her sister as an immigrant last year. She was accepted recently and she is going to come but this is a terrible time for her to come because she is not going to find a job.

The economy is in such miserable shape around here. The metropolitan Toronto area was hit very hard by the recession and I do not think we have recovered the jobs that we lost four years ago. We are down considerably by 100,000 or 200,000 jobs.

She was expressing concern about the ability of her sister to find a job when she arrived in Scarborough and was suggesting to me, even though she and her sisters were current clients of the immigrant process, that maybe we did not have the timing quite right.

That combined with many other questions put to me at the door caused me to undertake to my constituents that I would raise in the House the question of immigration levels when the economy is not growing, when we have a weak economy. That is why the issue is here. Although the economy has improved somewhat since last year the issue is still a legitimate one.

A year later some events have overtaken the currency of that issue. It is worth pointing out that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has undertaken a very comprehensive and broad ranging consultation process with a view to establishing a long run, a 10-year plus immigration plan for Canada that will take us into the next millennium. That process has begun and it is continuing. It is comprehensive. Canadians will play a definite part in that and I am looking forward to that process continuing.

There are a number of questions raised in the consultation but I want to note two because they bear relevance to the subject of debate at the moment. Page 10 of the first consultation

*Private Members' Business*

document it states while there may be increasing concerns about the number of immigrants coming to Canada there is evidence to suggest that these concerns are linked as much to issues of unemployment and the economy as they are to issues of diversity. That is in the government's own discussion paper.

Another question asked on page 13 is a question not unrelated to the one we are debating here today: should immigration be managed in response to the business cycle or only on the basis of long term social goals?

Right there the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and those who work with him have asked the types of questions that are related to the motion we discuss here today.

Keep in mind that the motion addresses immigration levels in a weak economy; high unemployment and all of the other manifestations of a weak economy. It is clear that the issue has been addressed. At least if it has been addressed, it may not have been answered, but an answer is being sought from Canadians.

Let us use this debate to focus on that particular issue, the issue of immigrations levels in a weak economy, and hopefully make a contribution to the broader consultation now under way.

What are the issues related to this? In a weak economy some Canadians ask, at least the ones I spoke to at the doors did, if we are able to receive as many immigrants in a weak economy as we are in a strong economy. Looking back over the last few years: immigration levels in 1991, 206,000; 1992, 220,000; 1993, 245,000; and the plan for 1994 would have us receive 250,000. There has been an increase and that increase took place at about the same time as the recession sucked the growth out of our economy.

If one was unemployed in Toronto or Scarborough in 1993 during the election campaign and simply took note of an increase of 30,000 or 40,000 people in metropolitan Toronto as immigrants, one might legitimately ask whether their arrival will decrease one's ability to find a job. It is a legitimate question and it is one that I do not think the government has definitively answered. It is a question we ask here today.

(1740)

There is something else going on here while the question is being asked and if we had 30,000 or 40,000 new Canadians in metro Toronto and they all started looking for jobs I think the unemployment rate would shoot through the roof, but it did not through that period. It went up in the recession but it never did shoot through the roof.

It is clear that the arrival of new Canadians does not per se on a person per person basis directly cause unemployment. Nevertheless, the question I have already acknowledged is a legitimate one.

We can look for the answer perhaps in some economic studies that have been done. There are some related economic studies which show that immigrants can create just about as many jobs as they would take as workers. The suggestion in some of these economic studies is that there is a balance.

When immigration increases, when the people come here to Canada to start new lives, they immediately increase the demand for goods and services. They in effect become a part of the marketplace that generates jobs. I suppose that particular piece of economic news is a good one.

There was a 1991 study by the Economic Council of Canada called Economic and Social Impacts of Immigration which states at page 62 that immigration may influence the incomes and job opportunities of existing residents. It also says the impact of immigration on unemployment is almost certainly negligible, at least over the long term. Even temporary effects seem quite unlikely unless immigration increases very rapidly.

Immigration appeared to be increasing relatively rapidly between 1991, 1992, 1993, but in any event it has at least addressed the issue.

There is another statement in that same study by the Economic Council of Canada which gives its recommendations as an economic advisory body. It recommends that the level of immigration be gradually increased above the average levels of the last 25 years to reach 1 per cent of the population, that is a 1 per cent increase on a gross basis by the year 2015. These levels would be reviewed every five years to verify that the integration of immigrants is being successfully managed.

While Canadians gain economically in terms of per capita income from more immigration, the gain is so small that it did not weigh heavily in our recommendation. Nevertheless, nearly every immigrant more than pays for himself or herself in scale economies and in lighter future tax burdens. These are positive things for our economy.

We note that there is hardly ever an effect on unemployment rates. Nevertheless, at the doors in my constituency the fear was there. It may not be a justifiable fear but Canadians are telling me they are worried about it.

I want to assume that in the discussion here the motion I have placed here is dealing with a period of high unemployment, weak or no economic growth, and a level of high immigration receipt. If you are from a community in Canada that did not have a lot of immigrants coming to it you would not care too much about the motion. You would not care too much about the issue perhaps. However, this is the way my constituents have put this to me.

*Private Members' Business*

Research on this subject also shows two earlier studies, 1977, 1982, which tended to suggest that there were materially recognizable costs with immigration.

(1745)

However, those studies second guessed the methodology and the computer models which were then called TRACE, CANDIDE and RDX2. These are 20-year old economic models which I understand are not used any more. Therefore the results of those studies are certainly in question.

We leave the ascertaining of the economic impacts to the economists. I have referred the House to Economic Council of Canada study in 1991. There was another study done one or two years ago by the Mackenzie Institute. I take note of it because that particular body contributes quite a bit to public policy development in the country. Its conclusions are not always the conclusions that I would come to but they are a contributor.

On page 124 of the Mackenzie Institute study is a quote I want to mention because it was written by a current member of the House, the hon. member for Capilano—Howe Sound. The assessment in that document was that the economic effects of immigration on the welfare of resident Canadians tend to be positive. I wanted to note as clearly as I could that overall the immigration impacts are very positive for Canadians.

I would like to get back to what I think the focus of the House disposition should be. I and my constituents would like the government to ascertain whether high levels of immigration, when the economy is weak, impact negatively on Canadians especially in high immigrant receiving communities. I realize that an answer might not be forthcoming quickly and definitively but that is the issue we seek to have resolved.

If the government finds that it does have a negative impact then it should take steps to alter the immigration levels in a way that would nullify those impacts.

Last, I again want to recognize that the question will be addressed in the current consultation process. I hope that it will be done by the government, by officials in employment and immigration and with the assistance and in consultation with Canadians in a way which will recognize the concern that has been expressed by my constituents and in a way which will permit our immigration act and policies to serve Canadians in the best possible way for the decades to come.

[Translation]

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against motion M-157 tabled by the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River.

[English]

When I read the motion for the first time I thought it came from a Reform Party MP. However, I was wrong. It comes from a Liberal MP and I am very surprised.

[Translation]

The hon. member wants to know whether current levels of immigration are sustainable in difficult economic times. This motion rests on the premise that immigration interferes with economic prosperity or undermines efforts toward economic recovery.

It seems to me that what the hon. member from the Liberal Party is suggesting is right along the lines of the longstanding Reform Party immigration policy to drastically reduce the number of immigrants admitted to Canada. The unemployment rate is not tied to the number of immigrants Canada welcomes. The economic crisis and resulting unemployment have much deeper causes. Let me quote figures for a few years. In 1991, while the unemployment rate in Canada was 10.3 per cent, having soared a full two points in one year, immigration levels were decreased by 7,813. On the other hand, from 1992 to 1993, while the average rate of unemployment remained more or less the same and extremely high in Canada, immigration levels were increased by 25,023.

(1750)

As the hon. member indicated, the unemployment rate is dropping slightly these days. There certainly does not seem to have been any correlation between the levels of unemployment and immigration for a very long time. As a matter of fact, it should be pointed out that British Columbia is currently the province with the highest growth rate in Canada. British Columbia welcomes the highest number of immigrants to Canada in proportion to its population.

Mr. Speaker, in Vancouver last July, I saw the vitality and dynamism injected by ethnic communities and new arrivals in that province's economy. I noted in particular the dynamism and contribution of the Asian community. I want to pay tribute to this very dynamic and lively community that has settled in Canada, particularly in Vancouver and British Columbia.

The hon. member quotes figures from studies by the Economic Council of Canada which, in fact, contradict what he is trying to prove today in this House. Many Canadians fear that too many refugees and immigrants are dependent on social assistance. But, according to the statistics, the truth is that immigrants, including refugees, rely less on social assistance and unemployment insurance than native-born Canadians.

So far, immigrants have brought more to Canada than they received by creating jobs, increasing the demand for consumer goods and housing and paying taxes drastically.

*Private Members' Business*

These facts have been confirmed in a recent study by Dr. Morton Beiser, a professor at the University of Toronto. He showed that only 8 per cent of the 1,300 refugees from Southeast Asia who were interviewed did not work in 1991, when Canada's unemployment rate rose to 10.3 per cent. One out of five had set up their own business. The study also found that 4.5 per cent of refugees collected welfare benefits compared with 7 per cent of all Canadians. My colleagues from the Reform Party should keep this in mind.

In any case, the member for Scarborough—Rouge River should not be too concerned, because Canada will not take in the 250,000 immigrants planned for 1994. Indeed, in the first half of this year, far fewer immigrants have come to this country than in the same period in 1993. Probably the total figure will not exceed 200,000 for 1994. The Liberal Party's program would increase immigration by 1 per cent a year, but the 250,000 immigrants that Canada should receive in 1994 are only 0.86 per cent of Canada's population.

We look forward to the document on immigration levels for the coming years which the minister is to table before November 1. At that time, the minister should provide us with all the studies and results of the consultations carried on in recent months.

I think that the Standing Committee on Immigration and Citizenship could then conduct a thorough study of this issue.

(1755)

[English]

Any immigration policy must in the first place consider demographic factors. Currently most considerations are based on economics. One of the factors that has this last year justified higher immigration levels is the increasing preoccupation of many Canadians regarding the demographic decline in Canada for the coming years.

The projections indicate that if immigration numbers and birth rates do not increase then Canadians will be faced with a reduction in their numbers. Studies show that post-industrial nations will have a birth rate between 1.4 and 1.7 per cent. However, a rate of 2.1 per cent is necessary only to maintain the current population numbers. This difference must consequently be adjusted by the immigration policy.

In addition we must take into consideration the ages of the Canadian population. Young immigrants are needed to work and finance our social security system.

Finally, there is an increasing number of countries that find themselves in conflict situations. There are more than 100 million refugees in the world. Canada has a moral duty to do its share in solving this problem by welcoming refugees into our country.

[Translation]

The motion tabled by the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River is totally opposed to his own party's policies, the Liberal Party of Canada, as they are worded in that red book which the Prime Minister and the members opposite often quote as though it was the Bible. As I said, increasing immigration levels so as to reach one per cent of the Canadian population is a promise made in that red book.

The hon. member's motion is a barely veiled and disguised criticism of his party's policy. He told us that immigrants account for 55 per cent of the population in his riding of Scarborough—Rouge River. I think those people will not be very proud of their member of Parliament today, since he is squarely in favour of lowering immigration levels. In any case, let me tell you that, as a member of Parliament who came here as an immigrant, I am not proud of the member's motion. For all these reasons, the Bloc Québécois opposes the motion.

[English]

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to address this reasonable motion. It is only a shame that this motion did not originate with the government. It seems that the government has a great deal to learn, at least as far as immigration policy is concerned, from its own backbenchers and especially from my hon. colleague, the author of this motion.

The fact that a motion like this even requires debate and is not already government policy is a reflection of the power that special interests have exercised and continue to exercise on government policy.

We currently have an immigration policy as outlined in the Liberal red book that is literally based on nothing. This government is allowing nearly 1 per cent of the population to come into the country this year as immigrants; 250,000 immigrants. At the same time Canada is experiencing a level of unemployment that is denying jobs to 1.5 million people.

The government can offer no rationale for this level of immigration. It is not derived from economic research, since the experts are agreed that immigration does not add to the wealth of Canada. Over the long term economic forecasts suggest that our current levels will actually lower the average income of all Canadians. There is no evidence that immigrants create more jobs than they take. At best the job and wealth creating effects of immigration are neutral.

There are data to back up arguments for restricting immigration during times of recession. There are data that clearly suggest that immigration should be tied to the economy. Moreover, it is only common sense that immigration should serve one primary role, to supplement our labour force to strengthen the economy and contribute to Canada's economic growth. That is not the agenda of this government at present and that is not the agenda of the immigration industry.

*Private Members' Business*

(1800)

There is no question that immigration could be made to work in the interests of the economy and the interests of Canadians. There is a simple recipe for success. That recipe is to cut the numbers of immigrants, especially during hard times such as the one that we are currently facing and ensure that immigrants who come into Canada are chosen for their ability to quickly and successfully integrate into the economy and to make an immediate contribution.

The way that we can do that is to ensure that the bulk of immigrants come in under the point system. Currently however only 15 per cent of immigrants come in this way. The rest are family class and refugees.

Over the summer a poll was conducted by the immigration association. One of the questions that was put to over 1,000 people across the country is the following: "Would you approve or disapprove of a proposal to place restrictions on the entry of immigrants who may compete with unemployed Canadians during times of high unemployment in the country?" The answer to that question was an overwhelming yes. Canadians would approve of restricting immigration levels if it was determined that the job market could not accommodate newcomers. Sixty-seven per cent of Canadians approved. In political terms that is an overwhelming majority.

That is not the only poll around. Earlier in the year the department of immigration commissioned the EKOS polling firm to survey Canadians on their feelings toward immigration policy. In this poll a majority of Canadians surveyed said that there were too many immigrants coming into Canada, period. That is very revealing.

Canadians have always been among the most accepting people on earth. We have welcomed newcomers and believed that there was a place in Canada for them where they could contribute, where they could stake out a place and become productive members of society.

Now the majority are saying: "Let's tighten up. Let's shut the doors", and many of them are immigrants themselves. Frankly there is little wonder that this sort of reaction is occurring. Officials from EKOS have told me that there is a direct correlation between the state of the economy and the desire of Canadians to limit immigration.

They also inform me that this level of discontent with immigration levels was unprecedented. Some spin doctors call the results of the EKOS poll intolerance. It is nothing of the sort. It is a logical reaction to a strain on Canada's economy and that strain while apparently unnoticed by officials in the department of immigration and by the minister himself is being felt by Canadians who are on the streets competing for jobs.

Canadians it seems have again demonstrated that they know more about the consequences of policy than do the policymakers. What Canadians want is an immigration policy that works for them. Canadians are not intolerant.

This government and those in the immigration industry should bear in mind that when they call those who are opposed to current levels of immigration intolerant that they are indicating a sizeable majority of the population. Are we to believe that the majority of Canadians are intolerant? Absolutely not. They simply want change. They simply want an immigration policy that makes sense. They want an immigration policy that first and foremost ties immigration levels to the state of the economy in a real way, in a substantial way. Immigration can work in the interest of the economy.

Tying immigration to the state of the economy would be so simple and the benefits would be immediate and would be profound.

This minister and this government refuse to consider it. This minister and this government are at the beck and call of a small group of immigration lawyers, immigration and refugee advocates and government funded ethnic leaders who have a monetary stake in ensuring that immigration levels are maintained at the current level or even raised. If anyone doubts that the immigration industry has the ear of the current minister, they need only look at this minister's appointment to the Immigration and Refugee Board. That will give a clear picture of who is calling the shots.

(1805)

It is time to take immigration back from special interests. It is time to put the direction of immigration policy into the hands of Canadians. They should be consulted. It is time to do precisely what this motion demands. It is unfortunate that it is not a votable motion. It only makes sense. I surely hope that this minister listens to what the Reform Party along with the majority of Canadians have been calling for for some time.

I hope the minister will look at the intent of the motion and recognize that it reflects Reform Party policy and the will of the majority of Canadians. I hope this minister does what is right and reduces immigration levels until Canada pulls itself out of this recession. I hope this minister does what is good for Canada. I am afraid he has not done this so far.

I applaud my hon. colleague for his common sense and for the courage to table a motion that flies in the face of policies that his own party has generated up until now.

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis):** Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today gives me an opportunity to outline for the hon. member some of the many initiatives this government is involved in to help newcomers to Canada settle in this country and quickly become effective, contributing Canadians and not a drain on our economy.

I wish to emphasize the importance of our settlement programs within this equation which assist immigrants integrating into Canadian society quickly.

People who come to this country are not set adrift once they arrive. They do not have to fend for themselves in a strange country. Immigrants long ago had few resources available to them but today we realize that providing initial assistance can quickly translate into independence for the newcomer to this country.

[*Translation*]

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration is involved in a series of joint projects with non-governmental organizations, centres for social services and other levels of government. For instance, we are involved in co-operative enterprises through our Immigrant Settlement and Adaptation Program and our Settlement Language Training Program.

In 1992, for instance, the federal government provided a total of \$277,000 in funding for projects to promote immigrant settlement, and we know that is money well spent.

[*English*]

The reception services point the newcomers to other settlement and integration programs we have in place and by promoting the many settlement services offered by governments and community organizations we acquaint newcomers with the programs they can tap into as they integrate into Canada.

According to our reports this has eased the anxieties of many newcomers about the problems of successfully settling here.

[*Translation*]

These programs are not frills but an investment that is vital to the well-being of new immigrants. We see them as more than just projects. These programs are a way to work together with people who are deeply committed to the integration of immigrants in our society.

I repeat, these projects are an investment that is vital to the well-being of new immigrants in this country. By working with community organizations across the country, we manage to involve all immigrants in every aspect of Canadian life.

This kind of work is essential to help people who are often very vulnerable. It is money well spent, because this is a hands-on way to give people support and help them become independent. We have been very successful with these programs in Quebec, where I know the situation very well, and across Canada. Most refugees who participated in our settlement programs have managed to integrate remarkably well into their new communities in Quebec and across Canada.

### *Private Members' Business*

[*English*]

It is the programs that help us build a multicultural society.

The motion before us implies that immigrants have a difficult time adapting to Canada and hence they are a drag on our society. I would suggest otherwise. I would suggest that our settlement programs are doing their job. They are helping new people adapt and integrate into a complex and dynamic country. In so doing they are helping to build and maintain a vibrant society that the United Nations told us not once but twice was the envy of the world.

Throughout our history immigration and nation building have gone hand in hand. Immigration has helped us to define a vision of a tolerant, caring and generous society. Today our immigration policy reflects these very ideals. To adopt the motion before us would diminish our success in immigration and refugee matters.

Canada is also a respected world leader because we offer new life for refugees. In fact international agencies rank Canada's refugee program among the most generous in the world. Our per capita acceptance of refugees places us at the top of the list.

My riding of Saint-Denis is made up of refugees and immigrants. Most are hard working and most contribute socially, economically and culturally to my riding and to the country. We have talked a lot about studies in the Chamber. A study was done by the Council for Cultural Communities and Immigration of Quebec, of which I had the honour to be vice-president. It was proven that in a very short period, in fact 20 weeks, most refugees or immigrants had found one job and sometimes had found two. They are working and contributing economically to the betterment of our society, to the betterment of our economy.

They do not, as some say, steal our jobs. They create jobs. They employ people. The hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River cited certain studies that said immigration impacts were very positive.

We have examples in the Chamber. We have examples of Canadians or children of immigrants who have contributed economically, socially, culturally and even politically to Canada. I would like the hon. member and the Chamber to take those facts into consideration.

**Mr. Morrison:** Mr. Speaker, I was struck by the initial part of the intervention of the hon. member for Saint-Denis.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order. Through this period of business there are no questions or comments. Unless I am mistaken, I would like to remind members they must be in their seats to be recognized by the Chair.

There being no further members rising for debate and the motion not being designated as a votable item, the time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper pursuant to Standing Order 96(1).



*Adjournment Debate*

## SUSPENSION OF SITTING

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Shall I suspend the sitting of the House to either 6.30 or until the members who are to take part in the adjournment debate are present?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 6.13 p.m.)

## SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 6.27 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

[*Translation*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

## IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa):** Mr. Speaker, on June 16, I asked the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration a question regarding the fact that immigration officers were requiring from refugees whose status has been recognized by the Immigration and Refugee Board a passport from their country of origin. If these refugees could not produce a passport, they were asked to contact their embassy or consulate to apply for one in order for the authorities to review their application for permanent resident status. This practice varies depending on the immigration office and the rules are applied in a totally arbitrary fashion.

This requirement can jeopardize the safety of those people and that of their families in their country of origin. It is sometimes very difficult if not impossible for a refugee to obtain such documents. I hope to get a complete and adequate answer regarding that issue today.

I also take this opportunity to denounce the setting up of the claims processing centre in Vegreville, Alberta, which is a total flop. The decision made by the Conservatives and confirmed by the Liberals to centralize the processing of claims far from the users and the immigrants was irrational. Things started off on the wrong foot and the centre was immediately overwhelmed by the massive number of claims to process. Delays are very long. People cannot get information on their files when they phone the information centres set up for that purpose. Since May, the Vegreville centre has literally never had control of the situation. Files keep accumulating and the delays due to the insufficient number of employees processing those claims is unjustified.

I learned that thousands of files which cannot be processed in Vegreville will be returned to local centres. These files are

returned precisely in those centres where staff cutbacks were made, since it was believed that it would be more efficient to centralize the whole process in Vegreville. Now it is the local centres which will not be able to keep up with the demand. I denounce the unjustified staff reductions at the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

In this regard, I must mention the intolerable situation of thousands of people in the Montreal area who try to contact their immigration department by dialing 496-1010. This number is the only one for answering all immigration questions, and it is always busy. In July alone, there were 126,000 calls to 496-1010. There were exactly six officials there to answer the phone. Officially, there should be 15, but in fact, there are never more than nine employees. Service to the public is woefully inadequate.

I also want to denounce another situation which clearly shows that the minister has lost control of the immigration centres. During the first week in September, Montreal had a list with the names of over 2,000 people who were waiting to receive kits by mail.

I hope that the minister will take concrete action soon to improve this terrible situation.

[*English*]

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development):** Mr. Speaker, in order to become a permanent resident of Canada, refugees must be able to prove their identity. This is necessary to protect Canada from persons who may have committed criminal acts or human rights violations in their own country and who should not be given permanent residence and eventually Canadian citizenship.

It is also necessary to establish a refugee's identity in order to clarify a refugee's relationship with family members. In order to prove their identity, refugees are asked to present a passport, even an expired one, a valid travel document or a satisfactory identity document.

Refugees who are unwilling or unable to apply for a passport from their country may therefore obtain permanent residence by presenting a travel document other than a passport or an identity document.

In some cases where none of these documents are available permanent residency may be granted on humanitarian grounds if it is unlikely that the person presents a criminal or security concern.

In all cases, however, every effort is made with the individual concerned, through community and support groups, to help them produce acceptable evidence of identity for the purpose of applying for permanent residence.

*Adjournment Debate*

[Translation]

## SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier):** Mr. Speaker, in a question I asked in this House on May 25, I mentioned a warning given to the minister in a communications strategy paper whose contents were leaked—there have been other leaks since. This paper referred to “UI cuts seen by the population as evidence that the government wants to fight the deficit on the backs of the poor”.

My question was this: “Under the circumstances, will the minister tell us if the delay in tabling his action plan is the result of a split among cabinet ministers regarding what is at stake?” That was on May 25. This question is still relevant today because, since May 25, we have learned that the minister’s action plan, following which a bill will be drafted and action will be taken, has been postponed until the spring and perhaps until the fall. It will be a discussion paper on which Canadians and Quebecers will be consulted.

The question I asked pointed out that the delay in tabling the action plan was no doubt the result of a split among cabinet ministers. This question is still relevant and I would say that it is even more relevant today. We must keep in mind that the only thing the government has done since the election to help the needy is to cut access and UI benefits except for a small number of cases which, as the minister reminded us today, had positive results.

(1835)

But for one thousand or so recipients to get enhanced protection at 60 per cent, all other claimants will see their UI benefit rate reduced to 55 per cent. More importantly, there is all those who will no longer qualify for UI, those who will be entitled to fewer weeks of benefits, which means more families and single parents ending up on welfare and increased poverty for children.

We could read in the papers this morning that in Canada, one child out of five is poor and their numbers have increased dramatically since 1989.

I repeat forcefully and will continue to repeat it as long as it takes: apart from talking—it bursts with generous, compassionate words—all the government actually did was to make matters worse on the whole for families and individuals in need.

[English]

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development):** Mr. Speaker, I have paid attention to the hon. member’s comments and I can assure her that the expenditures that will take place to engage Canadians in consultations will be expenditures that are necessary to engage them in what we as a government feel is an important dialogue.

There is great support throughout the land for the social security review. People understand that the present programs, although they have served us well in the past and have given us the security we need, are no longer valid for the contemporary reality.

We are going to use this review to engage Canadians. It is not just here in Parliament but it will be in town hall meetings throughout the country. It will be with the parliamentary standing committee. It will be the type of consultation that this country really has not seen to date.

The review is necessary. Canadians need change. We need to give our young people the tools required to compete in a very globally competitive society. We need to adjust our programs to take into consideration the changing configurations of the Canadian economy, the change in our families, the change in our incomes. All the changes that have occurred need to be addressed in a very serious manner.

It is for this reason that the government had the courage to engage in a dialogue with Canadians. We are sure that Canadians, like the hon. member, will be a very effective partner in bringing about positive change to the lives of Canadians.

[Translation]

## NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec):** Mr. Speaker, following the release of the report of the Department of Defence Advisory Council on Women in the Canadian Armed Forces, the media reported that the department had taken specific measures to combat sexual harassment. On May 30, I rose in the House to ask the minister what these measures were and whether there had been an evaluation of the new complaint process.

I have yet to receive a clear and substantial reply from the minister, who had promised something to that effect. Harassment is a problem that affects women throughout the workplace, especially in cases where women constitute a very small minority. I think everyone will agree that the Department of National Defence still fits that category.

All studies have shown that the effects of sexual harassment are many and varied. They may lead to physical discomfort (headaches, fatigue), personal and family problems or problems directly related to the job (unfair evaluation, poor references and, in extreme cases, resignation or release from employment). Linda Geller-Schwarz, who compiled information on sexual harassment in the workplace for the Women’s Bureau, Human Resources Development Canada, wrote:

Harassment is no joke. It upsets the life of the victim, threatens her livelihood, is detrimental to the career of the harasser and poisons the atmosphere at work.

In other words, in the workplace, the emotional and financial cost is often huge for all concerned.

*Adjournment Debate*

(1840)

HAITI

I realize the Minister of National Defence intends to take action, and I commend him for it. However, I would appreciate it if he would tell the House how he intends to rid his organization of the social poison of sexual harassment in the workplace. I would also ask the minister whether the main victims of harassment, his female employees, have been or will be asked to participate in the evaluation of measures taken to deal with a problem that concerns them directly.

[English]

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for giving me the opportunity to address this important issue and to respond to her question once again.

On June 20, I tabled in this House on behalf of the Minister of National Defence a series of documents describing the measures taken by the Department of National Defence to address the issue of harassment in the Canadian Armed Forces.

Changes have been made to ensure that DND's commitment to eliminating harassment is reflected in our programs and policy. Minor changes to the Canadian forces administrative orders that include the concept of zero tolerance are embedded in this policy.

The goal of the policy is simply the elimination and prevention of harassment. Every member has the right to work in an environment that is harassment free and to have any complaint of harassment dealt with in an expeditious, impartial and sensitive manner without fear of retaliation, and that is very important to add.

Our goal is to prevent and eliminate harassment in the workplace and this will be achieved by this policy and by educating and training members on harassment issues, policies and procedures.

Specifically, the new policies include revised complaint reporting procedures, the designation of harassment advisers, a DND harassment co-ordination office, a monitoring system to track the incidence of harassment and a comprehensive education and training program.

Harassment education and training for all members at the unit and base level is mandatory. The new policy is in the process of being printed and will be published in the upcoming months.

Once again I thank the member for allowing me the opportunity to stress the fact that the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces remain committed to the implementation of a zero tolerance policy on harassment.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer):** Mr. Speaker, I am here today simply because so many Canadians are asking the same question and are demanding an answer, not an answer that we can come up with in the months to come, but an answer that we need right now because the decisions are being made right now.

For Canada to think that we have the resources or the ability to be the 911 emergency for the world, we are far beyond that.

The minister would agree that there are many hot spots in this world, that there are many that can explode tonight, tomorrow, next week, next month, and we have to establish some criteria that we are going to follow when we make foreign affairs decisions, particularly in the area of peacekeeping.

We need to look at things like the economic implications, the humanitarian reasons. They are good reasons but then every single place would have these same reasons. We have to come up with a set of fixed criteria. We have to look at the geographical relationship. The people who are closest should be the ones who can help the best.

We have the OAS which should definitely have been more involved in the Haiti situation. The African states should have been more involved in Rwanda. We have to look at the effect on international stability. We have to look at the media relationships—should we always be driven by CNN and Newsworld? We have to ask those questions.

Canadian people want to know what it is going to cost. How much is this going to cost? How much money are we going to budget to handle all of these emergencies? Again, that all comes into criteria.

We have to look at the resources that we have and of course we have to ask ourselves what our commitments are. We look at the whole military situation and see an awful lot of generals but we are certainly running out of front line troops. We are expecting our men and women in the forces to do so many things and they are not able to be stretched any further.

We hear talk about the equipment not being adequate. We get letters from parents who have lost a loved one because they felt our ability to deliver was inadequate.

We have to ask, what are these resources? How far will they go? We have to have a plan. We cannot just trust politicians that say: "We will send them and we will let you know what we hope to accomplish after". We must know, we must ask questions. If my son or daughter was going I would want to know why they were going, what they are going to accomplish and how it is going to help Canada. For how long are they going?

The closest thing I have seen on how long we are going to be Haiti was when RCMP Chief Superintendent Pouliot said yesterday on "Canada AM" that we are going to be there for seven to ten years to train the police forces.

*Adjournment Debate*

We need to know the criteria, the costs, the resources that will be expended and of course the plan and how long we are going to be there.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question and intervention, I have taken the liberty to note the first interview given by Chief Superintendent Neil Pouliot in his capacity as commissioner of the United Nations civilian police contingency in Haiti.

Commissioner Pouliot has clearly indicated that Canada's commitment in Haiti has been set for approximately 18 months, that is until the inauguration of Haiti's next president which is slated for February 1986.

He has also said, and this became the basis for the member's question in the House today and his intervention now, is that he thought Haiti might need eight to ten years before its police force reforms were fully implemented. This comment made in his capacity as UN commissioner referred to the need for a complete change of attitudes and the time needed for all ranks of the future 5,000 strong force to assimilate the concepts of a modern police force.

He certainly did not imply that Canada has committed itself for that length of time. That is certainly not our intention. Canada has pledged to assist Haiti in the area of police reform through our participation in the United Nations Mission in Haiti. For this purpose we have sought 100 volunteers who will be

deployed in the weeks or months ahead once the Security Council has authorized the United Nations Mission in Haiti.

The cost of this participation has been estimated at \$12.8 million for the 18-month period I have just mentioned. This is what the member was asking. CIDA will cover those costs.

The task of the RCMP officers will be to monitor the behaviour of the new Haitian police, accompany them on their daily rounds and give them on-the-street training. The RCMP will not take official duty. They are there to train, not to do the policing themselves.

We do not know yet how long such monitoring will be required and if, after a certain lapse of time, all of the 100 Mounties will be needed. Once a formal training program has begun it is quite possible that smaller numbers will be required.

I thank the hon. member for raising this. He has made excellent interventions in the standing committee on foreign affairs and in the joint committee reviewing foreign policy. I know he views this issue with great interest and importance.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.48 p.m.)

---

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesday, September 28, 1994

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### **Young Entrepreneurs**

Mr. Arseneault ..... 6251

### **Tax Reform**

Mr. Leroux (Shefford) ..... 6251

### **Freedom of Speech**

Mrs. Hayes ..... 6251

### **Dress Code in Schools**

Mrs. Bakopanos ..... 6251

### **Davis Inlet**

Mr. Finlay ..... 6252

### **Selwyn Tam**

Mrs. Terrana ..... 6252

### **The Economy**

Mr. Godin ..... 6252

### **Liberal Government**

Mr. Ramsay ..... 6252

### **Schizophrenia**

Mr. Murphy ..... 6252

### **Domestic Violence**

Mr. Szabo ..... 6253

## **Argentia Naval Base**

Mrs. Payne ..... 6253

## **Party Fundraising**

Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) ..... 6253

## **Royal Bank of Canada**

Mr. McClelland ..... 6253

## **Child Poverty**

Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) ..... 6253

## **Gun Control**

Mr. Serré ..... 6254

## **The Reform Party**

Mrs. Sheridan ..... 6254

# **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

## **1992 Referendum**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 6254

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 6254

Mr. Bouchard ..... 6254

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 6255

Mr. Bouchard ..... 6255

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 6255

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) ..... 6255

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 6255

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) ..... 6255

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) ..... 6255

## **Social Security**

Mrs. Ablonczy ..... 6256

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 6256

Mrs. Ablonczy .....	6256
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	6256
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	6256
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	6256

**Child Poverty**

Mrs. Lalonde .....	6256
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	6257
Mrs. Lalonde .....	6257
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	6257

**National Defence**

Mr. Frazer .....	6257
Mr. Mifflin .....	6257
Mr. Frazer .....	6257
Mr. Mifflin .....	6257

**Centres of Excellence for Women’s Health**

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	6257
Ms. Marleau .....	6258
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	6258
Ms. Marleau .....	6258

**Land Engineering Test Establishment**

Mr. Hart .....	6258
Mr. Mifflin .....	6258
Mr. Hart .....	6258
Mr. Mifflin .....	6258

**Registered Retirement Savings Plans**

Mr. Brien .....	6258
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	6258
Mr. Brien .....	6258
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	6259

**Canadian Armed Forces**

Mr. O’Reilly .....	6259
--------------------	------

Mr. Mifflin ..... 6259

### **Pearson International Airport**

Mr. Gouk ..... 6259

Mr. Young ..... 6259

Mr. Gouk ..... 6259

Mr. Young ..... 6259

### **Social Program Reform**

Mr. Dumas ..... 6260

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 6260

Mr. Dumas ..... 6260

Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) ..... 6260

### **Haiti**

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) ..... 6260

Mr. Ouellet ..... 6260

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) ..... 6260

Mr. Ouellet ..... 6260

### **Turbot Fishery**

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) ..... 6260

Mr. Tobin ..... 6261

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) ..... 6261

Mr. Tobin ..... 6261

### **Human Rights**

Mrs. Barnes ..... 6261

Mr. Rock ..... 6261

### **Pneumonic Plague**

Mr. Hill (Macleod) ..... 6261

Ms. Marleau ..... 6261

### **AIDS**

Mr. Hanger ..... 6261



Mr. Marchi ..... 6262

**Presence in Gallery**

The Speaker ..... 6262

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

**Interparliamentary Delegations**

Mr. Kilger ..... 6262

**Committees of the House**

**Procedure and House Affairs**

Mr. Milliken ..... 6262

**Endangered and Threatened Species Act**

Bill C-275. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 6262

Mr. Caccia ..... 6262

**Lester B. Pearson Day Act**

Bill C-276. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted ..... 6263

Mr. Peric ..... 6263

**Committees of the House**

**Procedure and House Affairs**

Motion for concurrence in 34th report ..... 6263

Mr. Milliken ..... 6263

(Motion agreed to.) ..... 6263

**Environment and Sustainable Development**

Mr. Milliken ..... 6263

Motion moved and agreed to. .... 6263

**Fisheries and Oceans**

Mr. Milliken ..... 6263

## **Petitions**

### **Rights of the Unborn**

Mr. Thompson ..... 6263

### **Dangerous Offenders**

Mr. Jordan ..... 6263

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) ..... 6263

### **Abortion**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) ..... 6264

### **Euthanasia**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) ..... 6264

### **Library Book Postal Subsidy**

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) ..... 6264

### **Law of the Sea**

Mr. Caccia ..... 6264

### **Abortion**

Mr. Valeri ..... 6264

### **Assisted Suicide**

Mr. Valeri ..... 6264

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Mayfield ..... 6264

### **Gun Control**

Mr. Morrison ..... 6264

### **Human Rights**

Mr. Frazer ..... 6264

### **Euthanasia**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) ..... 6265

**Human Rights**

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) ..... 6265

**Members of Parliament**

Mr. Finlay ..... 6265

**Gun Control**

Mr. DeVillers ..... 6265

**Leonard Peltier**

Mr. Adams ..... 6265

**Gun Control**

Mr. Hart ..... 6265

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Milliken ..... 6266

**Motions for Papers**

Mr. Milliken ..... 6266

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Pearson International Airport Agreements Act**

Bill C-22. Motion of non-concurrence ..... 6266

Mr. Young ..... 6266

Mr. Guimond ..... 6269

Mr. Gouk ..... 6273

Mr. Reed ..... 6276

Mr. Loubier ..... 6277

Mr. Deshaies ..... 6279

Mr. Guimond ..... 6280

Mr. Keyes ..... 6281

Mr. Guimond ..... 6282

Mr. Gouk ..... 6282

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) ..... 6283

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Immigration**

Mr. Lee ..... 6284

Motion .....	6284
Mr. Nunez .....	6286
Mr. Hanger .....	6287
Mrs. Bakopanos .....	6288

**Suspension of Sitting**

(The sitting of the House was suspended at 6.13 p.m.) .....	6290
---	------

**Sitting resumed**

The House resumed at 6.27 p.m. ....	6290
-------------------------------------	------

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Immigration**

Mr. Nunez .....	6290
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	6290

**Social Program Reform**

Mrs. Lalonde .....	6291
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	6291

**National Defence**

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	6291
Mr. Mifflin .....	6292

**Haiti**

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) .....	6292
Mr. Flis .....	6293

**Appendix**