



# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 108

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, October 18, 1994**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 18, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### LOWER CHURCHILL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD.

**Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table, in both official languages, the 1993 annual report of the Lower Churchill Development Corporation Limited.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### PETITIONS

#### CANADIAN CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I would like to present a petition signed by voters of the riding of Pierrefonds—Dollard stating their opposition to the proposed amendments to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The petitioners are asking Parliament not to amend the Canadian Code of Human Rights by adding the rather vague expression “sexual orientation” to the list of prohibited grounds for discrimination.

[English]

#### GUN CONTROL

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise under Standing Order 36 to present two petitions signed by 60 residents of Kaleden and Oliver in my riding of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt. I would like to point out that to date 413 people from my riding have signed petitions regarding the same subject, gun control.

The petitioners oppose further gun legislation. They call on the government to provide strict enforcement of existing statutes governing the use of firearms in the commission of a criminal offence, with particular emphasis on the rigorous use of section 85 of the Criminal Code. Further restrictions on law-abiding citizens will not solve the problem of crime in Canada. Government must deal with the real problem and not punish law-abiding citizens.

I support my petitioners.

(1005 )

#### EUTHANASIA

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to rise on behalf of 685 residents of the constituency of Edmonton Southwest to present a petition that speaks against euthanasia.

The petitioners pray that the Parliament of Canada will ensure that palliative care is active and compassionate, that it can relieve the pain and suffering of the terminally ill and help families without the danger of suicide.

It is my pleasure to present the petition and I concur fully with the petitioners.

**Mr. Berger:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if I could seek the unanimous consent of the House to revert to committee reports for the purpose of tabling a report.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Members have heard the request of the member for Saint-Henri—Westmount for unanimous consent to revert to presenting reports from committees. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### INDUSTRY

**Mr. David Berger (Saint-Henri—Westmount, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Industry entitled “Taking Care of Small Business” or, in French, *Pour financer le succès de la PME*.

This report contains 24 recommendations aimed at creating a financial climate more favourable to the development of small business in Canada.

*Government Orders*

[English]

The report could not have been done without the tremendous hard work and non-partisan co-operation of all members from all parties of the industry committee. I wish to thank everyone who participated in the report.

[Translation]

**Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, on the tabling of this report I would like to join the chairman in saluting the 58 witnesses who participated in the committee proceedings and thanking the people who sent us 62 briefs.

I also want to stress the highly positive atmosphere in which the proceedings took place. I must say however that, in spite of this positive attitude, we had to dissent on two major points which we believed not to be in the best interests of Quebecers. The first point concerns the fiscal relationship between the Fonds de solidarité des travailleurs du Québec and the federal government; we will comment on this further during the forthcoming press conference; the second point regards the Small Businesses Loans Act; instead of restricting its scope, we would like to see it broadened to include all small businesses, not only those involved in exports, so that in the new economy, small and medium sized businesses can rely on this act for their working capital. That is all for now, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before I see the member rising, according to our standing orders concerning the tabling of reports from committees, if and when there should be a dissenting voice, members from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition have an equal amount of time to that of the presenter of the committee report.

I submit with the greatest of respect to all my colleagues that the Chair cannot extend the floor to another member to speak on the same report.

**Mr. McClelland:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With unanimous consent, could we be afforded that privilege just for a very brief comment?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Of course the Chair is the servant of all members of the House. Is it the wish of the House to extend the privilege to the hon. member? Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Okanagan Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here this morning and to be able to support and to be part of a process in which democracy is operating in its truest form.

The committee developed recommendations that will support small business. These were developed based on the people's commentary. The committee has come up with recommendations that in my opinion will definitely help to develop small business in Canada.

Some of the key recommendations are the increase of competition among financial institutions by increasing the number and kind of institutions that provide financing; setting interest rates under the Small Businesses Loans Act that are commensurate with risk; developing a code of conduct for banks; and the establishment of a bank ombudsman with the power to investigate and order compensation on matters of breach of duty or maladministration in order to ensure a level playing field between businesses and banks.

(1010)

We know that small businesses play a major role in the economic development of Canada. We need to shore up this part of our sector. Our economic future is dependent upon them and this report. If the government sees fit to implement the recommendations, we will have a better climate as a result of this development.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

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

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed from September 22 consideration of the motion that Bill C-41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I will recognize the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River. I want to apprise the House we are at the stage of debate where members have a 10-minute allocation without questions or comments.

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-41 addresses an area of the criminal justice system which we call sentencing. There is for me a certain sense of déjà vu. A bill not identical to this was introduced in the last Parliament.

Colleagues on the justice committee at that time viewed the bill as flawed and made a collective decision not to proceed. As a result the sentencing legislation, which has been in the works for some 10 years or more, languished for another period of time. That legislation was flawed from the point of view of properly defining what sentencing should be or could be and it

*Government Orders*

also failed to take adequate account of the role of the victim in a criminal law sentencing decision.

At least members on this side of the House and to some extent all members are the authors of the bill currently before the House. I am proud to stand with the Minister of Justice in presenting this bill for its consideration.

Certain refinements have been made to the bill. There have been a lot of contributors. It is only fair to acknowledge these contributors over all of the years. This is not something that came off the assembly line and was cobbled together quickly.

Over the years contributions have been made in the area of criminal law sentencing, at least in laying the new groundwork, by the Law Reform Commission of Canada, the Canadian Sentencing Commission, and former members of the House of Commons. I recall members of the other place also contributed to the debate. There have been some special individuals inside the House.

We should give credit to those in the Department of Justice who have shepherded the bill through to the present time. Last but not least is the Minister of Justice. He has come forward with what we believe is a landmark in the sense that not previously in our history have we attempted to codify the sentencing regime in the Criminal Code. We have not had a statute that specifically targeted the issue of sentencing.

Sentencing was referred to in the government's election platform. Some credit is due to a lot of members in the last Parliament, not just on the government side, but some credit is also due to the flexibility and foresight of the current Prime Minister who accommodated this in the party's platform. Now it is our job in the House to review it, refine it should the need be there and put it into law.

(1015)

What is worth noting for the record is this bill is not corrections legislation. It does not deal with penitentiaries. It does not deal with parole. It does not deal with sentencing terms per se. The sentence that could be given by a judge is set out in the Criminal Code, minimums, maximums or whatever. This bill does not set out the penalty or potential penalty for a particular crime. This bill does not deal with gun control per se. It does not deal with the way we deal with gradual release of our inmates. It is not any of those things. Notwithstanding, it is a landmark piece of legislation.

This bill consolidates and updates in a codified form our Canadian developed law of sentencing. Much of this law has been developed in the courtroom by judges. It was created judicially with reference to the Criminal Code, our criminal law traditions, our Charter of Rights and Freedoms and other com-

mon law elements that judges have taken into account over the years.

This is perhaps an opportunity for the legislators to play their role in giving the appropriate definition, guidance and framework to the judges who have for the last 100 or more years carried the burden of sentencing in the discretion that has been given to them under the Criminal Code. Here is our chance as legislators to provide a framework for them.

One of the major functions of this bill is to define the purpose and principles of sentencing. This was an issue in the previous legislation. It still may be an issue. It may be an area in which some refinement may be useful at committee stage recalling that as we debate the bill now we are debating the bill in principle. I am certainly going to support the bill in principle.

In terms of these actual definitions, it might be useful for the committee which will study this bill to look with a magnifying glass at the actual wording of the purpose and principles of sentencing as set out in the bill. There is some alleged fudging thinking. It is just alleged. I am not saying it is fuzzy, I am saying that from my point of view the wording in section 718 could be slightly more simplified and perhaps more orthodox than it is written at the moment.

In that regard, and I will put it on the record, I have a sense that in trying to define the fundamental purpose of sentencing Department of Justice officials have used the definition of purpose of criminal law. There is a difference between the purpose of criminal law, that being generally or usually defined to be the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society, and the purpose of sentencing which is just an element of the criminal law. The purpose of sentencing, in my view, is to promote respect for the law and respect for the criminal law system which does all of these other things for us. However, that is a rather narrow perspective at the moment as we debate the bill in principle and that can be taken up later.

I want to address the sections of this bill dealing with potential for change from the aboriginal perspective. It would be wrong to say there is now in existence an aboriginal system of criminal justice. There are some pilot projects through the goodwill of aboriginal Canadians, the people on their reserves, people in the criminal justice community, the police and the judges.

(1020)

There has been some leadership there in an attempt to develop a system in the aboriginal community that works. I do not think there is a member in this House who would walk into a reserve in northern Canada and say they believe affairs on the reserve ought to be run the same way they are in downtown Montreal or Vancouver or at King and Bay Streets in Toronto. These are two different worlds.

*Government Orders*

Our aboriginal Canadians never did apply for Canadian citizenship. We bestowed it on them. There is plenty of good reason to look for ways to make the criminal justice system work on these reserves that are very much removed from the urban way of Canadian life.

I look forward to working on that aspect of the bill. I will make note of my interest in section 745 of the Criminal Code which is related to sentencing provisions. This bill does not address that specifically. It might be constructive and useful to take a closer look at section 745 of the Criminal Code, the section that permits a decreased or reduced parole eligibility date for those serving life sentences, and at the wording of section 718(2) which deals with aggravating and mitigating circumstances that a judge may take into account at the time of sentencing.

There is an initiative put forward in the bill which may be useful. It would certainly bear discussion at the committee stage when we look at the entire package.

I will indicate my wholehearted support for the bill in principle. I look forward to further deliberations at the committee stage.

**Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address Bill C-41. The purpose of this bill is to introduce changes to the sentencing system of the Criminal Code. A number of aspects of this bill do improve the sentencing process.

Canadians are demanding improvements to the criminal justice system. Perhaps Bill C-41 will address a few of their concerns. However, some aspects only appear to be positive. Half measures or blatantly misleading proposals are not what they want.

Despite the introduction of the statement of purpose and principle of sentencing, judges will still have the same latitude under this legislation as they do today in imposing various and inconsistent penalties.

This month I have received over 4,000 letters and faxes as well as petitions containing the signatures of over 12,000 residents of the lower mainland demanding real deterrents as a fundamental part of the justice system. I believe that inescapable, real consequences are part of such a deterrent.

Respect for the criminal justice system stems from equality before the law. Where is the principle of building confidence in Canadians that their safety and security is a primary goal of an accountable justice system that must include the principle of equality?

As I address the issue of equality before and under the law, I would like to address the so-called hate crime section of this bill. It reads as follows: "Evidence that the offence was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on race, nationality,

colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim shall be deemed to be aggravating circumstances".

There is no question that it is totally reprehensible that a person should be attacked viciously or otherwise because of their personal characteristics. The attacker should be punished fully for the offence. However, this section of the legislation poses several dilemmas which need to be addressed.

How will the courts determine that a crime was motivated by hate, prejudice or bias? Will prosecutors launch investigations into the backgrounds and motives of every person convicted of assault in order to determine whether that assault was based on a personal bias against the victim?

How will this affect current backlogs in the courts? Will only the most obvious crimes be subject to this section? Will the courts later overturn a verdict delivered by a lower court because it later seemed that the assault was or was not motivated by hate, prejudice or bias, even though the assault on the individual took place?

(1025 )

Why should one form of assault be judged as more hideous or unacceptable than another? What happened to the fact that any assault on a man or a woman is completely unacceptable and should not be tolerated regardless of motivating factors? It is the viciousness of the attack that needs to be judged, not whether the accused harboured personal prejudice toward the victim. There is a problem with the enumeration of categories upon which bias, prejudice or hate will be decided. Is hate only an aggravated crime if it falls within these categories?

What about a person who is attacked because someone does not like their chosen profession? Consider for a moment the popularity of lawyers and politicians. Occupational bias is not on this list. What if they hate someone because they are rich or because they are poor? Class distinction is not on this list. The person who is mugged and beaten half to death for their wallet and keys to their expensive car by someone who resents their status or achievement will see their accused face a lesser sentence than if the same accused had attacked them for their religious beliefs. There is great inequity in this type of legislation.

I would like to bring to the attention of this House a couple of incidents from my own province of British Columbia which will help illustrate the problem with this particular clause.

The first occurred in B.C. to a young man by the name of Andre Castet. Let me read from the coverage of this case provided by the *Vancouver Sun*: "But no less than a month after the Sidney teenager died from a beating, its his former classmates and the community who must regain voices and steps broken by the tragedy. 'People are still grappling for an explanation for this—something they can latch on to', says Derek Peach, a grade 12 English teacher at Parkland secondary, the 800

*Government Orders*

student Sidney school where both Andre, 17, and his two accused killers attended classes last year”.

Would the parents and friends of the victims feel any better about this tragic death if they knew that the accused would be facing a stiffer penalty because the crown prosecutor could prove that the attack was motivated by hate, prejudice or bias? Since there does not seem to be any such evidence should there not be an outcry of injustice from those same parents and friends because the accused will not suffer as harsh a penalty as they might if it could be proven that they hated him?

What about the case in my own riding of Coquitlam, the tragic and senseless death of Graham Niven? His death sparked an outcry from the public which resulted in a rally attended by over 5,000 people demanding stiffer penalties for those youth convicted of crimes of violence.

Again, I quote from an article in the Vancouver *Sun*: “A man who was kicked to death last weekend was helping a teenager in trouble, the victim’s roommate said Tuesday. Graham Niven, 31, had just called a taxi for a stranded Burnaby youth before a confrontation with a group of youths outside a Mac’s convenience store in Coquitlam early Saturday morning. ‘He was being a good Samaritan’ said roommate Steve Hoskins Tuesday. ‘He gave his last \$7 to a kid from Burnaby who had missed the last bus home.’”

The people in my riding do not want the accused getting off lightly because they are young offenders but they also do not want them getting off lightly because they cannot be found guilty of hate, prejudice or bias. They destroyed a man, along with his dreams and goals, and left his family and friends with nothing but their memories and their pain. No matter what the motivation for the crime the sentence must reflect the tragedy and hideousness of the crime. An assault is an assault and must be treated with the full extent of the law.

I would also like to address the inclusion of sexual orientation in this legislation. I am personally opposed to the inclusion of this term and would like to outline the reasons for my stand.

My party affirms the equality of every individual before and under the law and the right of every individual to live freely within the limits of the law. I assert that homosexuals already have the same rights and privileges as all other Canadians as guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Sexual orientation in itself is not a legitimate basis for special enumerated protection. I will give several reasons.

First and foremost sexual orientation does not possess the characteristics essential for inclusion in the list. Human rights are protected on the basis of immutable characteristics such as age, gender and race, or the universally accepted positive characteristic of religion. These criteria have not yet been

established for the category of sexual orientation and in particular the undefined term as presented in this legislation.

As well my conclusion is based on the position of my constituents. Recently in a questionnaire sent out from my office I asked whether my constituents agreed that sexual orientation should be included in the charter as a protected category along with race, colour, religion or gender. A decisive 65 per cent of respondents rejected that notion.

(1030)

It is my duty to represent the concerns of my constituents. It is also my duty as an elected representative to consider all consequences and implications. As illustrated in the debate in this House, the inclusion of such a term as sexual orientation would result in a profound infringement on the longstanding rights and freedoms of Canadians.

Would the label of crime of hate be applied to even the expression of one’s deeply held religious or personal convictions if those personal convictions were that homosexuality was immoral? That has been proposed.

Would it be a crime of hate to express personal freedom of association by the exclusion of homosexuals in churches or private associations or even as roommates? These and other questions will be raised in broader ways as we discuss the government’s proposed changes to the Human Rights Act.

May I say that a government that denies the moral will of the majority of Canadians by forcing a vote on party lines is denying the very basics of democracy.

In conclusion, society demands that a criminal justice system enforce deterrence of the offender with just and predictable consequence. It demands the principle of equality under the law to be applied to all Canadians. Assault or any other crime for whatever reason should receive the full force of law regardless of the range of emotion behind the motives for the crime. Canadians want justice applied without the intrusion of mind police or political correctness. Canadians want laws and systems better defined to protect society as a whole.

Bill C-41 introduces more potential for inequities and unpredictability in an already flawed system.

**Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I can think of nothing more frustrating for Canadian people than laws which are in theory intended to protect and reflect our sense of what is right and what is wrong but which in practice continuously prove to be ineffective or variable in their application and result.

Our legal system forms the network that binds us as Canadians. It is the framework under which we all agree to live and be judged. With variability or uncertainty of application and use, the strength, control and credibility of this vital tool of human management is undermined and society as a whole is weakened.

*Government Orders*

In response to a growing sense of frustration on the part of Canadians, the Minister of Justice has tabled Bill C-41, an act on sentencing reform. In an effort to refocus the application and use of our laws Bill C-41 provides clear direction and guidelines to the courts on the purpose and the methods of sentencing. Prior to Bill C-41 the role of Parliament was simply to set maximum penalties for offences under the Criminal Code. With this legislation Parliament is looking at the fundamentals, the policy objectives of the sentencing process.

This legislation sets out that the fundamental purpose of sentencing is to contribute to respect for the law and the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society. The framework provided is of enormous significance. Sentencing is not simply about giving sentences. Rather, sentencing must serve the fundamental purpose of creating a just and safe society.

Bill C-41 provides as well a holistic vision of sentencing. Sentencing should not be solely about jails and prisons. Effective sentencing, sentencing that deters repeat offenders, also involves alternative measures such as restitution and conditional sentences.

Research has clearly shown that these forms of sentencing are more effective in combating crime than a strictly law and order approach. One only needs to look south of the border for evidence of this. In the United States the rate of imprisonment is 400 per cent that of Canada's yet 200 Americans are victims of violence every hour despite annual expenditures on police, courts and corrections that exceed \$70 billion. One cannot seriously argue that the United States is a safer country due to its bigger jails, tougher sentences and capital punishment. In fact, the opposite seems true.

Bill C-41 outlines another sentencing principle that I would like to briefly address. Under this legislation the courts should take into consideration the principle that a sentence should be increased if there is evidence that the crime was motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, or sexual orientation of the victim. Some say that this provides special status for these Canadians, particularly homosexual Canadians. If these people have any special status, it is the special status of often suffering abuse simply because of their minority characteristics.

(1035)

Bill C-41 ensures that the courts consider these circumstances when deciding upon sentences. This is not about granting special status. Rather it is about affirming equality for all Canadians. Homosexual Canadians should be able to walk on our streets without the fear of being attacked just because of their sexual orientation. Just as heterosexuals do not have to live with this fear neither should other Canadians who have a different sexual preference.

This is about promoting equality, not granting special status. It is also saying that Canadians will not stand for crimes based on hate.

Many of my constituents have expressed to me their concern that the criminal justice system does not do enough for the victim. I strongly support Bill C-41 because it does address this concern in several ways. One obvious way is that it provides for victim impact statements at section 745 hearings. Victims will no longer go voiceless at the early parole hearings.

A second provision for victims that I would like to discuss in more detail is restitution. Bill C-41 would allow the courts to consider ordering restitution to individual victims or to the community to cover property damage or personal injury. This provision responds to the demands of victims to have their needs considered by the justice system.

Crimes can have a tremendous financial impact upon victims. Is it more effective to have these offenders only put behind bars? Where does that leave the victim? Or should the perpetrators be hit where it hurts, in the pocketbook, which will promote responsibility for their actions?

Previously victims had to apply to receive compensation for their losses. Bill C-41 provides a process for restitution to be considered as part of the normal process of sentencing.

In cases in which the court orders an offender to pay restitution and a fine but where it is clear that the offender does not have the means to pay both, Bill C-41 states that restitution must take precedence. This demonstrates that this legislation is committed to helping the victims of crime.

I strongly support this move toward restitution. Why should victims of crime go uncompensated while the offenders simply spend time in custody? I would think for non-serious crimes rehabilitation of the offender can be more effectively achieved through directly seeing what damage has been caused to the victim.

I believe and would request that the framework for restitution as set out in Bill C-41 be extended to cover the special circumstances of certain specific crimes. I am particularly thinking about the issue of domestic violence. In most cases a severe economic inequality results from these situations.

If a woman makes a horribly difficult decision to press charges and leave the scene of abuse she in most cases retains responsibility for the children. She is forced to seek temporary shelter, needs to find child care or care for her children, often with very limited economic means.

I believe that restitution would be particularly important in cases involving domestic violence because of the economic inequality that results. Women and their children are too often left at a severe disadvantage. Too often the abuser spends some weekend in jail or pays some fines but the victim is left with

*Government Orders*

financial stresses in addition to the obvious physical and emotional trauma.

Under Bill C-41 restitution orders for bodily harm only cover pecuniary damages specifically including loss of income or support. It is unclear how broadly the courts might interpret pecuniary damages in ordering restitution in the cases of domestic violence.

I am suggesting that we should not leave this judgment to chance. We should define pecuniary damages in cases involving domestic violence to specifically include loss of income as well as costs related to temporary shelter, child care and transportation. These are costs that are directly incurred as a result of the abuse. The courts should consider these when ordering restitution.

Abused women are often forced to spend time in battered women's shelters since they are the only places they can afford and which offer protection. Perhaps a portion of the restitution order dealing with temporary housing could go directly to support these shelters as well.

I acknowledge this is not a solution to the problem of domestic violence. Solutions have to be found in addressing problems before the abuse occurs in looking at the inequality between men and women and looking at the problems of poverty and alcoholism. However, I think that restitution offers an excellent opportunity to address the economic inequality that can result from domestic violence.

(1040)

Another significant problem is that women often do not report abusive situations. Restitution would only be ordered after a conviction is obtained. I realize that this is only a small consideration to the emotional and physical challenges, but if women knew that compensation would be there in the end they might be more encouraged to report the abuse.

Requiring the courts to consider the specific circumstances of domestic violence cases in ordering restitution would help the victims of domestic violence. Requiring convicted abusers to financially compensate their victims would provide another good indication to offenders that they are responsible for their actions.

In closing, I strongly support the measures that are included in Bill C-41. The maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society depends on good and fair sentencing. This legislation provides a framework for our courts so that they in turn can give our community, Canadians, just that.

**Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-41. I do so on experience gained as a community worker in the criminal justice system from 1975 to 1993. I have 18 years experience working with offenders, victims, police, prosecutors, judges, correctional workers and

the public. I have also worked with many volunteers involved in the justice system.

My work was in the Waterloo region where we pioneered many programs in the field of community justice and corrections. Victim reconciliation, community mediation, Kitchener House where offenders serve provincial time in a halfway house, the first bail program in Ontario, law day and justice weeks were all pioneered in the Waterloo region. In the Waterloo region crime and justice are a community responsibility.

Bill C-41 is an omnibus bill that updates sentencing practices. I applaud in particular the section dealing with the imposition of fines. Under the current law close to one-third of admissions to Ontario jails are for the nonpayment of fines. We have a ridiculous situation where in lieu of collecting a \$200 fine we end up spending thousands of dollars to jail the offender.

For too long we have been incarcerating people for no other reason than their being poor. It is reminiscent of debtors prisons. Too many of our aboriginal people and too many of our economically disadvantaged people occupy our jails. This bill will address this injustice and will use community service work to replace costly incarceration.

It is important when we talk of crime and justice issues to recognize that offenders and victims are people who come from communities and are not aliens from another planet. Solutions to issues of crime are complex and involve all segments of our society.

Having reviewed the debates on Bill C-41, I am troubled by the simplistic solutions put forth by the Reform Party. It would have us believe that capital and corporal punishment along with longer prison sentences would produce a safer society in Canada. If the simplistic solutions dictated by the Reform Party had any basis in fact then I submit that the United States would be the safest society in the western world.

We know and I am sure the Reform Party knows this is not the case. The United States has the highest crime rate and the most violent crimes in the western world. It executes and jails more people than any other in western society. Surely the Reform Party would not want to trade the safety of our streets in Canada for that of the United States.

One of the biggest problems we have with the issue of crime is the perception created by the American and our own news media. They create a perception that in Canada we are living in a society where crime and violence are much more prevalent than the statistics indicate. Canada is not the United States.

(1045)

Our society is much less crime infested than the United States. We do a disservice when we pander and reinforce misconceptions. I would suggest that the Reform Party is pandering to misconceptions. I would further suggest the debate on firearms we are engaged in today is driven by the images of



*Government Orders*

gun laws in the U.S., along with its horrendous crime statistics, rather than by the reality in Canada.

There is no question that our justice system needs improvement, but in reality we have one of the best justice systems in the world. To continually attack the integrity of our justice system as the Reform Party does is to undermine it. If Canadians were to believe that our justice system does not work they would not report crimes and would not sit on juries. If the public is not supported the justice system breaks down.

There is no question that one victim is one victim too many. The issue becomes how to keep our communities safe. There is no question that to deal with crime we have to make crime prevention and community safety everyone's concern.

In the Waterloo region we have one of the safest communities in Canada and we do not rest on our laurels. We have established a regional committee on crime prevention and community safety that has two main mandates. The first is to mobilize the community to fight crime, for crime prevention is everyone's responsibility. The second is to deal with prevention through programs. We all know that a child who goes to school hungry or a child who is victimized is tomorrow's offender.

The community in the Waterloo region, in co-operation with the provincial and federal governments, has to deal with this social reality. It is of interest that the strongest proponent of dealing with the root cause of crime on the Waterloo crime prevention and community safety committee representing a broad sector of our community is the police.

There are no simple solutions to the problem of crime. To deal with crime we have to attack the root causes of crime and not just deal with symptoms. The answers to crime prevention lie at the level of individual communities where we work to enhance our own, our neighbour's and our community's safety. Crime and justice is a collective responsibility that we all share.

Much of the debate on Bill C-41 centred on the clause of the bill dealing with an offence being motivated by bias, prejudice or hate based on the race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim. If the crime was based on any one of these points it shall be deemed to be aggravating circumstances in the case of sentencing.

We have heard arguments that all crime should be treated the same. I cannot disagree in stronger terms. I am defending this clause because I believe if at any time somebody is attacked for no other reason than being part of a minority group, surely the law has to take a much stronger measure in preventing others from doing the same.

It is imperative to remember that in the case of the Holocaust we had persecution on the basis of religion. It took six million deaths to raise consciousness with regard to this problem. I cannot understand how anybody could extend the clause of the bill which specifically talks about sentencing to talking about spousal support for homosexuals. It talks about someone being attacked for no other basis than sexual orientation, religion or nationality, and about the offender being more harshly dealt with.

That is one of the more important clauses in the bill. I thoroughly support it. I regret some members of the House would have the public misinterpret what that clause says.

(1050)

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased I arrived on time from my riding to speak in this debate. It is a very important one that raises some fundamental questions about who we are as a nation, the values we hold dear, whether or not we are compassionate or just seek vengeance when we are wronged. It also says a great deal about the type of society we are trying to build for our children who, after all, are the people for whom we are holding the country in trust.

Everybody has spoken about Bill C-41. They talked about all the major provisions of the bill. I am not going to attempt to go through them again. However there are a couple of provisions in the bill which I think the public in the riding of Dartmouth will be very pleased to hear about.

During the election campaign law and order, whatever that means or whatever was the definition of the day, seemed to be the thing most people were concerned about. I knocked on doors and received calls from people concerned that the criminal justice system simply was not working. These people were not rednecks, right wingers or crazy people; they were concerned about the safety of their communities.

Somewhere in the mix over the last number of years there has been a problem. The fundamental problem has come from the fact that when we came in with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which was a very bold initiative of the government of the day that was applauded by nearly all Canadians, it switched the pendulum over to individual rights and away from community rights. Indeed at times there are community rights which must be taken into consideration.

How often have we heard individuals ask why it is always the rights of the individual who has broken the law, who has wronged the community, who has sought to injure an individual, steal their property or whatever, that are paramount and more heavily weighed than those of the victim?

*Government Orders*

The bill deals with sentencing. It starts to address some of the real concerns expressed by Canadians. I am not going to indicate that I have done a study and that I understand or I know that the concern of Canadians about rising crime is founded in fact or not, because that simply does not matter. Everyone can quote statistics. The most recently quoted ones are that we are not becoming a more violent society and that crime rates are actually down. As a legislator I am concerned about the perception in my community that people are less safe today than they were 3, 5, 10 or 15 years ago.

From time to time it is up to us as legislators to come forward to debate and try to figure out if the laws and the principles they were founded on, like the Young Offenders Act and some of the sentencing provisions in legislation, are actually attaining their goals and if they are not to try to change them. It does not mean we always have to respond to public opinion or that legislation should be a knee-jerk reaction. It should not be that at all. If members have their ears to the ground in their constituencies and if they strip away their partisan approach to public policy making, they can get a fairly good idea about what is in the public interest. Clearly some of the reforms in the bill are in the public interest.

The optics of the bill have to be seen to be fair as well. One thing that disturbs me a great deal is the focus of the public eye, through the media and through members of this place and others in public, on a very specific provision of the bill. I am saddened that the level of debate on sentencing has fallen to whether or not individuals should be subject to harsher sentencing, or if the crimes they have perpetrated were against persons and based on hate then the judge should look at that provision. The debate being about whether or not any group in society is being conferred special rights does a great disservice to the level of debate that has taken place in the Chamber since Confederation.

We are not here to respond to those who will slap us on the back when we make remarks either overtly or thinly veiled against minorities. The previous member who just spoke put it quite nicely. He referred to a tragic piece of history; he referred to the Holocaust and how in the minds of the people who supported the Nazi regime in Germany it was fine to discriminate based on a person's religion. It is not fine and if anybody thought it was, society has changed. It is not fine to discriminate against persons because of the colour of their skin.

(1055)

I have the largest, oldest, indigenous black community in Canada. When I have an unemployment rate of 10 per cent in my riding, three miles away their unemployment rate is 48 per cent. I may not be able to prove it because there is systemic racism. I am sure if every employer were blind we would probably have a more even distribution of the unemployment load in my area.

Any type of act predicated by hatred for a group based on whatever factor—if they have two green eyes, if they have an arm or two arms or one is shorter than the other, or if it is sexual orientation—has to be recognized as something that is not supported by the legislators and is not supported by the people of Canada.

It has done a great disservice to the bill and to individuals who have been harmed far too often in the past by our refusal to discuss these issues as well as the issue of hate crimes in a full and unbiased atmosphere.

A couple of things are not in the bill. We are talking about Bill C-41 and its impact on sentencing. We have heard of all the great things in the bill. There are a few things I think should be in there, and if they are not they should find their way into legislation.

Unfortunately I live in an area that is now the pimping capital of Canada. In the riding of Dartmouth we lay claim—and we are not pleased with or proud of it—to probably the largest illegal pimping ring in Canada. It extends into the United States as well. That pimping ring has been going out and luring girls—and this is a victim crime—as young as 11 years of age into juvenile prostitution. They are luring them into illegal drug use and then into prostitution on the streets of New York, Niagara Falls, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Vancouver, Halifax, Truro, and small towns near any of us.

All too often very few of these girls are ever rescued. They are children. They are not adults who choose to get into this way of life. They are children who are literally stolen from our schools and off the streets. If they ever get out of the cycle of prostitution they are like walking zombies. They have no self-worth left. They are usually addicted to drugs and alcohol. They have no life ahead of them. Their lives are destroyed; their families' lives are destroyed.

However, when we deal with sentencing in the law most of these guys get off with three to six months in jail. In Nova Scotia that means they go to a minimum security institution and three months later they walk out. They have not lost even one penny because one of their friends will have taken over their stable of young juvenile girls on the streets and they will still maintain the financial incentive to break the law.

This has to stop. This is murder of the worst kind because the soul and the spirit of the child, of the woman, or the young girl are being killed, but she is not being killed physically. They are hollow empty vessels after these low life scum are finished with them. In our laws we most often treat that type of crime less seriously than if somebody absconds with \$100,000 or \$10,000 from the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Crimes against children when the sentencing comes down from the judge in a court of law in many cases are dealt with less

*Government Orders*

harshly than crimes against property. That is simply wrong. For anyone who does not understand the full implication, there have been a number of articles written in *Chatelaine* and *Reader's Digest* in the last number of months. This is one of the worst crimes that happens in Canada because it happens to defenceless children.

I have spoken to the Minister of Justice a number of times and we could probably get support for one of the things I would have liked to have seen in the bill. If the government is not prepared at some point to deal with the issue then I am prepared to deal with the issue as a private member by putting a motion in the House.

I am not one of those right wingers who believes we should lock everybody up; I am the exact opposite. This is one of the few crimes, I am told, where the length of sentence will be a deterrent. For crimes against our children like sexual crimes against our children the legislation should indicate the revulsion of Canadians and of legislators. There has to be tough minimum sentences. In my view not one of those pimps who destroy the lives of young girls should get out of jail before a five-year minimum sentence is carried out. If I had my druthers it would be a 10-year minimum sentence, but they are out in three months.

(1100)

For everybody who is out there watching and listening to these debates, if they have a young daughter or granddaughter, if their neighbour has a 10, 11, 12 or 13 year old and they think they are safe when they are going to school, they are not. There are predators out there, predators our sentencing law does not protect our children against.

Although I support this bill, I encourage members as I encourage the Minister of Justice, to be a little more bold. I ask the minister to bring legislation into the House as soon as he possibly can to deal with this most abhorrent crime of pimping juvenile women, juvenile girls, our children.

**Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C-41, a bill that fulfils yet another Liberal red book promise, sentencing reform within the criminal justice system.

During the past election campaign there was great debate over public security. That debate raged in some quarters as a debate of extremes. Some of these extremes have found their way through the electoral process into the House, which is as it should be.

The House, by its very nature and by its very culture, is a place of polar views and the residence of extremes, which are used sometimes as a vehicle for expressing opinion and as a vehicle for driving a point home. Other extreme views are strongly and I would suggest in some quarters unreasonably held.

That is the great risk and quite frankly the great beauty of the democratic system. The views will be heard. The views will be challenged. The views will be studied. They will be agreed with or they will be discarded. As in the case of the 1993 election, there will be a predominant view in the House which will succeed. That was reflected in the election by our forming the government. There was a predominant view in the land and Canadians overwhelmingly elected the Liberal Party of Canada to govern. From this overwhelming support, we have as we must taken our mandate. It is a mandate for job creation, for tolerance among disparate groups. It is a mandate for economic growth and a mandate for safer streets through tough but humane measures that recognize the supremacy of the rule of law.

It seems the charter has become inconvenient for some members of the House. The charter has become the subject of derision. The charter has become something for which some members have no respect.

Since 1979 I have practised law in the criminal courts of Ontario. Since 1982 I have acted as a prosecutor for the crown attorney's office in Windsor and Essex county. Between 1986 and 1988 I also served as a federal prosecutor. I know more than just a little about the subject matter in this debate.

I have defended and I have prosecuted the criminal. I have done both successfully within the bounds of the rule of law and since 1982, when it was enacted, within the bounds of the charter. I have seen the system at its best. I have seen the guilty convicted and punished even though the charter was in place. I have also seen the not guilty walk away. Most times when this happens the rule of law and the charter have prevailed. It is a tool for democracy and a tool for democratic resolution of disputes. It is also a tool that applies fairness within the system.

This bill is part of a fair, reasonable and responsible approach to the problems of public security that face our communities.

(1105)

It is a bill that recognizes that intolerances exist in our society, intolerances that Canadians abhor. Sections which relate to hate crime and to crime arising out of hate recognize not special rights for individuals but recognize that our society abhors that kind of treatment of individuals. It is not there to create special rights for any given group and to provide excuses for individual behaviour. It is there because we as a society do not tolerate and promote hate. The bill has to be seen within the overall framework of Liberal philosophy and of the Liberal solutions to problems today.

I would like to take a moment to reflect on some of the problems in our society other than the Criminal Code, other than the behaviour of prosecutors and other than what some think are the causes of crime.

*Government Orders*

I suggest that what we should look at is crime as a part of the overall problems that plague our society. In the city of Windsor, part of which I represent, we have had an excellent recovery recently from the recession which has really wracked industrial Ontario and all parts of the country. Fortunately for Windsor our recovery has been on the leading edge of the recovery and has been quicker because of our excellent industrial base. We have found as we have begun to recover and as our unemployment rate has gone down that our crime rate has also gone down.

I suggest that the Liberal red book and the current government policy which promote economic recovery, job creation and reforms will give people a dignified means to make a living and contribute to our society. This will interact with bills like Bill C-41 to reduce and to handle crime in a way that is healthy and productive within our society. I would also suggest that as the greater Canadian community prospers, we will see a related decrease in the types of social problems that plague us.

No service is done to the community by firing the issue up to a point where it cannot be reasonably and responsibly addressed. No service is provided through disinformation to the electorate, through driving home a subject irresponsibly and emphasizing issues which serve only to inflame and frighten the citizenry without offering responsible solutions.

Increasing penalties for crimes—in particular I am thinking of non-violent crimes, property related crimes, regulatory offences and the like—and increasing incarceration penalties for those types of crimes do nothing but increase the financial burden on our citizenry and force the government into the pocket of its citizens in terms of taxation which some people see as another form of criminal activity.

I suggest that this bill addresses the financial bottom line in society in a very clear, creative and helpful fashion. It provides alternatives in terms of sentences which are based in the community so that offenders will be recognized as offenders. Offenders will be punished for their crimes and they will be rehabilitated within the community itself rather than being isolated and put into institutions which are phenomenally expensive to support.

(1110)

On the other hand it takes a hard and I would suggest long awaited look at criminals whose activities are violent and extremely offensive to our citizens. By amending the parole section and by taking a good hard look at some of the sentencing problems that we have in our system for violent offenders, we are offering protection to our citizens where that protection is needed and where it is wanted.

This bill takes a balanced view. This bill takes a humane view. This bill respects the rule of law. It is a statute that fits within

the overall Liberal philosophy, the red book philosophy, which respects the citizenry, which seeks to protect the citizenry and which seeks to elevate the quality of life for all Canadians.

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, N.D.P.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise during debate at second reading of Bill C-41, legislation which is a comprehensive package of amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada.

I know that my constituents have a number of concerns about elements of the legislation. Because we are at this stage in second reading in which there are some 10 minutes remaining, I want to take this opportunity to focus on one particular provision of Bill C-41 which has been the subject of considerable debate and controversy.

It is the provision of Bill C-41 that deals with the question of so-called hate crimes, crimes which are motivated by bias, prejudice or hate, and which are based on a number of criteria set out in Bill C-41. Those criteria include race, nationality, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation of the victim.

The question of the inclusion of sexual orientation of the victim has been the subject of some debate both inside and outside the House. I want to take a couple of minutes to explain why I believe it is profoundly important that sexual orientation be included in the hate crimes provisions of the bill.

However, before I get to that specific subject, I want to note that the reference to hate motivation as a factor in sentencing already exists in the province of Ontario. The Ontario attorney general has directed crown attorneys to argue that sentencing should be increased when a crime is motivated by specific hatred. A number of guidelines are in place to guide the work of crown attorneys in this.

I want to give a couple of examples of circumstances in which sentences have been increased because a crime has been motivated by hatred. Lelas was a case involving the desecration of synagogues. This crime was quite clearly motivated by hatred, by anti-Semitism, by the hatred of Jews. The Ontario Court of Appeal increased the sentence as a result of that. Another is the case of Moyer, a neo-Nazi skinhead who urinated on grave-stones in a synagogue. This was considered as an aggravating factor in sentencing and the sentence was increased.

There is the case of Hoolans who went to a so-called hate rock concert and was urged to go coon hunting at this concert. Well he did. He went out and beat to unconsciousness a Sri Lankan dishwasher. When the judge looked at sentencing for this particular crime, because the crime was clearly motivated by hatred on the basis of race, the sentence was increased.

*Government Orders*

(1115)

In that light I want to ask what are the implications of the argument of the member for Central Nova and other members of this House, including the members of the Reform Party? What are the arguments for excluding sexual orientation from Bill C-41?

The arguments are very clear. They say that it is just and right and appropriate to increase sentences if a person is motivated by hatred on the basis of religion, race or sex, but it is not if you are motivated by hatred on the basis of sexual orientation. What kind of message would this House be sending to Canadian society if we accepted that message?

Just last weekend in Toronto two men on a downtown street walking home from a cafe, the Second Cup coffee shop, were attacked. Six young men piled out of a van and beat up these two men with fists, boots, and beer bottles, right in the heart of downtown Toronto. As they beat them and injured them, in a pool of blood and broken glass they were calling them faggots. That is gay bashing. Gay bashing occurs tragically too often in my home community of Vancouver, in Toronto, Halifax, and New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, and in many other communities. It is not always bashing of people who are gay or lesbian. In some cases it is bashing people who are perceived to be gay or lesbian. They are not gay or lesbian at all but because these thugs, these people who are motivated by hatred, believe they are gay or lesbian they beat them.

This legislation is saying that is wrong. It is saying that if we are to sentence people who are convicted of serious crimes of assault and other crimes and those people are motivated by hatred that judges should take that into consideration as an aggravating factor.

Frankly, I am astonished that a party like the Reform Party which says it believes in law and order would not understand that importance. I am very surprised and very disappointed at that. I have to say I am even more disappointed in the position taken by the member for Central Nova and a number of other Liberal members of Parliament on this issue. That member has said that sexual orientation should be taken out of Bill C-41, not the other grounds in section 41, but sexual orientation.

The implication and the message which is sent out by that is that it is okay. There is one standard if you beat up people based on race or religion and there is another standard if you beat up people based on sexual orientation. That is the message that goes out. If there is a different interpretation let her silent colleagues get up and say so. Let the member for Toronto stand up and say what he thinks about that kind of hateful language. That is what we are talking about here.

In fact, even the vice president of the Central Nova Liberal riding association, Janet Rosenstock, has said she is opposed to the position taken by the MP for Central Nova in this debate. She said the legislation does not single out sexual orientation

any more than it does physical disability. It does not give special rights to gays or any other groups. That is the vice president of the riding association of Central Nova. She says, and perhaps Liberal members might find this interesting, that in its simplest terms if the hated are not named specifically prosecution of hate crimes is virtually impossible.

(1120)

We in this House want to send a very clear and strong signal that we believe that prosecution of hate crimes must not only be possible but must be vigorously enforced. That is the message we want to send out.

I urge members of this House to support this legislation. I urge members of this House to recognize that this is an issue of fundamental justice. It is not an issue of any kind of special rights or treatment. I urge that that be recognized.

To those who say it is necessary to somehow define sexual orientation, I have something to share with them. Sexual orientation has been in legislation in this country for a number of years. There has been absolutely no need to define it to avoid abuses.

I appeal to members of this House to support this provision. Recognize that to do otherwise would be to send out a message of intolerance, a message which this House surely does not want to send to the people of this country.

**Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this bill goes a long way to improving our criminal justice system. Yes, it will be debated pro and con.

Moves must be made. We as a Liberal Party made these commitments during the last election campaign and we will carry them out. Improvement in the way sentences of probation are decided in the courts and handled in the community for example by specifying the information that should be in a presentence report and increasing the penalties for offenders who break the conditions of their probation are a very important part of the provisions in this proposed legislation.

We know that during probation period many people have not been apprehended, could not be apprehended and went on to commit other crimes. The streets in this country have to be made safe. The communities across this country, rural and urban, have to be made safe. There has to be respect for decency and law and order.

Canada is looked upon throughout the world as a very civilized, law-abiding and internationally interested partner on the international scene. It is this government's aim to bring that respect to the legal system, the parole system and the justice system in general in Canada.

There have been horror tales in the media and for just cause over the last number of years. The decay of any system must be stopped. We must put in its place the barriers and the inhibitions that are necessary for that to happen.

There also has to be a change in the treatment of these people. We are not going to gain anything by simply throwing people in jail for long terms. They are going to come out the same as they were before, or worse. This point has been argued time and time again.

It is going to be very important that there be proper liaison among the national Department of Health, the justice system and health ministers across this country to make sure that people in prison are treated so that when they do get out they are not a threat to society. If they are not ready to be released, they should not be released. That has to be a reality in our justice system.

(1125)

We heard of the person who a few years ago was stopped at the Canada-U.S. border at Niagara Falls by American customs people and turned over to Canadian authorities. The Canadian police were notified but nothing could be done under the then legal system because the person had committed no offence. That person committed two murders before being apprehended in London, Ontario. He ended up shooting himself. In the interim he had shot two women in the head.

These things have to receive as serious attention as the crime itself. If a person is breaking parole or is out on bail, they must be monitored. One iota of disobedience to the bail and parole system must be cause for apprehension. That individual should be taken into custody so that he or she will not commit other crimes.

The Government of Canada in co-operation with the provincial governments must be absolutely serious about putting these new rules into the system. They may never be enough so amendments must follow to tighten up the system and protect the public. There is no way in a growing society that we can allow these offences and unsafe conditions to continue.

We have seen examples from around the world where growth in the areas of crime and the justice system have been handled badly. They ended up with the problems they have today for example in Chicago, New York, and other major cities across the United States, as well as in England and other countries. We as a nation that has grown rapidly in population over the last 20 years cannot go in the same direction.

The justice and legal system must serve the safety of the citizens of this nation today, tomorrow and on into the future. A mentality must be built up whereby we will not allow any decline in the safety of today's citizens or future citizens of this country. Canada can indeed be recognized around the world not only as an internationally caring country but as a nation that pays great attention to the safety and well-being of all its citizens.

### *Government Orders*

A big challenge, yes. A big start here, yes. It must be continued. We must work on new ideas, a vision of building a nation that is safe and respected and will carry on with the qualities that our forebears wanted for Canada.

(1130)

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my intervention in this debate today is going to be relatively short but I hope important.

I would like to caution the government, the minister, the committee about the danger of some of the aspects of this particular bill. I want to use a specific example which came to mind when I was listening to the debates.

I was thinking of little Randy. Randy was a young boy about two years old who lived for a while with a very close member of our family as a foster child. In order to reunite him with his sister, he and his sister were adopted by a couple. Imagine how shocked we were when we heard that Randy and his sister and their adoptive mother had been murdered. It really hurt our hearts. I can hardly speak of it now without the emotion of that occasion returning.

One of the things in this bill is the government proposal to get into the mind of the perpetrator of the crime to find out what motivated him. We really do not know what motivated the person who did that evil deed.

I am greatly offended when I stop to contemplate that someone would venture to say that a person took the life of another person simply because he had a different coloured skin, simply because he had a different religious background, simply because he had a different sexual orientation. If that could be proven and that person is now subject to a more harsh sentence than the person who took the lives of Randy, his sister and his mother, leaving that husband and father bereaved in that way, I am deeply offended.

I believe this government makes a colossal error by starting to say that we are going to base sentencing on what we think was in the mind of the person.

I would like to also say something with respect to sexual orientation. The hon. member has talked about that. He has added to what other people have said imputing somehow to the members of the Reform Party an improper motivation, which I think is against the rules of the House in any case. He has said that we somehow hate these people because we are talking about these ideas.

Again, I have some level of resentment being told that I cannot openly and honestly debate an issue without getting into

*Government Orders*

name calling. That is wrong. I believe we ought to have total freedom of speech in this place particularly if we are going to be able to debate and to bring in laws which are absolutely the best for the future of this country and for its citizens.

I do not know how to communicate to the member and to all the members of that community that we do not hate them. A friend of mine was of that particular orientation. His funeral was this year. The hon. member can say that I hate homosexuals and he is totally wrong. In the case of this friend of mine who died this year of AIDS I know and every thinking person in Canada knows that if he would have behaved sexually he would not have had that disease.

I would like to promote very simply that what we need to do in this country is promote sexual fidelity. We need to promote a lifestyle which is healthy, right and good. In no way should we be promoting a lifestyle which has such dangers, even according to what the Minister of Health has said in this House.

(1135)

I would like to urge all of the members of this community to recognize that we are trying to do what is right, we are trying to do what is good. To legitimize the homosexual lifestyle in this way is a wrong direction.

Further to that, it is again misguided. I remember when I was a young man. Members should all recognize looking at me sideways now that I have a propensity for a little wider girth than others. I have had that all my life. I was some 180 pounds when I was in grade 8. I remember coming into the big city school as a farm kid from Saskatchewan. One day some of the mean city kids beat me up. The best I know the reason was that they were taunting me for being fat and then they proceeded to beat me up. It was not a happy experience. It was many years ago and I still remember it. It was a traumatic event.

By the same token, I do not believe that any citizen in this country for any reason whatsoever should be subject to being beaten up. It is my understanding that there are laws in place right now which would provide for punishment for people who do things like that. I submit to the different people who are classified specifically in this Bill C-41 proposal that they are already included. If you are beaten up the person who did it should be found and punished in a substantial way so that there is a deterrent to this type of thing.

I think we should simply say, as the Reform Party always says, a good country, our nation is going to be strong if we can come to the place where we treat our citizens equally without regard to how they are classified into subgroups, without regard to what race they belong to, without regard to whether they are male or female, without regard to any of these other classifications.

I implore, I beg, I plead for the minister and the committee to think very carefully of the implications that are being included in the proposal that is being given here.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Call in the members.

Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), I have been requested by the chief government whip to defer the division to a later time. Accordingly, pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the division on the question now before the House stands deferred until this afternoon at 5.30 at which time the bells to call in the members will be sounded for not more than 15 minutes.

\* \* \*

(1140)

**DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE ACT**

The House resumed from October 3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

**Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of The Department of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today in the House to speak in support of Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Over the past few months it has been my privilege as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage to work closely with him in advancing the department's initiatives on many fronts. I have had occasion to journey to the farthest reaches of our department's operations, visiting and consulting with local officials and community groups. Most striking among my findings was the intense enthusiasm of our Department of Canadian Heritage personnel whose zeal I am sure is fueled by the value they attach to their work.

The Department of Canadian Heritage is not some distant or insulated agency. It is an active participant in countless com-

*Government Orders*

munities. In a real sense the department is a large part what makes many towns and cities into strong communities, very often the focal point, the gathering ground for communities, events or institutions that might not exist were it not for the support of the ministry.

From museums, parks and orchestras to sporting and multi-cultural events, literally millions of Canadians are attracted to our programs every year. The Department of Canadian Heritage is the guardian of our inheritance as Canadians. This department, this minister, stands at the gate protecting rich and unique elements of our culture, our vast stretches of unspoiled habitat, national historic sites, buildings and monuments, which offer Canadians a glimpse of the struggles that built this country.

The Department of Canadian Heritage is the protector of our artistic tradition, our sporting tradition, our official languages, the multitude of contributing cultures from our native citizens to the newest Canadian.

This is not a department which regulates a commodity. Our product is a better Canada, enriched with its natural and historic treasures.

[*Translation*]

Up to now, the debate taking place in the House has highlighted a number of interesting points, not the least of which being the diversity of programs administered by the new department.

Bill C-53 reflects very well the mandate sought by Heritage Canada and the scope of its field of endeavour. Although this has been mentioned by others, I should repeat that Heritage Canada incorporates programs from five existing or abolished departments.

It is easy for some to say that these programs have little in common, but this is a very superficial way of seeing things. A more thorough examination reveals that the three main areas of activity in the department have a lot in common, and I will come back to that later. More than that, they mesh very well and contribute to the prime goal of the department which is developing Canadian identity centres and encouraging the contribution of all sectors of society to the growth and vitality of our culture.

[*English*]

One of the major sectors of the Department of Canadian Heritage is Parks Canada, formerly a part of Environment Canada. National parks, national historic sites and the historic canals under the stewardship of Parks Canada represent some of the best examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage. These gems are to be found in every region of the country. The economic activity and tourism generated by the department's operations in this program area are of vital significance to many local economies.

(1145)

The parks service is mindful of its importance to these communities and has been at the forefront of efforts to fashion innovative partnership arrangements with private and not for profit enterprises in carrying out its mandated responsibilities.

The second major sector of the department encompasses those programs which are aimed at the promotion of Canadian identity and civic participation. As one would expect with such a broadly based mandate, this sector includes an impressive sweep of program areas. In fact some of the government's most important initiatives are being implemented in this sector. They include the promotion of official languages, the pursuit of excellence in amateur sport, the promotion of our cultural diversity, and the encouragement of the full and open participation of every Canadian in society.

Here then are the programs that speak to us regarding what it means to be Canadian, that set us apart from the rest of the world, and that have helped Canada earn its top ranking by the United Nations for overall quality of life.

[*Translation*]

The third main activity of the department is cultural development and heritage. This includes arts, broadcasting and heritage preservation, as well as cultural industries like film, video, sound recording and publishing.

As regards the wide variety of activities involved, the best way to describe them is to quote the short statement in the government's red book on the importance of culture. Here it is: "Culture is the very essence of national identity, the bedrock of national sovereignty and national pride. At a time when globalization and the information and communications revolution are erasing national borders, Canada needs more than ever to commit itself to cultural development".

This shows not only the importance of the department's programs, but also stresses what its prime objective should be: To develop policies and mechanisms to ensure a steady growth of artistic and cultural sectors both strong and dynamic.

[*English*]

During debate on the bill we have heard the Minister of Canadian Heritage outline the important connotations imparted by the term heritage. For me one of the most meaningful uses of the term is to capture myriad ways in which we express ourselves not only to our fellow Canadians but to the world. In my view heritage conveys the idea of the link between the past and the present in matters of human endeavour, whether they be related to culture, language, shared values or common experiences.

When I think of Canada and its heritage what springs to mind is a nation forged on the principles of respect for the use and



*Government Orders*

equal treatment of its two major languages, French and English; of respect for the cultural diversity, the traditions and the contributions of its aboriginal citizens and their languages; and of fundamental respect for basic human rights and values and an all encompassing and abiding devotion to democratic principles. It is no exaggeration to say that all these sentiments and ideals will find expression and action within the programs embodied within the Department of Canadian Heritage.

It is vital not to lose sight of what will be accomplished by the passage of Bill C-53. Moreover the bill should not be viewed in isolation. It is part of a greater reorganization of government being effected through the passage of various pieces of enabling legislation now in different stages of parliamentary review.

This redistribution of programs and responsibilities, as we are all aware, had its origin in steps taken by the previous government last June. The current government has put its stamp on the reorganization, redefined it and refined it. We are now proceeding with the task of confirming these changes in law.

(1150)

This exercise, however, is but one component of our overall effort to provide Canadians with the most effective and open government possible. Toward that end it should be emphasized that the government's program review is ongoing and that the tabling of the various pieces of enabling legislation is part of the process.

The wording of Bill C-53 establishes the overall responsibilities of the Department of Canadian Heritage without being prescriptive as to how the mandate will be delivered. In other words the bill does not limit the types of changes that government may implement to make services more responsive and efficient in the current fiscal context.

The enactment of the bill will summon the coming wave of re-engineering efforts in the department that can only yield even greater efficiencies and more focused services. We must not allow Canada to grow pale from the leaching of its natural and cultural resources. We believe in a Canada infused by the advancement of our sense of Canadian identity and participation as a society and by the continuation of our cultural development and the protection of our priceless natural and cultural heritage.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my colleague for her presentation, which could not be any clearer or more interesting.

With regard to her quote from the red book about culture being really important, why did the Liberal government not take this opportunity to establish a department that could have been

called something other than the Department of Canadian Heritage? I, for one, would have called it the department of tutti frutti, since it includes a little of everything whether or not it belongs there. So why not give us a department other than this one?

Why did the Liberal government not take this opportunity to do the right thing? When they were in opposition, they criticized the Conservatives for creating such a department; now that they are in office, they do the exact same thing the Tories did.

How is it possible, now that the information highway is just around the corner, that no mechanism has been provided for in the Department of Canadian Heritage to deal with this subject, that there is no regulatory power over the information highway, that telecommunications remain separate from communications, that the CRTC will continue to be split between culture and industry, and that we will never be able to resolve copyright issues because this government lacks courage once again and does what others did before it? It must go back to the drawing board. How can they justify this according to the Liberal party's philosophy? I wonder.

**Ms. Guarnieri:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois complaints only make the achievements and importance of Canadian heritage stand out. We often hear that Canadian culture belongs to all Canadians wherever they come from. I think the hon. member should be the first one to admit that we save taxpayers, including Quebecers, money. She should applaud us instead of criticizing us because we do not do exactly what she wants. The Bloc's goals are different from those of the department.

**Mrs. Tremblay: What are the Bloc's goals?**

**Ms. Guarnieri:** You do not understand me? She wants me to speak in English. But I want to practice my French but, as you can see, she will not give me this opportunity.

(1155)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order! I would like to remind you that comments must be made through the Chair and not directly from one member to another. You can use the official language of your choice.

**Ms. Guarnieri:** Mr. Speaker, I want to reassure the hon. member that Canadian culture belongs to all Canadians wherever they come from. I read the hon. member's speech and I am surprised by her suggestion. She proposes that francophones be confined to local cultural resources only.

I want to add that Canada's culture and history were built by all Canadians together. Sharing our culture and history is the basis of Canadian heritage. It is easy to see why the Bloc

*Government Orders*

Quebecois is against our goal. I think that Quebecers and Canadians agree with us.

When the hon. member talks about telecommunications coming under the purview of the Department of Industry, is she aware of the growing role of telecommunications as an important source of Canadian economic activities? Broadcasting is easier to integrate into the mandate of Canadian Heritage, as it relates to Canadian culture, identity and content.

Departments work in close co-operation—and I think the hon. member will agree with this—in order to manage these sectors efficiently. I wonder why the hon. member is laughing, when she should be applauding us for saving Canadians, including Quebecers, money. I think that she should be applauding.

[*English*]

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. parliamentary secretary was talking about looking for ways to cut spending in government. I would like to offer one right now.

The department of multiculturalism is redundant. Not only do Canadians not want to see a department of multiculturalism but people in various multicultural communities around the country do not want to see it. I refer to a recent article in *Saturday Night* magazine wherein noted Canadian writer Neil Bissoondath talked about doing away with the whole idea of multiculturalism. He happens to come from the West Indies, but he is a Canadian writer and that is what he calls himself.

There are people in the Liberal caucus who say we must do away with hyphenated Canadianism. I urge the parliamentary secretary to use her influence on the minister, in conjunction with other members of caucus who feel the same way, to do away with the department of multiculturalism which is absolutely and completely redundant in the eyes of the Reform Party, many Liberals, the Canadian public and the ethnic communities around the country.

**Ms. Guarnieri:** Mr. Speaker, I sometimes feel the Reform Party should be called the 1 per cent party because it spends all its time criticizing 1 per cent of the government programs.

The government believes in communities, strong linkages among communities and promoting understanding from wherever people come. The government is committed to pursuing programs which foster understanding and harmony.

However it is a dark day for members of the Reform Party; they should be promoting and endorsing the bill. How does the opposition permit itself to criticize an administrative change that saves all kinds of moneys for taxpayers and actually reduces bureaucracy? The number of assistant deputy ministers has been reduced from 14 to 3. It increases efficiency. Actually the administrative cost savings will be \$7.3 million. They may scoff

at that, but it is \$7.3 million of Canadian taxpayers' money. Members of the Bloc and Reform should unite and applaud us for this initiative rather than indulging in tangential tirades about programs. These improvements would actually increase efficiency. It should leave the Reform speechless but they prefer to remain groundless rather than speechless.

(1200)

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that was an interesting exchange. I rise to oppose Bill C-53 because it affirms the continuation of officially sanctioned multiculturalism. It encourages division along racial, linguistic and cultural lines.

We are going to continue to have anglo Canadians, French Canadians, native Canadians, Chinese Canadians and a host of other hyphenated nationalities, but apparently no plain, ordinary Canadians. John Diefenbaker must be spinning in his grave.

It is ironic that a department dedicated to “the preservation and enhancement of Canadian heritage” should be charged with state sponsored multiculturalism. This is a contradiction in terms.

For generations Statistics Canada, which used to be called the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, has been obsessed with our ethnic origins. Until fairly recently one could not even if born in Canada be recorded by the census taker as a Canadian. Ottawa now accepts the reality that we Canadians exist. However the 1991 handbook for census takers assures us that they must continue to inquire into the racial origins of our ancestors, again I quote: “to ensure that everyone, regardless of his or her cultural background, has equal opportunity to share fully in the economic, social, cultural and political life of Canada”.

I am not sure what that pretentious bureaucrat slop means but one interpretation could be this. The government wants to know where the money should be sent to buy votes, where to distribute the pork and how to tailor certain government policies to appease voters whose first loyalty is still to the old country.

The Liberals and the scattered remnants of the other two traditional parties endorse official multiculturalism. This foolishness began with the racially and linguistically biased concept that Canada is a coming together of two founding nations, French and English. This understandably irritated native Indians, western Canadians of Ukrainian ancestry, Newfoundlanders whose ancestors were here centuries ago and just about everyone else. As a pedigreed Heinz 57 Canadian I was a little ticked myself.

To resolve the problem it was ordained that everyone belongs to a distinct subspecies of homo-Canadiansis, another of the Trudeau government's wonderful legacy of destructive policies. The maintenance of ancestral culture should be a matter of

*Government Orders*

personal choice at one's own expense. That would be commendable.

What we do not need are federal politicians saying: "Here is money to preserve and promote the cultures of the societies which your ancestors wished to escape from". This is an absolutely immoral abuse of the power of taxation.

It is the Reform Party's position that official multiculturalism is a divisive force that encourages ghettoization and wastes our tax dollars to do it—\$25 million last year. This annual slush fund is doled out to hundreds and hundreds of entities without justification.

(1205)

Why for example should the various Ukrainian committees get hundreds of thousands of dollars in public funding? If they want to dance the prysadka, more power to them. They are better men than I, but why should I help to pay for their athletics? Most of them are at least fifth generation Canadians. The first and second generations living in rude cabins in northern Alberta and Saskatchewan got all the exercise they needed clearing land and working away from home to earn a little hard cash. They prospered, helped to build a nation and preserved their language and culture with no help from anyone.

Four years ago I spoke at a Reform Party organizational meeting at a hamlet north of Yorkton, Saskatchewan. The meeting was held in the Ukrainian hall, a 70-year old building made from hand hewn logs, nicely finished and decorated with icons, scrolls and pictures of patriarchs. No civil servant had had a hand in it. That is multiculturalism.

Why do the descendants of these Ukrainian settlers have their hands out now? I suspect it is because they see everyone else lining up for grants. Being practical people they want some of the action.

According to clause 7(a) of the bill the minister may provide financial assistance in the form of grants, contributions and endowments to any person. That is outrageous. One of the principal functions of Parliament is the approval of appropriations. This legislation gives the minister, in other words the bureaucrats, carte blanche to give away money without even cabinet oversight.

The long list of grants to cosy little social and cultural organizations contains such gems as \$12,000 to the Icelandic League—more fifth generation Canadians—to finance a convention; \$22,575 to the Institution of Ethnic Minority Writing; \$72,000 to the National Council of Canadian Filipino Associations—we are going to dance the tinikiling too—\$20,000 to the Multicultural History Society of Ontario. Here is a beauty: \$19,254 to the Lu Hanessian Productions: Love Notes, to

produce a musical review of 27 songs and musical vignettes about human relationships.

The government has apparently become a little sensitive about these long lists of grants that appear in newspapers. More and more of this stuff is being camouflaged in grants to umbrella groups like the Canadian Council for Multiculturalism Intercultural Education, \$205,000; the Cross Cultural Communications Centre, \$114,000.

I have been thinking of organizing a club for my particular ethnic group. I will call it the Mixed Origins Line Dancing Association for the Genetically Challenged. That should be good for a grant of at least \$100,000, provided I make the application in a red envelope.

I grew up in an ethnically diverse community. All of western Canada had been ethnically diverse for generations, when Toronto was still a WASP enclave where on Sundays travellers could starve or die of thirst right on Yonge Street. Times have changed; I will not pretend that we lived in a sea of brotherly love. Every group felt superior to some other group, but we got along. We were glued together by a common language, shared history, the adverse conditions of that time and place and, above all, by a lot of intermarriage.

(1210)

Now the federal government by stressing diversity instead of human commonality is weakening that glue and it is weakening the social fabric of our nation. Ghettoization is in; adaptation to new surroundings is out. Why learn the language and social customs of your adopted country when you can hide in an enclave from which emissaries are sent out every day to come back with sustenance and interface with the wicked outside world.

Every few years a politician will stop in your community, figuratively pat people on the head and patronizingly solicit your votes as a vehicle to combat racism or preserve cultural diversity.

Now lest any hon. member dismiss my deeply held convictions on this matter as the insensitive views of one white guy in a suit, somebody who does not understand, I would like to conclude my remarks by quoting a few recent immigrants.

Dr. Rais Khan is a very wise new Canadian who heads the department of political science at the University of Manitoba. A couple of years ago he was guest speaker at the Reform Party assembly in Winnipeg. I would like to quote some of his remarks verbatim. He said: "I did not come here to be labelled as an ethnic or as a member of the multicultural community or to be coddled with preferential treatment, nurtured with special grants and then sit on the sidelines and watch the world go by". Later in the same speech, he said: "If I want to preserve my

cultural heritage, that is my business. If I want to invite you into my home to eat some spicy traditional food, that is our business. If I expect you to pay for my cultural activities, that is your business”.

Bharati Mukherjee, a writer who emigrated to Canada from India, felt marginalized here. She blamed Canada’s obsession with multiculturalism for making her a psychological expatriate, so she moved to the United States after being here for 15 years. She says that Canada has chosen to be a mosaic but by preserving differences it also preserves bias.

One of the most eloquent opponents of multiculturalism is Al Meghji, a professor of law at Dalhousie University. I believe he is Canadian born but in the eyes of the multiculturalists he is an Indo-Canadian whose fragile identity must be preserved from the dark forces of assimilation. I will quote him at some considerable length.

He states: “Multiculturalism undermines the efforts of those who are seeking to forge a national identity and prevent the disintegration of an already fragile nation. Whatever the purpose of multicultural policy, the net result is that it highlights and accentuates differences among Canadians. What is needed is not a policy that emphasizes differences but one that promotes common goals and nationally shared values while at the same time allowing the expression of individual identity”.

I have one last name on my list. He has been previously mentioned. I would like to quote him at a little more length. Neil Bissoondath is a prominent Trinidad born Canadian author. Some of you may have read his collection of short stories *Digging Up the Mountain*. He was a darling of the chattering classes until he had the temerity to question the doctrine of official multiculturalism. Now he is in big trouble for saying things like multiculturalism is a policy that seeks merely to keep a diverse population amenable to political manipulation.

(1215)

A very prominent and very white chatterer who is well known to most of us in this House has asked a snide question. Now he wants to reject his brothers, his sisters, his nieces, his nephews. So much for politically correct tolerance.

It is the responsibility of government not to encourage immigrant people to maintain their separateness but to help them, especially through language courses to integrate into Canadian society. Even that would be more than the old timers got. They put down their roots, helped each other and thanked the stars that they had arrived here. Their children became unhyphenated Canadians through their own efforts and now this government like those that have preceded it for the last 20 years is trying to rehyphenate their great grandchildren. You cannot bind a nation together with hyphens.

### *Government Orders*

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. member for Swift Current—Maple Creek especially with respect to his comments dealing with the Ukrainian community in Saskatchewan. I am one of that community and my hand has never been out for any moneys from any group for funding for any of the cultural events that either I or any of my children have attended and continue to attend.

In particular in Saskatchewan we have groups such as the Hutterites who came from Europe to escape both language and religious oppression. They were hard working people who came to Canada to preserve their religious beliefs and language.

Can the hon. member tell us whether these individuals are objecting to integration into Canadian society? Should they be treated in some different manner to prevent them from being able to live in communities on their own where they preserve their language and their religion and are not integrating into society? The speech seemed to indicate that they should. This applies not only to the Hutterite communities but to the Mennonite communities, et cetera.

**Mr. Morrison:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his very astute observations. I applaud him for not participating in riding the gravy train. He probably noticed that I was looking right at him when I made that portion of my speech.

With respect to the Hutterian Brethren, I do not think there is any contradiction when I say that I have no problem with their continuing to live their lives apart from Canadian society the way they do. The reason is that they do this entirely with their own resources. They are not subsidized. They are not getting part of that \$25 million a year. They do not have civil servants coming around telling them: “Fellows, have we got a deal for you”. They are very independent people. There are several of their colonies in my constituency and I have no problem with that at all. I have problems with the other things I mentioned.

**Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have two questions. I listened to the hon. member and I find myself in accord with some of his remarks and in disagreement with others.

When he talks about rejecting multicultural policy, is he not really talking about rejecting a kind of implementation of it? I take it the hon. member is not really against multiculturalism. He is against a multiculturalism policy which tends to divide us rather than unite us. If I understand the member correctly, he still is in favour of our multiethnic nature as a country.

(1220)

I have also been looking at the grants issue to various ethnic groups and I have found during the last government a correlation

*Government Orders*

between payments to ethnic groups and election years in which the actual payments increased.

Would he care to comment on those two points?

**Mr. Morrison:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments. I will go to the bottom first and work back up.

I am aware of those figures. I had intended to mention them in my speech but through oversight I did not, and I thank him for bringing that to the attention of the House.

I know that this is by its very nature a multiethnic society. There will be people who will be assimilated quickly into a melting pot, as they call it south of the border. There will be others, like the Hutterian Brethren, who will maintain their individuality for generations.

As long as this is done as a matter of free individual choice, neither I nor my party has any difficulty with it. The magic words are free individual choice. Do it on your own folks. Do not expect me to pay for it.

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I speak to the House today as one who supports Bill C-53.

Today I would like to speak in a comparative fashion concerning the comments made by the hon. member for Kootenay East before the House broke for the recess. At that time he proposed that national parks be removed from the Department of Canadian Heritage and put into the Department of the Environment. In reviewing his comments I fail to understand the rationale.

He stated that he has, in a very anecdotal way, some experience with national parks, as his riding contains three of them. In his specific examples of concerns he spoke only to one environmental situation, namely the difficulties of maintaining naturally evolving forests. The remaining issues he mentioned dealt with maintenance of highways, user fees, enterprise units, hiring practices and office locations. I would suggest that these are administrative as opposed to environmental issues.

Nevertheless there are undeniably important links to be maintained with Environment Canada in the science and research sectors as they relate to national heritage exemplified in the national parks system. This is being accomplished now through a memorandum of understanding between the two departments. Specific areas of interest include membership on the science committee on participation, the biodiversity strategy and the protected areas strategy, all of which are multilateral initiatives involving a wide range of government departments.

The Department of Canadian Heritage is both the client department of Environment Canada and a leader on specific issues such as the protected areas strategy in the same way that other departments such as fisheries and oceans are both clients and leaders on specific environmental issues. This sharing of

responsibilities among departments not only focuses the right kinds of expertise on the right issues, but in the case of Canadian heritage adds an extra supporting voice at the cabinet table for dealing with them.

Parks Canada is an organization that comprises responsibilities for both the natural and the cultural heritage of our country and has done so under many different names and departments since 1919. It has, quite simply, a natural and a cultural component that are not mutually exclusive.

[*Translation*]

Nationally and internationally, efforts are being made to recognize that history, culture and nature are interdependent. This is largely reflected in the UNESCO Convention on the protection of natural heritage and world culture, which he represents as the minister responsible for Parks Canada.

[*English*]

As the new Department of Canadian Heritage includes the bulk of natural cultural programs over and above those within Parks Canada, there is a unification of that element of our national and international responsibilities.

(1225)

Moreover the national parks and national historic sites are tangible symbols of the best of our Canadian identity. The Department of Canadian Heritage has national responsibilities, programs for the enhancement of Canadian identity that will build on this element as well.

An example of this kind of synergy that is developing throughout the new department of heritage is the heritage tourism initiative which we on this side of the House are supporting. Given the wide mandate the department now enjoys, there are tremendous opportunities to build an exciting, economically significant and, probably most important, a sustainable international program based on the cultural institutions and natural wonders of this country. To this end the government is also committed to the completion of the national parks system, the expansion of our national historic site themes, and the establishment of new national marine conservation areas.

I would point out that new guiding principles and policies for the range of activities undertaken by Parks Canada were completed under the umbrella of Canadian heritage. When these policies were tabled in the House last March it was to considerable acclaim for the many stakeholders involved in these aspects of national heritage. There was a clear demonstration that they had been involved in their development.

With regard to the specific concerns raised by the member for Kootenay East I would note that it does appear strange that the Department of Canadian Heritage is involved in the road maintenance business. However I do not comprehend how that

*Government Orders*

translates into an argument for returning the national parks to Environment Canada.

In any event there are roads, national transportation corridors, that pass through some parks. There is no question about that. As they are within park boundaries there is an obligation of the responsible department to ensure their suitability and safety. In some parks work is contracted out or performed under an agreement with the province.

The member will be interested to know that Parks Canada is reviewing all its road operations to ensure the most effective means of proper maintenance. That could well mean consolidation of operations in the four mountain parks.

I understand well the member's argument that highways are normally managed by provinces and should not be funded by Parks Canada. Accordingly the government will take the member's suggestion under advisement.

I found that the member's comment on road tolls for commercial through traffic in national parks to be somewhat confusing. There was no such road toll nor is one being contemplated.

On the question of the enterprise unit for the operation of hot pools I believe that this project is turning out to be successful and should be a good pilot for similar ventures. Staff will continue to be hired on merit and where appropriate, business opportunities that can be realized will be pursued. I welcome his support for a more businesslike approach to park operations as exemplified by the enterprise unit at the hot springs. The member will be pleased to know that this initiative is one of many that represent the future direction of management in our parks.

I trust that I have answered the member's concerns. I conclude by saying I am proud to support Bill C-53, which creates the Department of Canadian Heritage.

**Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, at the departmental briefing, officials from this new department told us there would be no streamlining, no downsizing and no cash savings. A few moments ago the parliamentary secretary was talking about a saving of \$7.3 million.

I wonder if the hon. member could tell us where that saving is going to come from. Where is it going to get that money, especially since there is a recommendation tabled with the bill that will allow the department to spend more money? I wonder if the hon. member could straighten us out on this point.

**Mr. Gallaway:** Mr. Speaker, in all fairness it is difficult to answer a question raised in an earlier speech with respect to a

speech made by the parliamentary secretary. Perhaps the member ought more properly to have addressed the question to her.

(1230)

As I understand the concerns raised by the hon. member, I have been advised by the parliamentary secretary that the figure of \$7.3 million will come through streamlining administrative procedures within the department.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, we are here today to debate a bill establishing the Department of Canadian Heritage and amending and repealing certain Acts. This bill is known as C-53.

Its title suggests that this bill simply reorganizes a department. The heritage minister himself presents it to us as a technicality. But in fact, this bill goes far beyond the mere restructuring of a department. Indeed, this bill proposes an inefficient and dangerous distribution of government responsibilities.

Let me highlight two important points where the bill is seriously off track. First, let me point out a serious inconsistency in the sharing of departmental responsibilities. Once again, the government is acting in such a way that the left hand will not know what the right hand is doing, since the sharing of responsibilities between the departments of Industry and Canadian Heritage raises various problems of jurisdiction, competition and policy.

To illustrate what I am saying, I shall now quote what the bill says about the department's field of jurisdiction. First, clause 4 says:

4. (1) The powers, duties and functions of the minister extend to and include—

In French, the bill says “de façon générale”. What does this mean?

—all matters over which Parliament has jurisdiction, not by law assigned to any other department—

If it is already somewhere else, the heritage minister does not have to be concerned with it, and anyway it is “de façon générale”.

—relating to (Canadian) identity and values, cultural development—

Let us look at some areas of jurisdiction. Subclause 2 says:

(d) cultural heritage and industries, including performing arts, visual and audio-visual arts, publishing, sound recording, film, video and literature;

This subclause also includes broadcasting and the formulation of cultural policy as it relates to foreign investment.

My colleague said that it is a real mish-mash. You see, the minister's portfolio includes the arts, cultural industries, museums, heritage, broadcasting, physical fitness, amateur sport, multiculturalism, the status of women, parks, historic sites and

*Government Orders*

canals, state ceremonial and protocol and so on. I felt like saying "Alouette" at the end of this long list.

There is a problem and let me mention an obvious one, copyright. When it comes to culture, copyright must be strictly and effectively protected. Here, copyright comes under both Industry and Heritage; Industry is in Bill C-46. There is a problem.

(1235)

I would also like to mention a document just recently published by the Canadian Conference of the Arts that points out, with respect to copyright, that the division of powers between industry and heritage will slow down the legislative process that should one day lead to fair compensation of artists and creators for the commercial use of their works. I understand the government's good intentions, but I quite simply do not believe there will be any concrete results.

Secondly, I would point out to this House that the bill does not address the cultural and societal impact of technological advances and in particular of the so-called electronic highway. The second objective set out in the Throne Speech with respect to the electronic highway is to strengthen Canada's cultural sovereignty and identity, in the singular, I note, as if there were only one cultural identity in Canada.

The stakes are high. Certainly, in Canada, Quebecers have a cultural identity. Can we speak of one cultural identity for the rest of Canada? I am not sure we can. Maritimers have their own values, heritage and history. Canadians from the Prairies have a different history, heritage and set of experiences that are also uniquely their own. The same can be said for Canadians on the West Coast and for Ontarians, with their very different history. This assumption of a single Canadian identity worries me.

I was speaking of the electronic highway, technological advances and the Department of Canadian Heritage. The latter, in its eagerness not to miss anything, is aiming in all directions, but is missing the real targets, the challenges we must meet in the next few years, not ten or twenty years down the road.

And here we should mention technology. Broadcasting, communications and telecommunications are being revolutionized. As I speak, the real stakes, the real players, the real pieces of this incredible puzzle are not immediately apparent. The problem is a multi-faceted one. On the one hand, there are the suppliers of telephone services and infrastructures, the telephone companies, of whom there are several in Canada. On the other hand, there are the cable distributors, which bring television to the homes of so many Canadians and Quebecers.

These two major players are in the process of merging and using computer technology to transmit their signals, with the result that there will no longer be any difference between my

telephone conversation and a television broadcast. The electronic signals travelling through the wires will be the same.

(1240)

The contents will change but the container will remain the same. This container will travel at very high speed on the optic fibre, which is basically a glass wire along which light can travel. Light can carry much more information in one second than electrical current. In fact, it is ten times faster. This means that a single fibre-optic cable can replace a huge number of copper wires. Then there is the coaxial cable of the type used by cable distributors. This cable is also capable of carrying large amounts of information.

With these cables, we are on the way to acquiring the physical capability to carry information of any type from point A to point B at astounding speeds. Technologically, this is feasible in the very short term. The problem is knowing what information will be carried.

If we are talking about telephone conversations, just between you and me, that will not make much of a difference. If the technology enables me to make banking transactions from my home, that is already an improvement on the present situation. If I can make banking transactions with other countries around the world, with electronic movement of capital, then the flow could be substantial and I understand that the Department of Industry would want to look into this. As a matter of fact, so should the Department of Finance and the Department of National Revenue.

In terms of programming, what would happen to cultural programs and television programs as we know them? Will we continue to have local antennas broadcasting according to the familiar sequence? I do not think so. We are headed for a drastic changeover. At present, you turn on your T.V., select a channel and watch what is on, without having any input regarding the sequence. This is as if you were to go to a restaurant, went in, checked the menu and were told: "Here are your choices of soups, your choices of appetizers, your choices of main dishes, your choices of desserts and your choices of beverages, and these are your only choices". Today, when you select say the CBC, you take what you are served. It is direct and simple, but if you do not like what is on, you turn the dial to another station. Again, you watch what that station is offering, in the sequence it has decided. But no more.

In just a few years, you will find yourself in a situation similar to being in a cafeteria. You will not tune in to a station; rather, you will look at a list of programs which will have been prerecorded—sometimes 20 or 30 years earlier, since there are already video libraries containing large numbers of prerecorded tapes—and you will decide what you want to see and when. This is what I call a cafeteria-style of selection. You want three desserts but no soup? Fine, the decision is yours. You want more

*Government Orders*

of these vegetables? You do not like turnip or broccoli? They are good for you. No, Mr. Speaker, I know that you do like turnip and broccoli. So, you choose what you want and then pay for it. This is how it will work.

The real problem is that each consumer will now decide what he or she will consume. The question then is: Who works in the cafeteria kitchen and prepares what is available? Who will prepare these programs and according to what standards? Who will define what is good and on what basis? Who will conduct inspections in the kitchens?

If this was done in a single facility housing these kitchens, we could go there and see what goes on, but these kitchens will be located all over the world. The information highway gives instant access to data located anywhere. We do not have the ability to control what producers do in other countries.

(1245)

To what extent will we be able to ensure the second objective stated in the Speech from the Throne, namely the strengthening of Canada's sovereignty and cultural identity? I am not only referring to Quebec's cultural identity, which is a lot easier to protect since the majority of Quebecers are French-speaking. However, in the rest of Canada, where the majority speaks English, access to American production, for example, will be incredibly easy.

So far, the issue of Canadian content has been discussed in terms of broadcasting time. So much time is allocated to Canadian programs and so much time to American content. This is fine when you are in a restaurant with a fixed menu. The soup is Canadian, the potatoes are American, the steak comes from western Canada, while the dessert is home-made. However, when you are in a cafeteria, you choose what you want and there is no way of making sure that a consumer will opt for a quantity of Canadian products which is equal, greater or lower than that of foreign goods.

Of course, one can resort to the video store technique which consists in allocating a certain number of shelves to Canadian productions and leave the rest for foreign ones. However, nothing guarantees that customers will go for Canadian productions in a proportion that matches the space allocated on shelves. No one is at the door to control what customers choose.

We are in a similar situation with the information highway. At first glance, it seems that it will not be easy to control. However, in terms of technology, the Department of Industry is taking quite an interest in wires, cables, connections, interfaces and protocols, while the Department of Canadian Heritage is making pious wishes regarding our cultural identity.

This bill essentially gives the Minister of Canadian Heritage the right to talk about heritage without giving him the power to

regulate or to intervene at any level. It does not give him any real power to ensure that Quebec and Canada's values are protected at a time when the stakes are extremely high because we find ourselves in a situation where we are facing the unknown.

I am thinking about this Minister of Canadian Heritage who, question period after question period, explains to us when we are wondering about the CRTC or the Museum of Nature that these organizations are independent, that they have their own set of rules and that they will do a good job. Well, do we really need a Minister of Canadian Heritage? I think I have expressed my concerns very clearly but, to give you a brief summary, allow me to say that at a time when the telecommunications and cable industries are converging, which threatens the level of cultural content from Canada and Quebec, it seems totally inconsistent that the mandate of the Department of Canadian Heritage be outdated with regard to these issues.

In conclusion, I support the amendment proposed by my colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata to withdraw this bill which, I am sorry to say, is bland, colourless and has a strange smell to it.

(1250)

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again, the Bloc Québécois has expressed its concerns about the federal presence in cultural matters. I listened with a great deal of interest to what was said, but I must admit I was somewhat surprised at the cafeteria metaphor.

They worry that people are allowed to choose. They worry that people do not have the knowledge, the discipline or the ability to make informed decisions about the kind of food they should eat.

As you know, thousands of people use the Commons cafeteria, and I think we have quite a variety. People eat more than cakes and cookies. They are concerned about good nutrition. All Canadians, especially young Canadians, are very much aware of the importance of good nutrition.

In the bill before the House today, we want to give Canadians a chance to make choices and not necessarily make those choices for them, as the hon. member for the opposition assumed. I trust the public, and I am confident that our fellow citizens can make informed decisions. After all, the purpose of this department and the objective of the Government of Canada is to establish links among the various elements that make up our country.

I think we can benefit from the experience of a fisherman from the maritimes, a logger from Quebec, and a western farmer. I think we should realize that the genius of federalism



*Government Orders*

lies in having invited these various elements to come and build such an extraordinary country.

Once again, the opposition talks about controlling. Controlling whom? Controlling choices made by adult individuals, by people who want to find a way to express themselves? For instance, the federal government never intervened when Pierre Falardeau decided to do his film *Octobre*. I must say I do not share the views expressed by Mr. Falardeau. However, the Government of Canada, through Telefilm Canada and the National Film Board, agreed to produce, to fund this film which, as you all know, is raising a lot of questions and causing a lot of debate. People say it is not a big success because unfortunately, the Government of Quebec refused to participate.

This goes to show that when partnership is lacking, some projects often never get off the ground. And some are often not well received by the general public. In any case, I wish the opposition would realize that as far as Canadian heritage and culture are concerned, the goal of this government and of all creative artists has always been to stimulate our intellectual curiosity and urge people to reach beyond the horizon. Oddly enough, separatist nationalists often say they want a Quebec that is open to the world. So why not start with a Quebec open to Canada, and vice-versa? I think we already have a system that works well and is very open to the range of different opinions we have in this country.

To go back to the cafeteria metaphor, I am glad to know I have a choice and that this choice is a matter of individual freedom. Unfortunately, the opposition only proposes to remove or control those freedoms we take for granted.

(1255)

**Mr. de Savoye:** Mr. Speaker, to have a choice is great, but to have the right choice is even better. But the hon. member opposite seems prepared to consume anything, provided he has a choice. The Americans rely on the power of money and on competition to bring down the price of the cultural product in the United States and the price of using communications and telecommunications resources and infrastructures. And they succeeded at it. But a small price buys a small amount, as is unfortunately too often the case on this side of the border.

Our cultural industry has great merit and does great things, both in English Canada and in Quebec. The danger is that this bill, which basically gives no power to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, will have a disastrous effect on our culture and our cultural industry. I am pleased to see that the hon. member opposite shares my concerns. What makes me sad, however, is that he does not realize that this bill does not have enough teeth to deliver the goods.

I would be delighted if he interceded personally with the Minister of Canadian Heritage and his caucus to have this bill

withdrawn and replaced with a bill which would truly deliver the goods he was referring to.

**Mr. Gagnon:** Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I find the remarks made by the hon. member opposite quite legitimate. I agree with him that the system is not perfect. It is true that further efforts are required to safeguard the Canadian cultural space, whether French Canadian or English Canadian. And I believe that is the primary goal of the Canadian National Broadcasting Strategy. There is no doubt that the bill deals with several aspects that extend beyond radio and television broadcasting.

It also deals with parks, as well as multiculturalism. That is true. Matters that affect culture also affect the cultural industry, and the hon. member is right in saying that we must remain wary of the American competition which, as we know, can be plainly disloyal at times not only vis-à-vis the Canadian culture but also other cultures worldwide.

Take France, England, Japan for example. These are countries that already pay closer attention to their cultures because of the massive American invasion in our cultural spaces. The fact remains however, and I believe all the hon. members agree on this, that Quebec and the francophone culture in Canada, which certainly extends beyond the boundaries of Quebec, are better protected in a federal context than if left to fight the American cultural giant on their own, alone, without any friends or allies.

**Mr. de Savoye:** Mr. Speaker, I have time for three short quotes. First, I would like to quote the Arpin report to Ms. Frulla-Hébert, who was Quebec's minister of culture. It says: "We can conclude that overlap between the two levels of government clearly exists in terms of structures, programs, target groups and even legislation and fiscal measures". It talks about culture here. "We can even talk about duplication which leads to one-upmanship. The two governments have different policies and priorities for the same target groups. Measures taken by the federal government sometimes flatly contradict Quebec's options. Harmonizing the action of the two levels of government has always been difficult. The federal government never wanted to recognize Quebec's precedence in cultural affairs".

To conclude, Keith Kelly, National Director of the Canadian Conference of the Arts, said: "Telecommunication companies seem to be prepared to penetrate the world of broadcasting and the government must ensure that their activities have a beneficial impact on Canadian cultural industries. Reaffirming the separation of telecoms and broadcasting companies in these two bills simply freezes a status quo which is no longer appropriate today".

Mr. Speaker, that is why I spoke as I did this morning.

*Government Orders*

(1300)

*[English]*

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to share with hon. members present my views on the legislation that will establish in law the Department of Canadian Heritage.

As an opening comment I must say that a reading of Bill C-53 has convinced me of the importance of this piece of legislation. This department is called upon to play a central role in the life of Canada and Canadians.

The legislation reflects the sweep of the new department's mandate that includes responsibilities in the areas of cultural development, multiculturalism, official languages, heritage conservation, national parks, national historic sites and amateur sports.

Moreover the policies and programs of the Department of Canadian Heritage are meant to promote increased understanding of our diversity, the involvement of all citizens in Canadian society and an increased awareness of our cultural and natural wealth. In other words the department is active in those areas that have clear links to our identity as Canadians.

One of the pre-eminent characteristics of Canada has always been its multicultural nature; in fact it is a vital comment of our national identity. This multicultural dimension is one of the most exciting realities of our society, one that should be cherished and nurtured. I find it very comforting therefore to read in Bill C-53 that the new department will be responsible for the promotion of the greater understanding of human rights, fundamental freedoms and related values as well as multiculturalism.

All Canadians must experience a sense of belonging to the country. Multiculturalism seeks to bridge the gap between cultural communities with diverse interests and backgrounds. I have referred to Canadian heritage as a new department. However as most members know the department has been functioning well for almost a year and a half.

Passage of the bill is a necessary legal step and will serve to confirm the areas of jurisdiction within which the Minister of Canadian Heritage will exercise his powers and carry out his duties and functions, one of the key sectors that will occupy the time of the minister in ensuring the growth and development of Canada's cultural section. Never has this area been more important than now, given the significance of the contributions to the Canadian economy.

I will not repeat the figures and statistics that others before me have quoted in support of that contribution. Rather I will focus on the role of the federal government in cultural development.

Some maintain that culture above all is a way of looking at the world and a manifestation of our civilization. This unique view of the world is one of the features that allows one group to distinguish itself from others. In short, without culture there is no identity.

Most would agree that the federal government's responsibility in cultural matters extends to those areas that are pan-Canadian, interprovincial and international in scope. Federal endeavours in these areas remain complementary to those of the other levels of government. It is crucial there be many agents of cultural development and for governments to play an active role. The federal government's role is to ensure that Canadian artists, creators and cultural industries are able to produce and that Canadians have access to those cultural products.

No better example can be given than the current efforts of the Minister of Canadian Heritage to ensure that the Canadian cultural content will be readily accessible to Canadians on the rapidly evolving information highway.

I will now turn briefly to the department's specific programs to promote the country's two official languages. These programs are designed to provide opportunities for Canadians to appreciate and profit from our rich linguistic heritage and to communicate with and participate fully in federal institutions such as the one we are in today.

As anyone who has travelled exclusively and extensively abroad will attest, it bears emphasizing that Canada remains one of the world's most favoured nations. Our prosperity and civility are products of much hard work and cannot be taken for granted. Duality is an essential element for our identity and our defining characteristics.

(1305)

The English and French languages and the people who speak them have shaped Canada and helped define its identity. The federal official languages policy is designed to reflect this reality. I am proud to be a member of a government committed to a vision of Canada where vital English speaking and French speaking minority language communities can contribute to the economic, social, cultural or scientific life of our country.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage also has responsibilities in the areas of heritage policies and programs. The Department of Canadian Heritage provides support and assistance to museums across the country. At the same time the department ensures that the environment in which our national museums function, including the National Archives, the National Gallery, the Museum of Civilization, the Museum of Nature and the National Library, is conducive to giving Canadians maximum accessibility to our cultural heritage.

When I think of the heritage of Canadians my thoughts often turn to our national parks and national historic sites. The

*Government Orders*

Minister of Canadian Heritage is charged with the weighty responsibilities of preserving these priceless examples of our nature and cultural and natural heritage for the benefit of present and future generations. These parks and sites represent the very essence of our identity as Canadians.

Parks Canada is one of the major components of Canadian heritage. It provides strong leadership in the management of protected heritage areas and aims at promoting sound principles of stewardship and citizen awareness. Parks Canada also leads the field in ecological and commemorative integrity by adhering to international conventions. Canadians can take pride in the internationally recognized contribution of Parks Canada to heritage conservation.

Nationally and internationally there is a trend toward regionalization, that history, culture and nature are intertwined. This is strongly reflected in the UNESCO convention concerning the protection of world culture and natural heritage for which the Minister of Canadian Heritage is Canada's representative.

In summary, it is clear the programs of the Department of Canadian Heritage span Canada's past, present and future. In many ways the department can be regarded as the flagship of Canadian identity, bringing together the diverse mix of federal programs that will help us confront and surmount the challenges that lie ahead.

I look forward to the passage of the legislation and the official creation of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before recognizing the member for Surrey North, I want to advise the House that the block of five hours of debate which entitled members to speak for a maximum of 20 minutes with a 10-minute question or comment has lapsed. We are now going to the next stage of debate which allows for 10-minute interventions without questions or comments.

**Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to participate in any debate in the House. Today I join in the debate on Bill C-53 concerning the creation of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Before getting into the text of my talk today I refer to a comment that was made earlier in the debate about the saving of \$7.3 million in relationship to the bill. At a departmental briefing it was indicated there is no streamlining involved with the bill; there is no cost saving and there are no layoffs. I am left a bit mystified as to where the saving of \$7.3 million will come from.

A number of speakers have preceded me in the discussion and have addressed a number of the components singled out by the government as comprising the mandate of the department.

(1310)

When reviewing the items in the bill one wonders what criterion was used for the selection of these items for the department. For example, according to Bill C-53, it includes such things as multiculturalism, national parks, historic sites and canals. It moves on to the field of amateur sports and the advancement of equality and status of the English and French languages. Then it goes into the field of broadcasting and so on.

When the present government was restructuring the ministry at the beginning of this session it would seem that items which were left over along with a few others that were pulled from other departments have been lumped together to create the Department of Canadian Heritage.

This questioning of the practicality of placing diverse and unrelated items in the same department leads to a more fundamental question as to what is Canadian heritage. Webster's dictionary defines heritage as something that we inherit at birth; in other words it is like a legacy. It is something or anything that is derived from the past or from tradition. By definition, then, heritage of an individual or group or a country is what we actually inherit at birth, that which was created and moulded by the actions of those who preceded us, just as what we do now in our lifetime will become the heritage or the mould of the lifestyle for those who come after us. For example, briefly, those in the present inherit a base from the past to build on for those in the future. That would be what heritage is.

A basic source contributing to our heritage is the consensus of our society to recognize specific events and/or issues as being valuable to retain for our future development and to create and maintain these things through tangible symbols as a constant reminder for those who follow us in the future. When events of the past no longer directly influence how we govern our lifestyles today, they tend to move from the concept of heritage into what we call our history.

Following this definition, I question the purpose of the Department of Canadian Heritage. I feel that the citizens of the country do not need a Department of Canadian Heritage at all. We in the House must realize that everything we do in terms of the laws we pass, the issues we discuss, will become part of the legacy we leave to those who follow us, which will be their heritage.

Instead of there being a specific Department of Canadian Heritage, all departments or ministries should be responsible through the legislation they propose for the development and maintenance of everything we do, of the heritage for those who are to follow, not just a single department.

The government's role is simply to provide a legislative framework for all persons living in Canada and to provide an overall framework within which individuals and groups of

*Government Orders*

individuals and Canadians generally can define their own existence. As long as they operate or define it within the parameters of Canadian legal jurisdiction it will become or carry on as heritage.

For example, persons who come to Canada have the opportunity to maintain their heritage, such as language or dress, as long as that heritage or the components of that heritage do not come into conflict with established Canadian laws, the equality of men and women, for example.

People should not come to Canada to recreate the country they left. That begs the question of why they left in the first place. People who immigrate to Canada do so because we have a country that is very attractive to people all over the world. Our response to those who come should not be to reproduce the country they left behind but to do our best to maintain Canada so that it will be as attractive to other people as it was to them.

On this subject I quote from an October 5 article in the *Globe and Mail* written by Sonja Sinclair, a freelance writer and self-described Canadian by adoption rather than birth:

(1315)

“At the risk of being politically incorrect, I believe that those of us who left our original homelands whether by choice or necessity have no business complaining that the country that offers us a refuge happens to be different than the one we left behind. This does not mean that we should not criticize things that we believe to be wrong or better still try to improve those that seem to be imperfect. Neither does it mean that we should forget where we came from or if we choose keep alive our native language and our culture. What we should not do is expect the government or our fellow citizens to do it for us and foot the bill”.

Canada's history is filled with cultural groups that immigrated to this country and maintained their own heritage. For example, the persons of Ukrainian descent who immigrated to western Canada this century did not have a department of heritage to show them or to help them maintain their traditions. They did that on their own and their community in Canada is much stronger for it.

Anyone who has been to a wedding in Vegreville can attest to the enduring strength of the Ukrainian culture in Canada. It is government arrogance to believe that people with different cultures will maintain their cultures only as long as they are able to receive money from federal governments to help them remember their own heritage.

Therefore, what it is to be Canadian, that is our heritage, is defined by the actions of the people and groups of people within the parameters of legislation as determined by the governments of this country.

The meaning of Canadian should be defined from the bottom up and not the top down. The process for defining our nation should go from individuals to groups of individuals, to community, to province, to region, to nation. This is the only way our struggle for identity will be resolved.

We do not need a Department of Canadian Heritage. Government's role is to provide good legislation and parameters for the present and future growth of our country. With this our heritage will be looked after by the citizens themselves.

**Ms. Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of Bill C-53 because I believe this nation is probably the world leader when it comes to identifying the importance of heritage and what that means to all of us.

To suggest that we do not need a department of heritage is to suggest that this country does not have a vision or focus or direction as a nation and nothing to build, that things will happen as they may, that regionalism will evolve as it may, that one part of the country need not talk to the other part of the country and that culture need not be reinforced in any which way.

However, today I would like to concentrate my comments around the whole issue of multiculturalism which hon. members of the Reform Party have made a great to do over in this House in the last several days.

What is multiculturalism? The first problem is that the members have totally misunderstood what that is. They keep referring to it as the Ukrainian community out west or the such and such community somewhere else which maintained their dance, their culture and their food. That is not only what multiculturalism is about. That is such a minor part it happens quite by itself as an hon. member rightly pointed out.

Multiculturalism is a fundamental policy that acknowledges the reality of what Canada is today. It is a multicultural society made up of peoples from all over the world.

Over the years it has been to the advantage of what used to be referred to as the mainstream to maintain the status quo of us and them. In the discussions even today I keep hearing the us and them, those people, the cultural people, the multicultural people. Those are the people who are neither English nor French. With respect, that is not what multiculturalism is all about. Multiculturalism defines this country. That means if one looks at a circle the perimeter of the circle is multiculturalism and that is Canada. Within the circle are Canadians of British descent, Canadians of French descent, Canadians of Italian descent and so on, and the aboriginal community. Within that circle is where we try to develop programs to deal with equity and to arrive at an equitable kind of society.

*Government Orders*

(1320)

Without the fundamental policy, the concept of multiculturalism, I will tell members what happens. I have dealt for 20 years with program delivery of services in this country. Multiculturalism applies to every government department, not just to the department of multiculturalism. It is a policy, it is an idea. When policies are developed by different departments if the concept of multiculturalism is not taken into account at the very development of that policy the delivery of that policy will not reach everybody. It will be very inequitable.

The people developing both the policy and the mechanism with which to deliver it do not have either the experience or the understanding of the different peoples of this country. In order to be able to understand the needs of people in this country, in order to build a policy and a delivery mechanism that does not have barriers within it that would prevent people from accessing what is their right to access, that policy is not developed properly.

The policy assists in schools, the discussion of equality within the school system, so that children will learn about one another and are able to respect each other's backgrounds, are able to work together and be proud of who they are. The curriculum in this country for the longest time—these are very simple examples that should not even have to be made—ignored totally the contribution to Canada and around the world of peoples of different cultural backgrounds.

When we take into account the policy of multiculturalism we begin to say we must take into account all the contributions of all the people in this country. Christopher Columbus was not a North American; his name was Cristoforo Colombo. There are many others who came to this country over the last 200 years. People of Chinese background who built the railway in this country made a contribution to build this country. The Europeans who cleared the west made a contribution to this country. The Italian Canadians who built the railway as well and were incarcerated during the second world war, many of them built this country. This is not an us and them country. It is a we country.

Canada is a nation that is evolving. The culture of this country is evolving. It is not a British culture entirely. We are very respectful of the institutions.

The member across the way from the Reform Party a week ago suggested that people of immigrant background if we continue with multiculturalism will not respect Canadian institutions. I find that insulting. I am a Canadian and I respect Canadian institutions.

What is a Canadian? I was not born here. I came here at the age of nine. I am very proud of who I am and where I come from, but I am a very proud Canadian first and foremost. To suggest that people who have heritage that is not English or French are

not proud Canadians is an insult to people in this country. Multiculturalism is the equalizer. It is the acknowledgement of what we are as a nation and that is what we are building.

Countries around the world have called us and asked us to share our experiences with them. Australia has taken our policy and taken it much further than we have. Germany has recently asked that we help it to develop a similar policy because the world around us is changing. We have countries where because of religious or ethnic differences people are killing each other.

We in this country are developing a model of coexistence, of mutual respect for one another and that is what multiculturalism is about. It fosters that respect. It helps us to build an evolving society. Nothing is static.

Every one of our heritages is just as important as the other. No one is more or less important.

(1325)

It does not mean that Canada as a state and as a country is not something that we are all proud of and that is first and foremost in our minds. It does not mean that Canadians who are not of British or French background did not fight and die in the world wars.

Some people say that multiculturalism is divisive and is causing the divisions and the breakup of this country. That is highly insulting.

**An hon. member:** Look around, it is.

**Ms. Minna:** It is not. You are. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I thank the hon. member for recognizing her indulgence.

**Ms. Minna:** I am sorry, but it does not. It is not the people like myself who are neither of English nor French background who are causing the breakup of this country.

We believe in multiculturalism, in having a policy that acknowledges that this country is not what it was 200 years ago. Even then it was not what people claim it was. It was a multicultural nation from day one.

The model that we are building is one that we can be very proud of. The moneys used are for programs to develop and implement the ideology and concept of multiculturalism. One may disagree with a specific program but to disagree fundamentally with the policy is absolutely wrong.

I want to quote some of the statements that have been made in this House over the last week. One of the statements suggests we are funding specialist groups at the expense of the taxpayer. Are we not all taxpayers? Are the people who receive the funds not taxpayers? Why do some suggest that of us and them, those people are not taxpayers? This policy is not one of us and them, it is a policy of all of us. It affects every single Canadian.

*Government Orders*

There were statements such as this policy encourages large groups to remain apart from the mainstream. Who is the mainstream? In metropolitan Toronto the mainstream is all of us. There are some 100 different languages spoken. That is the mainstream of metropolitan Toronto, Hamilton and many other large urban centres in this country. I am not sure what is meant when people say the mainstream and what that is supposed to be.

Sometimes I am asked why I do not become a Canadian. What does Canadian mean? Canadian simply means that you are a citizen of this country who respects the laws and the citizens of this country and who will work and fight for this country.

**An hon. member:** We choose the government.

**Ms. Minna:** We choose the government, that is right. We vote and we have a democratic process. That is what Canadian means. Every Canadian in this country has a different heritage, a different place that their parents came from, a different vision or a different region, but we are together as Canadians and that is what Canada is about. We are hybrids, some of us.

Some Canadians are first generation, some third, some fourth. Nonetheless, we are citizens of this country and we are Canadians. Multiculturalism is the only policy that this country has which is the equalizer, which brings this country together to create the model that this world needs.

In of all places, the *New York Times*, a writer stated that if Canada killed multiculturalism and the experiment died here it would be a sad state of affairs because if it died in Canada there would be no hope for the rest of the world to develop the same thing. I say to this House that it is time that people began to look at this government policy and include themselves in the future of this country instead of trying to maintain the status quo that never was.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, the bill we are debating today in the House is a perfect example of the measures which we strongly oppose and which explain why many Quebecers have come to embrace the sovereigntist option. That is why I support the amendment of my colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata to withdraw this bill and refer its subject matter to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. The purpose of this amendment is, of course, to prevent the House from proceeding to second reading of this bill, which deals with the concept of promoting the Canadian identity. A basic reason why we are opposed to this bill being debated now in this House is that many ethics problems have not been resolved yet.

(1330)

When we talk about promoting the Canadian identity, it goes without saying that the mandates and subsidies of the various

government agencies will support this goal. Such is the case with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which should logically promote a big and beautiful Canada, but especially a united Canada.

A declaration made by the Prime Minister of Canada on June 18 leaves no doubt as to the directives given to the CBC. The Prime Minister said: "There is a law governing the CBC's operations and I will ask them to obey this law. Among the obligations outlined in the law is that of letting people know about Canada's advantages".

They would ask a broadcaster to voluntarily provide biased information in order to fulfil a mandate given by the Canadian government. It is very difficult to swallow. During an election campaign, for example, the air time allocated to the main political parties is monitored to the second. If one party gets more coverage than another, the news room will soon receive a telephone call from the party that feels slighted. This golden rule is the only guarantee that the population will be shown both sides of the coin.

Reflecting his leader's thinking, the Minister of Foreign Affairs said in 1977: "I cannot see the CBC taking a neutral stand to show both sides of the issue. During the referendum campaign, employees must stand squarely on the pro-Canada side".

Mr. Speaker, as this statement shows, our Minister of Foreign Affairs was already advocating in 1977 that this Crown corporation—24 per cent of whose operating expenditures are being paid by Quebecers—should take a biased position. Today, this same Minister of Foreign Affairs travels around the world preaching a healthy democracy, which he would flout here in his own country.

I saw him last Sunday in Haiti with President Aristide extolling the benefits of democracy. If democracy is healthy in a country like Haiti, why would he deny that this same democracy is just as beneficial here in Quebec, in Canada? It is very dangerous for the future.

It remains to be seen whether the opinion of the minister I just told you about has evolved since 1977, but I doubt it. What the Prime Minister and his Minister of Foreign Affairs said amounts to favouring, for example, the no side during the next referendum campaign, either by giving them better air time or by boycotting events favourable to the sovereigntists. It amounts to asking Bernard Derome to look disgusted when mentioning the benefits of having a sovereign Quebec.

(1335)

Such an attitude means one of two things: first, all Radio-Canada employees are federalists, or at least lack some professional ethics and agree to give a biased view in their media coverage; second, Quebecers do not realize that democracy is being cheated. For all those journalists, news desk officers, producers,

*Government Orders*

technicians and others who have contributed to establishing Radio-Canada's reputation as a serious and credible organization, these comments are outrageous and reflect a blatant lack of respect for the right of Canadians and Quebecers to be informed. In fact, such comments jeopardize the credibility of Radio-Canada's news bulletins.

On top of these horror stories, the daily *Le Devoir* reported last April that the gap between programming budgets for the French and English networks is constantly increasing. There is no alternating here: every year the gap gets greater. Last year, the difference was \$76.4 million. Indeed, Radio-Canada's budget was \$69.7 million, while CBC got \$146.1 million. And then Radio-Canada is being told how to present its news bulletins. There are limits to taking advantage of Quebecers.

To say that a nation is defined by its culture and its language is stating the obvious. We will continue to fight relentlessly until we get all the necessary tools to ensure Quebec's cultural development. Quebec's interests cannot be the same as that of a population with a different culture. The best example of this is the recent film released on the events which occurred in October 1970, to which the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine referred this morning. The producer, Pierre Falardeau had to defend his project because a Liberal senator campaigned against it, claiming that Telefilm Canada should not have to support such projects. Political schemers and movie producers do not have much in common.

In conclusion, the mandate given to the Department of Canadian Heritage goes totally against Quebec's will. We urge the government to recognize Quebec's distinct and specific character and we will keep doing so.

(1340)

**Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-53 takes a very realistic and comprehensive approach to the new realities and problems confronting Canadian society. The new Department of Canadian Heritage is an instrument to promote Canadian identity. Multiculturalism is a part of this new department because it helps to define us as Canadians.

The department's programs and policies reflect the changes that are taking place in how we see multiculturalism, in terms of its realities and present problems. At first, the purpose of the policy on multiculturalism was to protect cultural identities and promote exchanges between cultures. However, since 1988, when the Parliament of Canada unanimously—I repeat, unanimously—passed the Canadian Multiculturalism Act, the policy has evolved considerably. In addition to its initial cultural dimension, it now includes a social and economic focus.

[English]

We know that exclusion can be said to present a threat to democracy for it impedes equal and full participation for all. It leads to alienation, a sense of disenfranchisement, and feelings of powerlessness. Alienation leads to political apathy that diminishes both the society and the individual within society.

According to the 1991 census of Canada, 42 per cent of Canadians identify themselves as having at least one origin other than British or French. Canadians with origins other than British or French now make up the majority in every major urban centre west of Montreal. By 2006 the proportion of Canadians who are visible minorities is expected to be between 13 and 18 per cent. In Toronto some estimates suggest the proportion could be as high as 50 per cent.

The increasing diversity of our population presents a profound challenge for Canadian society. In order to avoid conflict and maintain social cohesion, institutions within education, policing, justice, media, health and social services, business, labour, municipal and other sectors will have to redouble their efforts to develop policies, programs and practices adaptive to the reality of Canadian diversity. At the same time public education initiatives are necessary to promote among Canadians the value of their diversity and the tangible benefits that can be derived from it.

[Translation]

The federal multiculturalism policy is dynamic, because it responds to new challenges to society. Today, both policy and programs provide a response to major problems connected with racism and racial discrimination and to the problems encountered by immigrants seeking to become a part of Canadian society.

I want to make it clear that multiculturalism is everybody's business, not just that of members of ethnic and cultural minorities. We all gain if we are able to give everyone a chance to make his way in society and make a full contribution towards building a stronger country.

[English]

Canadians are consistently expressing growing concerns about racism and racial discrimination. In November 1993 Decima Research found that an overwhelming 86 per cent of Canadians have identified racism as a problem in Canadian society. Further, 53 per cent of Canadians believe that racism has increased over the past four to five years. When asked to identify those individuals or organizations that could best promote harmony and acceptance, a majority cited the federal government and/or the Prime Minister. In March, Ekos Research found that over three-quarters of Canadians feel that an

*Government Orders*

appropriate future role for government is to “promote tolerance and understanding throughout Canadian society”.

I would submit that the above facts clearly demonstrate that this bill reflects the aspirations of Canadians and that the programs that it enables respond to the demands of the majority of Canadians. This government is in touch with Canadians.

[*Translation*]

It is in our own interests to try and preserve harmony. A society that understands the value of diversity and is prepared to make the adjustments that are necessary will enjoy an enviable reputation internationally.

(1345)

John E. Cleghorn, president of the Royal Bank of Canada, says that our success as a nation depends on our ability to channel our country’s rich diversity in ways that will make us truly competitive on the world markets. Because of an increasingly globalized economy, Canadian businesses must turn to new markets.

In doing so, they can take advantage of Canada’s abundant resources and a knowledge of other cultures, other languages and other ways of doing business. I would even say that businesses that are able to make this adjustment will have a competitive edge when the time comes to hire, and keep, qualified staff in a tight labour market. Multiculturalism reflects Canada’s basic values. Multiculturalism derives from the general framework of civil, political, social and linguistic rights enshrined in the Canadian Constitution.

[*English*]

These values are consistent with the results of a large national attitude survey conducted in 1991. On questions relating to diversity an overwhelming 95 per cent of citizens believe you can be proud to be Canadian and proud of your ancestry at the same time. Seventy-six per cent believe that multiculturalism applies to all Canadians regardless of ancestry and 73 per cent have close friends who come from different cultural backgrounds.

Canada’s multiculturalism policy is an eloquent testimony to our commitment to upholding the value of diversity as well as setting an example for the rest of the world. As a member of the United Nations our country has signed several international articles affirming our commitment to better the human condition at home and abroad.

The international convention on the elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination obliges us to take positive measures against racial discrimination. The international covenant on civil and political rights addresses the rights of all persons to enjoy their own culture, practice their own religion and use their own language.

Other articles to which we are a signatory such as the international covenant on economic, social and cultural rights and the international convention on the alienation of all forms of discrimination against women speak with conviction about basic Canadian values.

[*Translation*]

It is extremely important for the Government of Canada to act on its commitments and realize the values proposed therein. This is even more important today, when countries throughout the world are turning to Canadians for support. Every day we hear news about civil disobedience, political oppression, public chaos and fighting in the streets. It is a reminder that these societies urgently need a model on which they can base hopes for a better future.

If as legislators, parents and citizens, we can keep working together to improve the Canadian vision, we will have something to offer the world, something of immense value. This brings me back to the real purpose and crucial role of the multiculturalism programs that will be part of the new department proposed in Bill C-53. These programs will help Canadians, whatever their cultural roots, become full members of our society and make a significant contribution to that society.

That is why the lion’s share of the \$22 million worth of subsidies and grants administered by these programs is intended to help new Canadians become integrated into our society and to eliminate racism and racial discrimination throughout Canadian society. We also support efforts to deal with problems such as institutional change and the integration and participation of all individuals in Canadian society.

[*English*]

Let me also emphasize that a great deal of work involving no funding is carried out by officials of these programs. For example, our strategy on diversity and the economy forges important partnerships between government, business and communities to seize the economic opportunities afforded by our diversity. In a similar way we are working with our federal colleagues in the Departments of Justice, Solicitor General, National Revenue and others to accelerate work on the issue of hate crime, the importation and distribution of hate propaganda.

(1350)

Examples of the department’s strategic partnerships include its work with the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, the Canadian Advertising Foundation, the Canadian Association of Broadcasters and the Canadian Bar Association.

As an ideology, multiculturalism reflects the reality that our society is becoming increasingly diverse. It is an ideology based on the shared values of acceptance and mutual respect. It is a visionary statement about the kind of society we are all really working to achieve, one in which each Canadian can realize his



*Government Orders*

or her full potential, economically, socially, politically and culturally.

Bill C-53 provides the government with a framework for action by which it can continue to build a society based on fairness, respect and is inclusive of each and every Canadian.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Colleagues, as a junior presiding officer it is not my place to call the attention of the House to anyone in the gallery. However earlier this day I was fortunate enough to have the visit of a group of young students from Bishop Macdonell School in my riding. I want them to know that if they are in the House, and if I could acknowledge them, I would. I would simply say welcome and thank you for your visit.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, like my colleague across the way I am proud to be a Canadian. Prior to that I was an immigrant. I see no reason to support this bill.

I begin with the idea that this bill is going to save \$7.3 million. I cannot find this anywhere in the document. Rather it appears to me to be a hodge-podge of ideas designed to remove more tax dollars from the pockets of taxpayers.

The bill proposes an omnibus department of government designed to promote a greater understanding of human rights. How often do we hear that? It has not one word about human responsibilities.

The bill proposes a department to promote fundamental freedoms and related values. The term related values has no meaning to most Canadians. What values are related to fundamental freedoms? Could it be that the term may give another minority group another reason to challenge the current charter or human rights legislation because their values are related to fundamental freedoms?

The bill allows for the establishment of multiculturalism, another tax grab. The Liberal government started multiculturalism as a means of using tax dollars to buy votes and it continues to do that today. Canadians, if given a choice between funding special interest groups under the guise of multiculturalism or funding education, health care and social services, would always vote for the essential services, not for a waste of tax dollars.

I recently attended a multicultural event. It was marvellous. We had ethnic food, represented by 14 countries, flags flying for each country, ethnic dancing. It glorified the splendour of young men and women, wearing ethnic costumes, depicting the varied artistic culture of their homelands.

This event did not cost taxpayers one red cent. It was entirely funded by those in attendance. There was a \$20 admission fee. Not only did everyone have a great time, the event earned enough money to assist one group with its building fund. That is my kind of multiculturalism, the proud display that cost taxpayers nothing.

The bill proposes to finance the cultural aspect of the status of the artist. Could anyone please tell me what that really means? It surely sounds like another waste of taxes to special interest groups who are so successful in lobbying the government for hard earned tax dollars. Another example of a catch-all phrase that steals taxes from essential services is the government's intent to fund cultural and heritage industries, including every form of entertainment imaginable.

(1355)

In case the government does not know, we have a vibrant entertainment business in Canada that does not need tax dollars to survive. It is funded on a user pay system. If citizens partake in any event they pay for it. What is wrong with the free enterprise system funding cultural heritage industries? All the user-pay system does is stop wasting tax dollars.

The government proposes that this new super department will oversee sites, canals, battlefields, railway stations and federal buildings of historical importance. I ask, who decides this importance? More special interest groups clamouring for tax dollars? More than likely.

Also the bill proposes to have control of national parks. Since there are national parks in my riding this is of special interest to me. My constituents already know a small band of radicals have the heritage minister's ear. Instead of allowing Canadians access to their national parks he seems intent on doing whatever is instructed by these radicals to prevent our national parks from being open to call Canadians.

It seems the minister listens to those who are already established in the parks and are preventing others from doing likewise. Again, special interests will control this department.

The bill proposes to encourage and promote development of amateur sport. Yet every parent I know that has their child in organized amateur sports like hockey, ringette, baseball and soccer are finding it more difficult each year to afford keeping their child in any of these sports. Again, special interests receive the tax dollars.

The bill proposes to advance the equality of status of English and French with the use of federal tax dollars. The provinces should be controlling language, not the federal government. Again special interests will benefit and all Canadians will pay.

The bill will allow spending tax dollars on state ceremonies and Canadian symbols. May we ask what ceremonies and what symbols, or dare we ask?

The bill also proposes to fund with tax dollars the formulation of cultural policy as it relates to foreign investment. Can anyone in the House tell Canadians exactly what this means? Who knows? I doubt if this government knows either.

S. O. 31

**The Speaker:** My colleague, yes, indeed, you do have some time remaining and I am looking forward to hearing what you have to say after question period.

It being 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5) the House will now proceed to Statements by Members pursuant to Standing Order 31.

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### PERSONS CASE

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today marks a significant event in the history of our nation. Sixty-five years ago on October 18, 1929, Canadian women were formally recognized as persons by the British Privy Council.

This victory came after a lengthy political and legal battle led by the famous five: Emily Murphy, Louise McKinney, Nellie McClung, Irene Parlby, and Henrietta Muir Edwards, five persons of incredible vision and perseverance.

As a result of their work and the subsequent decision, women became eligible for appointment to the Senate. One year later in 1930 Corinne Wilson became the first woman to sit in the Senate of Canada.

Today with 18 women in our Senate, we continue to work toward equality for all persons in every facet of our society. As we keep alive the spirit of the famous five and the legacy of the persons case, Canadians can be proud of our strong history of activism and our continued commitment to social justice.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, in presenting his economic statement yesterday, the Minister of Finance simply added a purple cover to the document presented in 1984 by the Liberals' new mentor, Michael Wilson.

The Minister of Finance is trying to tell us that social programs are the main obstacle to employment in Canada. Nevertheless, considering how much the population has grown in the past five years, we are still some 800,000 jobs short of the 1990 employment level. That is nothing to boast about.

Given this fact, what are they proposing to us? Solutions which the Liberals criticized and scorned every day that the Conservatives were in office. There is a limit to inconsistency

and political expediency. From their first reactions, the people know this limit better than the Minister of Finance does.

[English]

### KYLE BROWN

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Trooper Kyle Brown has been sentenced to five years in jail on charges of manslaughter in the death of a Somali prisoner. The minister of defence is now appealing, demanding a longer sentence for Brown.

The minister and the military establishment knew all along that a longstanding defence existed for Brown who was obeying an order of his superiors, an order that he did not understand to be so outrageous as to be obviously illegal. The Supreme Court last March reaffirmed the availability of this defence.

Furthermore, the minister and the military establishment ignored the well known effect of Mefloquine, a malaria drug administered to Canadian troops in Somalia. Side effects include violent dreams, hallucinations, confusion, anxiety and mental depression. Mefloquine could have precipitated the murder of the prisoner and Master Corporal Matchee's attempted suicide.

The minister of defence should today order the release from military detention of Trooper Kyle Brown pending an investigation into this affair.

\* \* \*

### WOMEN

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, 65 years ago today, women won the right to be recognized as persons.

We in the Liberal Party use persons day to honour the accomplishments of women and to acknowledge that we still have a long way to go. The members across the way in the Reform Party celebrate it by belittling the accomplishments of women.

The member for St. Paul dismissed women in the Liberal caucus, claiming they were given their jobs by the Prime Minister. She must be confused by her own party's selection process. After all, it was the Reform Party that had candidates fill out an application form.

Many women contested nominations in the Liberal Party, far more than got elected. The battle waged by every female Liberal MP was real. The fact they made it through a male dominated and sometimes sexist process must not be diminished.

*S. O. 31*

**PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU**

**Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of the birthday of a very important political scientist in our country's history. Today is the birthday of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, a man who served this country and served this House of Commons for many years, a man who believed in strong national programs. From strong national programs we created a great national will.

I think it is incumbent on all of us in this House today to recognize the great work that he has done on behalf of Canada.

\* \* \*

**WOMEN MPs**

**Mme Maria Minna (Beaches—Woodbine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member for Beaver River suggested in her statement that some women MPs on the government side were not duly elected.

The residents of Beaches—Woodbine are well informed on their democratic rights as citizens of Canada. After six months of meeting and discussing with them the Liberal agenda as outlined in the red book and after six months of evaluating my credentials and preparedness for public office, the voters of Beaches—Woodbine gave me 9,000 votes more than the next closest candidate.

It would seem that the member has forgotten a very important event that took place in October 1993 which is called an election.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT FINANCES**

**Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, year after year, the Auditor General denounces federal mismanagement that costs taxpayers billions of dollars.

Do you want some examples? What about the \$4 billion wasted by inefficient federal management of real property? What about the \$3 billion of contracts issued without bids, when the Auditor General himself says that \$1 billion could have been saved here? And what about the billions of dollars of military spending that is no longer justified today?

Instead of slashing only social programs that meet the needs of the poorest people in our society, the government should first clean up its own yard. Examples of wasted public funds are not lacking. The government should start by properly correcting its poor management instead of blaming the unemployed for all the fiscal problems in this country.

(1405)

[*English*]

**BILINGUALISM**

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of this House to a piece of propaganda masquerading as a news story.

In this story Alliance Quebec wrongly accuses the Reform of wanting a unilingual country by passing a resolution at our assembly calling for the repeal of the Official Languages Act.

This is the type of propaganda the government and its status quo allies use to colour the fact. If the government and its language lap-dogs were to speak the truth they would tell Canadians that the repeal of the act will cost nothing but will save millions.

Bilingualism in Canada is safe through the guarantees contained in the BNA and the charter. Alliance Quebec knows these facts but refuses to state them, not because it fears for the future of French and English in Canada but because it fears the loss of over a million dollars in annual federal funds which it receives through the Official Languages Act.

Speaking of money, the national debt now stands at \$534,738,000,000.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**SPORTS**

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to underline the exceptional performance of Dave Barr, Rick Gibson and Ray Stewart, all from British Columbia, who recently won the Dunhill Cup, in Scotland, which is the world championship for golfing.

I also want to congratulate Montreal's Impact soccer team for its impressive victory in the North American soccer championship.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**WOMEN MPs**

**Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been said by the Reform Party that the road to Parliament was made easier for Liberal women.

I rise to remind this House that Liberals sought the best candidates. They searched for and found top quality people in order to assist the Prime Minister of our government to do what is right for Canada. We were elected because of our commitment

and experience. Women and men in the Liberal caucus know that we have an obligation to serve this country through good government.

Nellie McClung, an early leader of women's rights, is quoted as saying: "Never retract, never explain and never apologize. Get the thing done and let them howl".

Certain members may find that all they know is how to howl, but our caucus, women and men, have joined our Prime Minister in getting the job done.

\* \* \*

#### WOMEN MPs

**Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to point out to those opposite who deride the accomplishments of female parliamentarians over here that I, like others, took all comers at a nomination meeting and I won.

I want to say that I am proud of that accomplishment and very proud of my brothers and sisters whom the Prime Minister had the good sense to appoint. He has the plan, he has the team and he has more female parliamentarians to support him than any other leader in history.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### GOVERNMENT FINANCES

**Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, there was disbelief on international financial markets after the comments made yesterday by the Minister of Finance. The fact is that these stakeholders are simply asking the minister to take concrete action to stop the wasting of public money. Yet, one year after his appointment, the Minister of Finance is still content to merely look at the extent of the damage caused to Canadian government finances.

The deputy chairman of the Deutsche Bank of Canada summarized the concerns of the financial community when he said that the finance minister's pledge to lower the deficit is certainly praiseworthy, but that investors will want to see concrete action. Must we conclude from the finance minister's failure that our 127-year old federal structure is too heavy and obsolete to adequately meet the challenge of improving the situation of government finances?

\* \* \*

[English]

#### WOMEN MPs

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, speaking of howling, it appears I may have struck a chord by questioning the Liberals' nomination not election process. The

normally docile government backbenchers came alive with protests and howls of indignation.

The hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester passionately claimed that she was duly elected in her riding and the hon. member for Edmonton East—I could go on and on today—went to great lengths to show that residents in her riding and no one else chose a Liberal candidate.

(1410)

How about some testimonials from those who were perhaps appointed? How about the hon. member for Etobicoke—Lake-shore? Why is she so quiet? What about York Centre or Hull—Aylmer? Nothing to say? We want testimonials from these people. How about my friend from Saskatoon—Humboldt? Does she have any comments on the nomination?

Were these people appointed or democratically nominated, not elected? Do they subscribe to the views of their Prime Minister who when asked why he appointed more than 14 candidates, male and female, said in a press conference "sometimes Canadians just cannot be trusted to make the right choice".

\* \* \*

#### YOUTH CLUB SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week the Canadian Soccer Association held its youth club soccer championships. The tournament was played over four days and included teams representing all provinces. I had the pleasure of attending the under 15 division in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan and was pleased with both the boys and girls teams in this division representing the city of Scarborough.

The girls under 15 division, the Scarborough West Rouge Soccer Club, finished third. In the boys under 15 age group the national championship was won by Scarborough's Alexander the Great team representing the Greek Canadian community's Olympic Flame soccer club.

These fine young men and women from all across our country have developed their skills and talents at the championship level and deserve the recognition of all the members of the House. Together with their hard work and effort this competition has instilled in them the importance of fair play and true sportsmanship.

I would encourage the Minister of Canadian Heritage to continue his support for our young Canadian athletes.

\* \* \*

#### PAUL BRODIE

**Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Wednesday, October 19, at Government House, Paul Brodie a resident of Bala in my riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka, will receive the prestigious Order of Canada award.

*Oral Questions*

Mr. Brodie is recognized as Canada's ambassador of classical saxophone and founder of the World Saxophone Congress. Having played for 35 years, Mr. Brodie has performed in 2,500 concerts. He has been the guest of high commissions and embassies in England, France, China, Israel, Australia and others. From the small, picturesque community of Bala, Mr. Brodie has travelled to small communities throughout Canada.

In the Parry Sound—Muskoka region Mr. Brodie has been kind enough to share his art with young students by performing in the many schools in my riding. I congratulate Mr. Brodie for winning the Order of Canada and wish him continued success in the future.

\* \* \*

**APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS**

**Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of success for apprenticeship programs in New Brunswick. Over those 50 years 50,000 diplomas and certificates have been granted to New Brunswick students in 65 different occupational areas.

[Translation]

New Brunswick is proud to offer its citizens new occupational programs in the field of high technology, thus preparing them to meet the challenges of the next century. The co-operative efforts of employers, unions, governments and students have had the effect of making occupational training an important element in the province's economy.

[English]

As the demand for highly skilled workers increases in Canada, the future for apprenticeship looks bright. The continued support of apprenticeship programs is not only an investment in youth and an investment in the New Brunswick economy but an investment in the Canadian economy.

\* \* \*

**PATRICK KELLY**

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am hearing concerns from my constituents and have been studying the facts. I would like to add my name to the list of individuals urging the government to take action in the case of Patrick Kelly. Mr. Kelly is the former RCMP officer who was convicted of murdering his wife based on eyewitness testimony.

The eyewitness has since reversed her position yet there have been unacceptable delays in the process which could lead to a new trial. Since the conviction of Mr. Kelly allegations of dishonesty on the part of the investigating officers have also been put forward.

Dawn Taber, the eyewitness who was critical in putting Mr. Kelly behind bars, has rescinded her testimony claiming she lied in court under pressure from the investigating officers.

While the government has called an independent review into the case, I am concerned that the Minister of Justice has yet to give a deadline for the review's completion.

It is imperative that Patrick Kelly receive a speedy review of this conviction in light of these new revelations and receive the justice he deserves.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

(1415)

[Translation]

**GOVERNMENT FINANCES**

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Finance sounded the alarm on the state of federal public finances. He said, and I quote:

We are in hock up to our eyeballs. That can't be sustained.

My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Does he share the gloomy diagnosis of the distressing state of federal finances, as given by his Minister of Finance? Does he intend to take urgent action to kill the deficit?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when you are \$500 billion in debt, you have a serious problem. That is what the Minister of Finance said yesterday, and we are taking steps to remedy the situation by reducing the annual deficit. The objective we clearly stated in our campaign platform was to bring the deficit down to 3 per cent of GDP after three years. We will do what it takes to get there.

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, once again, all we get is words and a rehash of the objectives the government set out in the red book more than a year ago. What we have is a case of total paralysis, as confirmed by the Prime Minister, while his Minister of Finance also told him yesterday that the situation is untenable.

My question to the Prime Minister is this: Does he not realize that after almost a year in power, it is high time that his government decided to act and that what he just said is no longer enough to calm the growing concerns of the financial community?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we brought down a budget in February, and we predicted a deficit of \$39.7 billion. We are confident that at the end of the year, we will be below that level.

At the time, we also predicted that the deficit would be around \$32 billion at the end of the second year and would drop to \$25 billion—the level required to meet our objective of 3 per cent—by the end of the third year. We said, I said so myself as did the Minister of Finance, that we would do what it takes to meet our objectives.

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has been very frank with us, since he just told the House they will do absolutely nothing between now and the budget next February to deal with the disastrous situation his government just disclosed. This is a very serious matter. We have here a clear and flagrant admission of irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, through you I would like to say to the Prime Minister, and to the government that has often asked us for suggestions on concrete measures that the Bloc has been suggesting concrete measures for some time but the government has refused to listen. What is the government waiting for to cut—Here are some concrete measures. Make a note of them, why not. What is the government waiting for to cut the fat out of federal operating expenditures? To eliminate the unconscionable waste caused by administrative overlap? To get rid of tax havens? To abolish the undue privilege represented by family trusts? Those are concrete proposals. Would the Prime Minister care to respond?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the question put by the Leader of the Opposition is a very broad one. He is talking about fat and unconscionable spending, without being more specific, which is exactly what the Minister of Finance is being now. He is talking to committee members. As for family trusts, the problem, as suggested by the Finance critic for the Bloc Québécois, was referred to the committee that is looking into the matter right now, to see if family trusts are paying the taxes they should be paying. We will act on the committee's recommendations as soon as the committee has finished its work.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, when it comes to reducing the deficit, the government is still turning a deaf ear to the various suggestions it receives from all over, including the Official Opposition. The government's only recipe is massive cuts in social programs, at the expense of the poorest people and the unemployed. To do this dirty work, the Minister of Finance is counting on his colleague in Human Resources Development.

(1420)

Why does the Prime Minister refuse to admit that his government is going the wrong way by attacking the poorest people and the middle class with cuts to social programs, when he should first reduce his spending, end waste and duplication and fight tax evasion?

*[English]*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the member would take the time to read the paper presented by the Minister of Human Resources Development he would see that what we are doing is taking some of the money available, not to give it to frequent claimants and so on, but we want to give them the training they need so that they will be able to have a job and have the dignity of working.

Canadians do not want the people of Canada who are unfortunately unemployed to remain on welfare or unemployment insurance. What they want is a government that will use this money to create jobs so they will have the dignity of working. That is exactly what this government will do for them.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, they are putting a purple colour on the Conservatives' blue book, which says that we are in the red. Does the government's inaction in the past year and its inability to attack the deficit not confirm that the federal structure is too cumbersome, paralysed, paralysing and incapable of the downsizing required to reduce the debt crisis?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have faced up to our responsibilities. We were the only political party that put in writing in a red book exactly how we would achieve our objective. The financial community thinks that it is a realistic objective; a deficit of 3 per cent of the gross national product is the level required in Europe for all countries in the European Community to qualify for the new European currency, the ecu.

Right now, I think that not one European country has been able to achieve this level, but we will get there in the third year of our mandate, as we promised in writing in our red book. If you want a copy, I can send you one; I have it here.

*[English]*

**The Speaker:** I am sure all hon. members will agree that we should not be using any props as we go through.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, evidence is mounting that the cabinet is divided on the urgency and importance of reducing the deficit and the debt and this is going to cripple the government's deficit reducing efforts.

Some ministers such as the finance minister appear to recognize and demand more serious and substantive spending reductions. Other ministers such as the Deputy Prime Minister only reluctantly agree to mild spending reduction. The silence from the Prime Minister is deafening.

Will the Prime Minister show some leadership by stating right now whether he supports the Deputy Prime Minister and her free spending colleagues or whether he supports the finance minister in his deficit reduction efforts?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I support the red book.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am seeking commitment from the Prime Minister and the government, not equivocation.

The cabinet and the Prime Minister's resolve to substantially reduce spending is still in doubt. Yesterday I directed a question to the finance minister on this subject but it was the Deputy Prime Minister who intervened. At one time they were both standing until the Deputy Prime Minister stared down the finance minister. I note also that the Canadian dollar dropped yesterday. I do not know if there was any connection.

I ask the Prime Minister, whose position on deficit reduction is the government's position: the Deputy Prime Minister's position or the finance minister's position?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is so easy to receive questions from the Reform Party that everybody wants to get up to have the privilege to reply.

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

**Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** I will read from the red book. Any responsible government must have as its goal the elimination of the deficit. This is our goal.

(1425)

Given the current state of the economy a realistic interim target for the Liberal government is to seek to reduce the deficit to 3 per cent of gross domestic product by the end of its third year in office and we will do it.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the money markets believe that the cabinet is divided and many Canadians do too. If the cabinet does not get its act together we are going to need another aisle in this House with the hard headed Liberals and Reformers on one side and the soft headed Liberals and the Bloc members on the other.

The other evident division in the cabinet is between those who think that tax increases are still possible and advisable and those who know that they are not.

Will the Prime Minister give an unequivocal guarantee that tax increases are not an option for deficit reduction?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of very nice members of Parliament but they want to be re-elected and they do not want to be seen with the Reform Party. That is a very good reason to keep our team together.

We are preparing the next budget at this time. It is the first time since I have been a member of Parliament, and it has been quite a few years, that there are prebudget consultations with the Canadian public. The Minister of Finance tabled documents yesterday. He is tabling more documents today and everybody will be able to have input. There will be a budget and what will

be in the budget will be written after we have listened. If we are consulting it is better not to make up our minds before the end of the consultation. We do not want to laugh at people that way.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the extremely difficult fiscal background described by the Minister of Finance yesterday, we learn that the Canadian Army is presently taking part in an international missile firing competition in Florida.

Canadian F-18s are expected to launch missiles that cost up to \$400,000 each. We are also told that over 60 members of the Canadian Forces—pilots, technicians, controllers—are taking part in this competition called Operation William Tell.

In the present context where the government is about to cut billions of dollars at the expense of the poorest of the poor and the middle class, does the Minister of National Defence not agree that he should immediately put a stop to this shameful waste?

[English]

**Hon. David Michael Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member displays his ignorance about the role of the armed forces. That was obviously seen in the manifesto of the Bloc Québécois in the last election when it called for a 25 per cent cut in defence expenditures and then objected to cuts when they occurred.

With respect to the William Tell exercise this is a normal exercise by the Canadian air force and it involves the firing of live missiles which cannot be done in Canada and can be done under the auspices of a bilateral training agreement we have with the United States. This is nothing abnormal, it is done quite frequently.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, let us put the question to the Prime Minister; he seems to have a lot to say on this matter. How can the Prime Minister of Canada tolerate such squandering at a time when our country is literally on the brink of bankruptcy, according to his Minister of Finance? Should he not be acting to stop the squandering allowed by his defence minister, with his tacit consent?

(1430)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have commitments to other countries. And Canada stands to gain from European forces coming to train in Canada on a regular basis as part of these military exchange programs between allies. There is, as a matter of fact, some controversy about this in Labrador.

*Oral Questions*

So, we have more foreign military training in Canada than Canadians training abroad. This cannot be a purely unilateral affair. We must co-operate with the other forces, and that is precisely what the Minister of National Defense is doing. In the case in point, he is co-operating with the Americans, but when the Belgians, the Germans or other forces come and train in Canada, in one province or the other, we all like to see them spending money in Canada. It helps the Canadian economy.

\* \* \*

[English]

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the finance minister presented a policy paper that in many respects, to be fair, is supportable. One of the minister's points was that increased productivity was key to economic growth. Yet just the day before the Deputy Prime Minister released a report calling for billions of dollars of new gasoline green taxes.

Would the Prime Minister state the position of the government in promoting productivity? Does the government advocate raising taxes or lowering taxes?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I never released any such report.

**Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister knows that every time Canadians go to fill up their gas tanks with \$25 worth of gas, it costs \$12.50 in federal and provincial taxes. Yet through her rather uncharacteristic silence she has implied that even higher gasoline and carbon taxes are possible; she has implied that.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. So that it is very clear to Canadians, will the Minister of the Environment demonstrate her commitment to improving the productivity, as was stated in the paper yesterday, of Canadian business by rejecting any kind of proposed tax grab in the carbon industry?

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I just told the whole House that I never released any such report.

If the member wants to be true to the people of Canada, why does he not tell the truth and admit in the House that the Minister of the Environment in no way released any such report. Stop setting up strawmen so you can try to burn them down.

**The Speaker:** I ask my colleagues to please direct their remarks to the Chair.

[Translation]

**HIBERNIA PROJECT**

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Yesterday, the Minister of Finance announced in his economic statement that the government intends to end subsidies for megaprojects. While the government slashes social programs, it will sink over \$250 million into the Hibernia project this year alone.

If the Prime Minister wants to be taken seriously, are we to understand that his government has now committed itself to not sinking the additional hundreds of millions of dollars required by the Hibernia project?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, several million dollars have already been spent on this project, which will be completed within two or three years. Ending the project now would make us lose all the money already invested. If we had to do it all over again, perhaps we should not have gone ahead. However, stopping now would be an enormous loss. We must complete this project because, when it starts producing oil and natural gas in three or four years, we will be able to recover if not all at least a large part of the money invested so far. We would be very ill-advised to stop now, as these investments will start paying off in two or three years.

**Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has a short memory. He should remember that his party supported the Hibernia project when they were in opposition.

How can the Prime Minister refuse to make a commitment not to invest any more public funds in this very risky venture, when there is no evidence that this project will ever be profitable?

(1435)

[English]

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a minute ago I explained something very simple to the member. There was a lot of investment in that and some of these projects have not produced the results anticipated. It happens like that many times.

At the moment we have invested millions of dollars in that project. The project is scheduled to start producing oil in three years and will be an available resource to be sold abroad or for Canadians to use in Canada.

It would be stupid to stop the project at this time because we would lose the benefits that would come from it. I must tell the hon. member that a lot of the work on the project is being done in Quebec at the moment.



*Oral Questions***HEALTH CARE FORUM**

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the health minister has sent out invitations to the provincial health ministers to her health care forum. There has been no response. The Prime Minister invited the premiers to the same forum and received the same answer.

Just to be sure I called the health ministers. Guess what? They are really not coming.

When will the health minister get it that the most important players do not want any part of this \$12 million boondoggle?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we were committed in the red book to having a forum of that nature. We kept our word. When we introduced the project members of the opposition said that we had to invite some people from the provinces.

The minister negotiated with them. At the beginning they asked to have several representatives. We said that was fine. After that they wanted to have as many as ten. We said that was fine. Some said some premiers would like to be there, that we should let them come. We said yes, yes and yes. If they do not come we are back to square one.

We began with no invitations. We have now invited them and they are not coming. We will just do what we said we would do in the red book, that is consult with the people and maintain good medicare in Canada.

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the provinces pay 48 per cent of health care bills. Private sources pay 28 per cent and the junior partner, the federal government, pays 23 per cent. Why would the major payer accept being a minor player?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if we have medicare in Canada today it is because there was a federal government that took the initiative to have medicare. The fathers and mothers of the program want to keep it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**NATIONAL FORUM ON HEALTH**

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, in a last-ditch effort to convince the provinces to participate in the National Forum on Health, the Prime Minister has written to his provincial counterparts inviting them to attend on a consultative basis. The Minister of Health sent a similar invitation to her provincial counterparts but never received any answers.

How can the government persist in trying to hold its National Forum on Health when it is so obvious that the provinces do not wish to participate in that forum in its present form?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a consultation exercise involving experts as well as other stakeholders. We asked the provinces to make suggestions and we welcomed their proposals. The forum is not a decision-making body. Its purpose is to look at the issue and make recommendations. This exercise is not binding on the federal government nor on the provinces. There are other initiatives involving the provinces, such as the meeting of federal and provincial health ministers.

Again, this is not a federal-provincial program: it is a consultation exercise to get ideas from Canadians. I will not make any decisions; I will simply preside and listen. I invited these people to discuss the issue. I will not be making speeches. I will take note of suggestions made. We will try to take those into account to ensure that health-related costs in Canada do not become prohibitive and to maintain a free health care program for all Canadians.

(1440)

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, at a time when the government is looking for ways to eliminate wasting, does the Prime Minister realize that, in the absence of the provinces, the National Forum on Health will be a totally futile exercise which will cost over \$12 million to Canadian taxpayers?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have the support of all intermediary organizations involved, including the Canadian Hospital Association, the Canadian Medical Association and others, because they realize that in order to have a national plan, we must establish national standards. Also, what works in one province could be used successfully by another. It is our role to find the best possible solutions and discuss them with the provinces. It will then be up to them to adopt or reject these solutions. This is how we intend to proceed.

\* \* \*

[English]

**VIA RAIL**

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Last Friday when VIA Rail announced that it was cutting another 478 jobs, half of them being in Montreal, it stated that it would be done without a cut in service.

Would the minister please explain how VIA can cut 478 jobs and not reduce service to the public? Why is VIA still pursuing a downsizing policy introduced by the Conservative government in 1993?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, VIA is approaching the problems it is facing in the same way as the government. We have problems in operating a service in the country that loses over \$300 million a year and is

*Oral Questions*

supported by taxpayers. The cuts that were announced by and large were about 50:50 as between administrative positions and operating positions.

The hon. member would know, because he has a very definite interest in it, that we are trying to do everything we can to maintain levels of service across the country. It is true that we have made cuts to VIA with respect to personnel. There have been no cuts or even requests put before us for eliminating any of the routes.

We still have another area to look at, that is what happens with the ongoing labour negotiations at VIA. The commitment of the government is to try to maintain services coast to coast with VIA but also to protect the owner of VIA who happens to be the Canadian taxpayer.

\* \* \*

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS OF CANADA**

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Public Accounts of Canada were tabled today. The Minister of Finance included in his 1994 deficit prediction half a billion dollars for the resource allowance tax fiasco. We now find that one of the reasons the 1994 deficit is lower than the minister's original prediction is that the cost of that tax boondoggle was added to the previous year's deficit.

When will the government come clean with the Canadian public and make real, and I mean real, cuts to the deficit rather than use smoke and mirrors to make us think that progress is being made?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to answer the question because we have made real cuts. We made real cuts in our budget of February. We took \$5 of spending cuts for every dollar in taxes. They were real cuts and we will meet our deficit target.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps we should debate real cuts. The government did not stop there. It changed the 1993 accounts to make the 1994 accounts look good. The government reduced the 1993 deficit by \$569 million. It reduced the 1995 projected deficit by \$200 million due to accounting changes, and there is not one penny of savings to the Canadian taxpayer.

What is the reduction in the 1994 deficit that will be dumped on the Canadian taxpayer's lap in coming years by accounting changes that are supposed to be deficit reductions?

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I find it rather interesting the Reform Party again and again quotes Auditor General's reports. Again and again it brings these things up and calls them mere accounting changes. These are accounting changes ordered by the Auditor General.

(1445)

[Translation]

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

While visiting the riding of Saint-Jean, the Quebec Premier announced that Ottawa and Quebec were back to square one regarding the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean, since the agreement in principle between Ottawa and the previous government had not been followed by the operating agreement which was supposed to be signed no later than August 31, 1994.

Is the minister going to confirm that the operating agreement, which was supposed to be concluded no later than August 31, has in fact never been signed and that he must start negotiating with the new Quebec government all over again?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we reached an agreement with the Quebec government. It is dated July 19. It is signed by Mr. Chagnon, the then education minister, by myself and by Daniel Johnson.

This general agreement is still in force. This agreement benefits people in the area by keeping the Collège de Saint-Jean open with a military presence and students coming from the Quebec education system. It would be a great pity if the Quebec government were to indicate now that it does not want to abide by the terms of the general agreement, but I do hope that it will not do so.

Some matters were still to be settled, such as the list of equipment the federal government was to hand over to the provincial government. Obviously, these are still open to discussion. But as far as the agreement is concerned, it is in place and it benefits the area.

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, if I understand correctly, there are still a few contentious issues left. The Bloc would like to make a suggestion. Given the fact that it is increasingly obvious that Kingston College will not be able to accommodate all student officers, is the government going to finally cancel its illogical decision to close the Collège militaire de Saint-Jean?

**Hon. David Michael Collette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as reported in the media, a previous Solicitor General authorized Grant Bristow to attend neo-Nazi rallies and meetings in Germany. However, CSIS and the previous administration did not believe it was necessary to inform the German government of Bristow's attendance.

Has the Solicitor General been provided with an explanation of why the Germans were not informed, and has he accepted this explanation?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a matter, as the hon. member says, that relates to the previous government.

I have sought assurances that the appropriate directives will be followed if any similar occasion arose. In any event, I am also informed that this is a matter which will be commented on by the Security Intelligence Review Committee in the report it is preparing.

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned that all of this is all inclusive in the SIRC report. They may not get that report out before the end of the year.

However, I am pleased that the minister has assured us that this sort of thing will not happen again. I ask if he has given the Germans an indication of Grant Bristow's involvement and a report of the activities.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, neither myself nor CSIS has confirmed that Grant Bristow is an individual who is involved in these matters. The matters in question, as reported last night, relate to events that happened several years ago.

If I am contacted by the German authorities I will be happy to give them assurances that will be appropriate in the circumstances.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment.

In 1987 the Brundtland commission concluded that the wilderness areas in the world today must at least triple if we are to protect plant and animal species and preserve biodiversity on this planet. What action is Canada taking to increase our protected wilderness areas and what role is Canada playing in the global protection of wilderness areas?

(1450)

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for the question and point out that the latest report of Statistics Canada said that 9 per cent of Canada's land was set aside as wilderness. It is short of our goal but certainly moving in the right direction.

We intend in the next few weeks to enact the Canadian biodiversity strategy. We will use this strategy, along with our strategy on expanding wilderness areas, to make sure that Canada is among the first signatories not only to the biodiversity strategy but also among the countries that actually put the strategy in place, working together with the provinces as we will do at the CCME meeting in November.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**COAST GUARD COLLEGE IN SYDNEY**

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which he did not know about in advance.

Students at the Coast Guard College in Sydney are automatically members of the federal public service and have many benefits including room and board, tuition, textbooks and an allowance of \$200 a month. This college competes directly with other educational institutions, including the marine institute in Rimouski.

How can the minister justify spending nearly \$10 million a year to maintain the college in Sydney, when the marine institute in Rimouski and other institutions in other provinces offer the same services? Is this not an example of needless and costly duplication?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will make a point of looking into the situation to which the hon. member refers, but I am sure, given the long history of the Coast Guard College in Sydney and the institute in Rimouski, that offering such services to students in both institutions is nothing new. Probably it was done that way when the Leader of the Opposition was in the government.

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, how can the government justify maintaining a college like the one in Sydney, when it used cost efficiency as the reason for closing the military college in Saint-Jean, the only French language college of its kind in Canada?

[English]

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the approach that the hon. member is taking in linking the activities of the coast guard facilities at Sydney with a facility in Quebec and other facilities across the country is

typical of the kind of approach that the Bloc Quebecois has taken in the House.

We are trying to give the best possible service we can to people that need them. One thing for sure is that what is being done today is very similar to what was being done when the duplicitous leader of the Bloc Quebecois was a member of government.

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

**The Speaker:** I would ask the hon. minister perhaps to withdraw the word "duplicitous". It is a little bit strong in the circumstances.

**Mr. Young:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that word and replace it with one that perhaps the Leader of the Opposition understands: double talking.

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

\* \* \*

#### WEST COAST FISHERY

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of oceans.

In the fall of 1992 the Ministry of Justice dropped 213 charges against poachers on the west coast, one of whom was caught with 30,000 sockeye salmon. When the minister's Liberal friends examined the aboriginal fishing strategy at his request last spring, they conveniently forgot to mention this embarrassment to a favourite program not only of this government but also of the Mulroney government.

Why should we expect a different standard from the current catch of DFO insiders appointed to examine this minister's handling of the 1994 salmon disaster on the west coast?

(1455)

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. If he were serious about seeing constructive improvement in the management of the salmon resource in British Columbia, rather than getting up and asking questions and impugning the reputation of somebody like the Hon. John Fraser, former Speaker of the House of Commons, who chairs the panel that he has called the panel of Liberal insiders, he might do what the president of the Fisheries Council of British Columbia and what the president of the Union of Fishermen of British Columbia did at lunch time today. They sat and had a constructive meeting with me to get something positive done, not just to throw out allegations.

**Mr. John Cummins (Delta, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the former Speaker of the House is hardly independent. He is now an appointee of the government as ambassador for the environment.

#### Oral Questions

The 35,000 member B.C. Wildlife Federation and the 12,000 member B.C. Fishermen's Survival Coalition have joined me in calling for an independent judicial inquiry.

When will the minister acknowledge the growing support for this and act?

**Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is questions like these that test the so-called commitment of the leader of the Reform Party to give due recognition to the honour and integrity of people who have served long and well in the public good of the country. That kind of attack on the former Speaker of the House of Commons is unwarranted and I shall look to see Mr. Manning repudiate it right away.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Yesterday, the minister made light of an unacceptable, insidious and inflammatory statement made by an employee of the Canadian embassy in Japan, namely the academic relations officer. This employee accused Hydro-Quebec, on the basis of an ad that this provincial Crown Corporation had nothing to do with, of fuelling racial tensions between Quebecers and the Mohawks.

Does the minister not realize that, by refusing to call this employee to order, he is in fact condoning a glaring breach of ethics and lack of judgment?

**Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, after this question was put to me in this House yesterday, I asked an official of my department to make an inquiry. Naturally, as the alleged incident took place in Japan, I have not received an answer yet, but as soon as I have, I will gladly follow up on the hon. member's question.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

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

During his speech on the proposed amendments to Bill C-22 the minister stated that the Pearson consortium was seeking \$445 million in damages through the courts. In fact that is his answer to virtually every question we ask.

However court documents clearly indicate no amount has been claimed, only the right to have damages settled by an arbitration tribunal in accordance with the provisions of the airport contract.

Can the minister tell the House why he is continually misstating the facts? Is it because he is trying to scare the public into

*Government Orders*

supporting an immoral, illegal and unconstitutional cover-up of Liberal election strategy gone bad?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we did not get the true face of Reform last week but we are getting it today.

In the documents presented to the court the claim is for some \$172 million but there are third party claims as well. What I said to the hon. member, and what I say to the people of Canada, is that the total amount of claims that have been submitted to Mr. Wright, who represents the Government of Canada in this matter is \$445 million that the deficit cutting Reform Party is prepared to put at risk just to satisfy its little political games.

\* \* \*

(1500)

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

Persons responsible for criminal atrocities may attempt to gain entry to Canada following an exodus of military police and paramilitary personnel from Haiti. In particular, the attachés and the tontons macoutes have been implicated in human rights violations and murders against the Haitian people.

What is the government doing to ensure that these human rights abusers are prevented from gaining entry into Canada?

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his very sensitive question and say two things.

First, those individuals who commit acts against humanity are inadmissible under the Immigration Act. This includes individuals who have been involved with de facto regimes in Haiti since the coups of September 1991.

Second, individuals wanting to visit Canada from Haiti or to make application as landed immigrants need to have security checks. In that regard a list is being compiled of all persons who have been close to all de facto regimes, including individuals who may have perpetrated acts against humanity, so that our officials and our offices may be advised that such individuals are inadmissible.

We are taking every possible precaution to protect society against those who have contributed to acts against humanity.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, before question period I opposed the bill. After question period, realizing we went another \$8 million into debt, I oppose it even more. Now it is \$8.5 million and climbing.

The bill proposes to allow the minister to provide financial assistance in the form of grants, contributions and endowments to any person. If that is not an invitation for every special interest group to bend the ear of the minister and grab tax dollars, I do not know what is.

The problem with that is quite simply that we have no tax dollars to spare. We are spending 39 cents of every tax dollar to fund the interest on our debt, and the government wants to spend some of the remaining 61 cents to satisfy special interests. It sounds like a red book Liberal idea to me.

The bill proposes to allow the minister to establish a Canadian council composed of seven to twelve part time members, including a chairperson, one or two vice-chairs and not more than nine other members to be appointed and hold office during the pleasure of the governor in council.

If that is not an ideal position for hacks, special interests and friends of the government to feed at the tax trough, I do not know what is. At a time when the government will not reduce our deficit spending or debt, the government wants to spend more tax dollars on cronies. The patronage continues.

(1505)

The bill proposes that the head office location of the Canadian council be set by the minister. Are there any bets the chosen location has no relation to the bill but has significant political meaning to the government?

The bill offers the government further excuses to give its political cronies, hacks and high donation buddies ample funds from the public trough and easily allows any special interest group that can successfully lobby the government its turn at the trough.

The bill does not take into consideration the fiscal and financial state of the treasury. The manner in which this tax and spend government will tax Canadians to spend their hard earned

dollars on political favours and to further increase the feeding frenzy of political hacks and cronies for which the government is famous will know no bounds if the bill is passed into legislation.

At a time when the government readily admits essential services desired by Canadians will be reduced, how can it justify further expenditures of tax dollars on the funding of hacks, special interest groups and friends of the minister?

Canadians must now ask whether they support the continuing waste of tax dollars being presented in the bill. I know what grassroots Canadians will say. It would be a resounding no. It is too bad grassroots Canadians could not get constituent representation with members of the government, because the bill would never be tabled for consideration if they would bother finding out. The government prides itself on making the tough decisions without having to ask its constituents for their input. The government has already said it knows what is best for Canada.

With bills like this one Canadians know the government only knows what is best for its friends who will feed at the trough well established by this kind of bill.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the bill describes the central role that the Department of Canadian Heritage will be called to play in the life of Canada and Canadians.

The legislation creates a department which will have responsibilities in the areas of national parks, historic sites, cultural development, amateur sports, multiculturalism and official languages. All those areas have clear links to our identity as Canadians.

I will speak today specifically about the official languages responsibilities of the Department of Canadian Heritage, the English and French languages and the people who speak them that have shaped Canada and helped define its identity. Surely Canada's linguistic duality has its origins in the very nature of the country.

The official languages policies put forward by the Government of Canada since the 1970s are the reflection of a generous and creative vision of Canada. It is a Canada where English and French speaking citizens can feel at home wherever they choose to live. It is a vision of Canada where vital English speaking and French speaking minority language communities can contribute to the economic, social, cultural and scientific life of the country.

In order to translate this vision into reality, federal institutions have become bilingual. It is the institutions that have become bilingual. The government co-operates with the provinces to ensure that our linguistic duality is reflected in the

### *Government Orders*

education system and other services in the areas of justice and health.

The government has recognized that it has a role in enhancing the vitality and development of official language communities from coast to coast to coast, both by supporting the development of their institutions and by supporting their efforts to have their rights respected. It has also worked to promote the recognition and the use of two official languages with a wide range of organizations within Canadian society.

The official languages programs of the Department of Canadian Heritage are designed to provide opportunities for Canadians to appreciate and profit from our rich linguistic heritage and to communicate with and participate in federal institutions.

(1510)

The Government of Canada believes that the great majority of Canadians share these goals. We all know that the Canada of tomorrow is being built in the classrooms of today. Few would doubt the importance of education to any community and of support for minority language education. The federal government works toward the full participation of both language groups in all aspects of Canadian society.

[*Translation*]

These programs do much more than support the vital contribution of official language minority communities. They allow them to contribute to our country's economic growth. For example, recent progress in education for francophone minorities has been a big help in reducing the illiteracy and school drop-out rates, thus raising the post-secondary attendance rate.

The 1991 census revealed that the number of francophones outside Quebec went up slightly in absolute numbers. Nearly 1 million French speaking Canadians, or about 14 per cent of Canadian francophones, live outside Quebec. They are found in all regions of the country and account for about a third of the population of New Brunswick. The largest community in terms of numbers is in Ontario, where almost 1 million francophones live.

Even in my own province of Manitoba, there is a significant number of francophones and a vibrant community. Minority language education is a good indicator of these communities' viability. There are some 660 French language primary and secondary public schools outside Quebec. By ratifying the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in 1982, the federal and provincial governments made commitments to official language communities.

Section 23 of the Charter gives minorities the right to be educated in their own language and to manage their own schools, as just happened in Manitoba. In the Mahé decision, the Supreme Court said that this section is "the cornerstone of Canada's commitment to bilingualism and biculturalism

*Government Orders*

because of the essential role of education in maintaining and developing linguistic and cultural vitality”.

By allowing parents to fully participate in the operations of their school boards and ensuring that together they can turn their schools into truly francophone living environments, we also discourage dropping out and give a head start to several generations of our very young children. That is why the federal government must continue to help the provinces and territories fulfil their constitutional obligations to their official language minorities.

As with any government policy, this policy, its objectives and its implementation may be misunderstood and misinterpreted. Even here in the House of Commons, we hear comments that reflect a misunderstanding of the objectives of the federal policy on official languages. I would like to take this opportunity to clarify certain facts about supposedly imposed bilingualism.

The 1969 Official Languages Act stated that French and English had equal status in all Canadian parliamentary and government institutions. It was revised later to take into account the provisions of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

[*English*]

As a result of this policy everyone has the right to use English and French in Parliament and Parliament must enact its laws in English and in French. Everyone has the right to appear and proceed in the official language of choice before any federal court and any criminal court. The public has the right to communicate with and receive services from the institutions of Parliament and the federal government in either of the two official languages.

English speaking and French speaking Canadians have equal opportunities for employment and advancement in federal institutions. The composition of federal institutions must reflect the presence of the two official languages communities in Canada.

(1515)

The federal government is bilingual so that the citizens do not have to be. Every Canadian has the right to remain unilingual. Universal bilingualism has never ever been the goal of the policy. The B and B commission stated:

A bilingual country is a country where the principal public institutions must provide services in two languages to citizens, the vast majority of whom may very well be unilingual.

The key concept in all of this is that it is the choice of individual Canadians. So much for the supposed enforced bilingualism.

This policy is one that not only reflects what Canada was, what Canada is and what Canada can be. It is an open policy, a policy that reaches out and encourages people to participate in the official language of their choice. In doing so it does not

exclude other groups from participating fully in Canadian life. That is what sets it apart.

[*Translation*]

I could speak for a long time but I understand that I am coming to the end of my speech. It is unfortunate because I had so much to say. However, I would like to close simply by asking all members of the House of Commons to look with their eyes, their minds and their hearts open at this policy encouraging all Canadians to get involved.

**Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, B.Q.):** Madam Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to make a comment on Bill C-53.

With the establishment of the Department of Canadian Heritage, the government only accentuates existing differences. Once again, the federal government ignores the cultural distinctiveness of Quebec by attempting to promote a hypothetical Canadian identity. The minister's mandate is at odds with Quebec's fundamental interests. The Liberal government openly denies the distinct and specific character of Quebec. Moreover, it seeks to reinforce even more the centralizing power of the federal government, at the expense of provincial jurisdiction.

Ottawa will make decisions affecting Quebecers' culture, based on its own priorities. One can imagine what bright future awaits our province. Already, the allocation of smaller budgets is an unfair treatment. Indeed, the discrepancy in the budgets for Radio-Canada and CBC is a blatant example of federal bilingualism. The budget of the English network is more than double that of the French one, this—and make no mistake about that—for an equivalent number of viewers. We are not talking about population but about the number of people who watch television.

For the same public interest program, the English network spends \$58,000, compared to \$34,000 for the French one, in spite of the fact that the number of viewers is the same. This discrepancy is a blatant example of so-called federal bilingualism. When the Liberal government says white it means black. The Liberals talk about bilingualism but they do not provide the same means to French-speaking and English speaking groups. I could go on and on.

(1520)

Considering that the cultural future of a nation is based on its language, we can see that the efforts to promote a Canadian identity will ignore Quebec's own cultural identity.

But there is more. This bill does nothing to correct the government's inconsistency regarding the sharing of departmental responsibilities. On the contrary, it accentuates the existing discrepancies. Why is that? Is it to slow down the process? Is it to increase costs? Maybe. It becomes difficult to understand the inconsistencies of the Liberal government. Are

*Government Orders*

the Liberals creating an administrative monster over which the minister will have no control?

This inconsistency on the part of the Liberal government was also demonstrated with the information highway. Responsibility for policy lies with the Department of Industry, while the Department of Canadian Heritage is responsible for content—in other words, culture.

Both departments share similar responsibilities but differ in their approach to procedures and content. Actually, one is concerned with the framework, while the other concentrates on content. The future seems pretty clear-cut. The Minister of Industry will approach culture in a way that promotes the interests of large corporations and users, at the expense of the creators. Since the Minister of Industry will be responsible for programs and policies, this does not leave much room to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who is to reinforce cultural and social values.

Hon. members must realize that our cultural future is at stake. Both departments will be on a parallel course, without any consultation between the two. To build something you need co-ordination.

The House will recall the lack of consultation when the Advisory council on the Information Highway was established. When appointing the committee, the Minister of Industry failed to include members from the cultural community. The Bloc believes, and we are not alone in this, that culture lies at the very heart of the information highway, and the Bloc Quebecois also believes that jurisdiction over culture and communications is a provincial matter.

Today, Ottawa makes decisions unilaterally. Quebec has been excluded from major decisions, where Canadian cultural interests are crowding out Quebec's distinct identity. Apparently, good government means denying a distinct identity. This has been borne out by the Liberal government. In spite of repeated requests, it has failed to amend its procedures with respect to copyright and intellectual property. The government ignores the major contribution made by authors, creators, performing artists and other parties in Quebec that make this province a living force.

One wonders who, will get his views on copyright across, the Minister of Industry or the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Will it be the Minister of Industry, who prefers the straight copyright system that benefits large corporations, or will the Minister of Canadian Heritage manage to convince his colleague to opt for a copyright system with neighbouring rights. Under this system, author, creator, performing artists and producers all enjoy rights with respect to the future use to be made of their work.

For once, the Liberals will have to get their act together.

(1525)

In this connection, it is a serious mistake to give the Minister of Industry ultimate responsibility for copyright policy. This area should be the responsibility of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who would then have a mandate to propose policies to Cabinet and to table bills accordingly.

Will the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who often says he is powerless to act, have enough political clout this time around to persuade his colleague to avoid total disaster on such an urgent and important matter? Canadian creators have been waiting for a long time.

Last Sunday on TV, the ADISQ Gala was a good example of the work done by Quebec artists to disseminate Quebec culture throughout the province, across Canada, in the United States and Europe. There are no ifs and buts about it: this bill should be revised. In its present form, it contains too many aspects that are inconsistent or poorly defined.

Therefore, the Bloc Quebecois will support the motion moved by the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata.

[*English*]

**Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-53, the bill to create the Department of Canadian Heritage.

This bill is designed to give legal status to the amalgamation of five previous organizations: the Secretary of State, the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship, the Department of Fitness and Amateur Sport, the Parks Canada component of Environment Canada and the cultural broadcasting and heritage components of the Department of Communications.

This new department has functioned well over the past year and reflects the government's commitment toward more efficient and effective government. The Department of Canadian Heritage lays the foundation for the promotion of Canadian cultural heritage and identity which are important sources of social and economic enrichment.

I wish to speak at this time on what I feel to be one of the most important aspects of this legislation, the preservation of Canada's national heritage.

As Canadians we value our freedom, our clean environment, the breathtaking beauty of our natural scenery and the hard work of those men and women who helped make this country what it is today. With this in mind the proposed legislation intends to preserve Canada's rich past and to stimulate a profound concern for ensuring the survival of historic places, artefacts and structures.



*Government Orders*

Inasmuch as these areas and sites represent the very essence of our identity as Canadians, so is the concern that our historic legacy continues to be maintained and that we are motivated to protect our natural resources and commemorate our historic places.

The vast expanse of Canada's environment presents an interesting array of terrestrial and marine ecosystems: the Arctic tundra, the western mountains, the prairies, the Precambrian Shield, the Atlantic, Arctic and Pacific coasts. The environment also includes places and landscapes associated with our human heritage. These historic places, which represent thousands of years of human history and encompass places of work and worship, commerce and culture, evoke all our aspirations and all our values.

For more than a century the Government of Canada has been involved in protecting Canada's outstanding national areas and in commemorating significant aspects of Canadian history. This extensive experience has enabled Canada to be recognized internationally as a world leader in the management of heritage.

Parks Canada as an integral part of the Department of Canadian Heritage is committed to establishing an extensive and comprehensive network of protected heritage areas that fully represent Canada's natural and cultural heritage.

(1530)

Canada's national parks system began in 1885 when 26 square kilometres around mineral hot springs near Banff Station, Alberta were set aside for public use. The Rocky Mountain Park Act of 1887 defined the first parks as public park and pleasure grounds for the benefit, advantage and enjoyment of the people of Canada.

In 1930 the National Parks Act dedicated the national parks to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment and made provisions for their sustained enjoyment for future generations.

In 1917 Fort Anne in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, was set aside as a historic site, followed in 1919 by the establishment of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada. These two significant events set the ground for Canada's system of national historic sites.

Following the second world war the Historic Sites and Monuments Act of 1953 reflected the strong sense of national purpose that was found in Canada. The act provided statutory authority for the designation of natural historic sites as well as a legislative basis for acquiring and contributing directly to the care and preservation of these sites.

As Canadians we appreciate the beauty of the natural environment and the richness of our history. Canadians share this heritage with each other and welcome others to value, respect and learn about it. We celebrate the rich heritage through

national historic sites, national parks, park preserves, heritage railway stations, historic canals, marine conservation areas, heritage rivers and federal heritage buildings as well as historical markers.

These national symbols contribute to our Canadian identity in numerous ways and it is for this reason that I eagerly await the enactment of the Department of Canadian Heritage.

With this legislation Canadians can be assured of the future preservation of Canada's illustrious past.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak to Bill C-53 today. This bill establishes the Department of Canadian Heritage and amends and repeals certain other acts. This bill also makes multiculturalism and the official languages the responsibility of the new department. That is the topic of my address today.

Let me start by repeating what we have already heard from this side of the House. The Reform Party supports the rights of citizens and private groups to preserve their cultural heritage but the Reform Party wants them to do so using their own funds. The Reform Party is opposed to using taxpayers' money to fund multiculturalism.

I am opposed to Bill C-53 because it entrenches multiculturalism, bilingualism and the financing of special interest groups. I have no problem with different ethnic or linguistic groups keeping their culture; I am all for it. As the trade critic for the Reform Party I believe this kind of diversity is one of Canada's strengths in this great country.

New immigrants and second and third generation Canadians help Canada display an outward looking approach to business and trade practices. They do so by maintaining linguistic, cultural and family ties with other countries. Besides speaking English and French, Canadians speak many aboriginal languages, German, Ukrainian, Mandarin, Arabic, and Norwegian, the language of my wife's ancestors.

That is great. I have no problems with this and I have no problem with different groups maintaining organizations to preserve their language and culture. I do not think that government should get involved in the process.

In my riding of Peace River there is a strong Sons of Norway organization which has been in place for 75 years and I have some colleagues who know quite a bit about that. How did it survive before multiculturalism? It did not need federal government grants to survive. It did it on its own initiative.

My riding has a strong French population in the Falher area which has been there since about 1912. These people kept their language alive on their own before there were any federal moneys available to them and they did so by their own hard work.

*Government Orders*

My riding has a German society and a Ukrainian group. All of these organizations were doing fine before the federal government started emptying its piggy bank.

(1535)

My riding also has a Filipino association, an East Indian cultural society and a Scottish society. I suspect that all of these groups will survive very well on their own initiative and according to their own needs when we abandon this very divisive policy we have in place.

This whole multiculturalism process, and some would say not a process but rather a mess, started just over 20 years ago with the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism. Many witnesses appearing before the commission appeared because they wanted to protest the notion of two founding peoples and two nations. They were right.

We in the Reform Party also reject this notion. Canada is a very different country today than it was in 1867. Our new Canada would be a country of 10 equal provinces all with the same opportunities and rights, not one built on two founding peoples.

After all, a country built on two founding peoples in 1867 did not even recognize that the very first people here, the aboriginal people, certainly should have fit into that category. It was misguided from the very beginning. Before the English and French came to this country Indians and Eskimos were the first people here. We have seen several waves of immigration since.

We were all immigrants to this country at one time or another, but we do not need the federal government to promote our culture and languages. We can do it very well on our own.

At the time of the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism, roughly 44 per cent of the population could claim to be of British descent; 29 per cent could claim to be of French descent; another 27 came from other ethnic backgrounds, German, Italian, Ukrainian, Dutch, Polish, native Indian, Chinese, Jewish or East Indian.

People who sprang from stock other than English and French objected to the notion that these two were the most important groups in Canada. They made the point that Canada is a mosaic of people from many different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.

Prime Minister Trudeau announced the official multiculturalism policy in 1971. Many people felt it was meant to diffuse the concerns about official bilingualism in areas where there was absolutely no need for a second language.

Multiculturalism started with a budget of \$3.5 million. The budget has since grown to \$39 million. Of this almost \$15 million is spent on community support; \$5.5 million goes to heritage cultures; and \$6.5 million goes to race relations. Many

proponents of multiculturalism today point to race relations, the last item, as being a worthy area of funding. I would agree.

Racism is a problem in Canada today and there is a role for the federal government to play here. Racism is not a multicultural issue. Race relations is the domain of the human rights commissioner. It is so stated in the mandate of the Human Rights Commission.

The Canadian government should not pay people to be different. This leads to balkanization and divisiveness. Instead of dissolving racism, multicultural funding emphasizes and hardens it. Instead of diminishing separatist strategies, multicultural funding further creates and encourages people to be different.

I know it is not politically correct to state that I am against public funding for multiculturalism but a lot of people in Canada feel this way and they expect their representatives to express their views publicly. These people are not racists or bigots. They think that government has no role to play in funding special interest groups and I totally agree with them. Culture cannot be dictated or controlled by the state. Therefore, I am opposing Bill C-53 proposed here today.

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is certainly my pleasure to rise today in the House to speak on Bill C-53, an act creating the Department of Canadian Heritage.

The purpose of the bill is to effect the establishment of the Department of Canadian Heritage in statute and thereby amend and repeal certain other acts.

The proclamation of the Department of Canadian Heritage Act will be the culmination of a process that began more than a year ago when the department of the day decided to proceed with a wide ranging reorganization of federal government departments. Passage of the bill will fulfil a number of technical yet nonetheless important requirements.

(1540)

First, it allows for the appointment of the Minister of Canadian Heritage and outlines the jurisdictions within which he will exercise his powers and perform his duties and responsibilities. The bill has been drafted so as to promote the minister with the flexibility that will be needed to carry out these responsibilities both now and in the future.

The legislation will also permit the government to assure the status of the Canadian heritage employees and to formalize their transition to a new department. The entire process is consistent with the government's commitment to its employees and respects the principles of existing workforce adjustment policy.

In short, the bill will give the department the legitimate basis it requires to assume the rightful share of the responsibility for implementing the mandate given to the government by the people of Canada.

*Government Orders*

Broadly speaking, the Canadian heritage minister will work for the betterment of our country in matters relating to Canadian identity and values, cultural development, heritage and areas of natural and historical significance for the nation.

Much has been said about the diversity and complexity of the new department that Bill C-53 will start. Certainly it reflects the richness of the activities and the fact that the new department comprises programs from the former and existing departments, namely the Secretary of State, Communications Canada, Multiculturalism and Citizenship, Environment Canada and Fitness and Amateur Sport.

It is easy for some to claim that the department's program areas are disparate and ill matched but this is a superficial assessment. A closer examination will reveal that the department's principal sectors have much in common. Chiefly, they will work together in support of its primary objective which is to enhance our sense of Canadian identity and to encourage the contribution of all segments of society to the growth and vitality of Canadian culture.

Canadians know that this government is committed to fiscal responsibility in all areas of federal endeavour. They can be assured that Bill C-53 is consistent with that over-arching objective and therefore with the comprehensive review of the federal government's objectives now under way.

For those who value the bottom line, they will take comfort in the knowledge that for 1993-94 the Canadian heritage portfolio appropriations total \$2.97 billion, a reduction from the previous year by some \$76.1 million. In addition to these actual savings in money, there will be other longer term efficiencies realized through the regrouping of areas of responsibilities from the various departments through strengthening the linkages between program areas and through the elimination of duplication.

The government appreciates that there are some concerns about the decision to divide the responsibility for broadcasting and telecommunications between Canadian heritage and Industry Canada. There are many valid reasons for so doing. The inclusion of telecommunications in the Department of Industry's portfolio recognizes the increasing role of telecommunications as an important economic generator in the Canadian economy.

On the other hand, broadcasting is more closely related with the identity and cultural Canadian content mandate of Canadian heritage. Strong co-ordination and liaison exists between the departments to ensure that effective management of these two sectors are compatible and will work out well.

In light of responsibilities and the program areas gathered within the Department of Canadian Heritage, the government believes that the passage of Bill C-53 will have far reaching and enduring positive benefits for all Canadians. We are all confident that a detailed examination of the bill by the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage will clearly show this to be the case.

(1545 )

As a society, culture is very important. We are made up of a diverse people. We have two founding nations. We have diversity with the First Nations. Culture is an expression of the Canadian identity. It connects us with our past and projects to our future. It makes for a better life and allows people to express themselves. Therefore I am glad to be here and to participate in this discussion.

It is very important that we use new ideas, innovative approaches, cost saving techniques, yet respect the rights of the workers and see that we have some mechanism to make sure they can fit within the department or be trained for something new.

I am pleased to speak on behalf of this bill.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, B.Q.):** Madam Speaker, Bill C-53 is aimed at establishing a department which would have the following duties, as stated in clause 5, and I quote:

[—] initiate, recommend, coordinate, implement and promote national policies, projects and programs with respect to Canadian identity and values, cultural development, heritage [—]

This bill is unacceptable because it definitely infringes upon an area of responsibility that which must remain under exclusive provincial jurisdiction. It fails to recognize the distinctiveness of Quebec society and provides none of the guarantees required to protect the francophone and Acadian communities in Canada.

René Lévesque, the former Premier of Quebec, used to describe Quebec society as two nations within the same country. This means we are in fact dealing with two majorities, two complete and separate societies trying to get along within a common framework. The fact that we were made into a minority from a numerical point of view does not change a thing. Just as a civilized society will never force a smaller man to feel inferior to a larger one, civilized relations between nations demand that nations consider and treat each other as equals in law and in fact.

What matters today and for the future it that we realize every day more clearly on both sides that this answer has had its day but now a drastic revision of the bill or a completely new bill is urgently required.

The people of Quebec must preserve their collective personality and, to do so, they need unfettered powers, particularly in the areas of cultural rights and telecommunications.

This bill enables the federal government to interfere with cultural issues, because it has the power to make expenditures without the consent of the provinces. This bill fails to recognize the distinctiveness of Quebec society. Quebec is prevented from setting its own priorities, as the federal government sets the budget and makes decisions regarding the distribution of federal

assistance without taking into consideration the basic needs of Quebecers.

A similar line of reasoning culminated in the 1976 white paper by Dr. Camille Laurin—who was again reelected in the riding of Bourget—and became the Quebec policy on cultural development. During its first mandate, the Lévesque government demonstrated that Quebec could support its own cultural development. In a context of political and economic subordination, the cultural life of a people is weakened.

On October 12, in Paris, the federal Minister of Foreign Affairs said that culture will become one of the priorities of the Canadian foreign policy. The daily *Le Devoir*, in its edition of October 13, 1994, mentioned the meddling of the federal government: «Cultural relations will be, along with political and economic affairs, one of three pillars of the Canadian foreign policy, that the joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate has been mandated to review».

(1550)

The cultural services of the Canadian embassy in Paris will benefit greatly from this change of direction. In this case, Ottawa is making a complete turn around. We know that Conservatives had decided to sell the large building the embassy is using on the Esplanade des Invalides, in Paris. The Liberals have now decided to give the building a new lease on life. The other federal institutions currently leasing offices in Paris, like Telefilm Canada and NFB, will move out of their present accommodations and into this building.

This is only a first step. Next year, the building, probably worth \$30 million, will be renovated from top to bottom. The improvements will cost approximately \$2 million.

This recent example shows that the federal government is trying to dilute Quebec culture in a pan-Canadian cultural identity based on bilingualism and multiculturalism.

In the past, every Quebec government, even the Liberals, claimed exclusive power over cultural matters. Why such useless overlapping? Overlapping jurisdiction in the management of cultural programs automatically leads to confusion and dissatisfaction.

In 1992, Mrs. Liza Frulla, the Quebec Minister of Cultural Affairs in the former Liberal government, said this to the Standing Committee on Culture: “Federal programs are developed in an essentially Canadian perspective. Quebec must constantly be on guard to ensure that it gets and keeps its fair share. The same is true of federal legislation and regulations. The CRTC ruling on French song quotas in broadcasting and

### *Government Orders*

ongoing negotiations regarding the federal bill on the status of the artist are cases in point”.

During this period of recession, Canadian taxpayers must pay tremendous amounts of money to maintain this overlapping jurisdiction over cultural matters. The Bloc Québécois is committed to honouring Quebec’s cultural priorities.

First, the Bloc Québécois will make sure that federal actions are consistent with the main orientations of Quebec culture. Second, the Bloc Québécois will also demand that Quebec receive its fair share of federal spending on the major cultural institutions, such as the museums, the National Film Board and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Third, the Bloc Québécois will also make sure that cuts at the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation do not have a negative impact on the French network and, in particular, on Quebec artists. Fourth, the Bloc Québécois will also ensure that the Quebec cultural milieu receives its fair share of grants from federally subsidized organizations, such as the Canada Council and Telefilm Canada, as well as program resource envelopes.

The arts, culture, heritage and communications must be the four cornerstones of Quebec’s cultural policy. The ultimate goal of this policy must be to ensure the development of Quebec’s cultural and social identity through the introduction of conditions conducive to artistic creation. Our goal must be the distribution of creators’ works, access by individuals to culture, the growth of cultural industries, the preservation of our heritage, and finally the development of communications.

On March 14, 1994, *La Presse* reported that a recent Gallup poll asking Canadians their opinion of bilingualism found that a small majority of them, 54 per cent, thought that official bilingualism had been a failure in Canada.

I will conclude with René Lévesque’s thoughts on what it means to be a Quebecer. In his view it means, above all else, and indeed on occasion to the exclusion of all else, that we have an attachment to this particular corner of the world, the only one where we can be fully ourselves, and that we know in our hearts that Quebec is truly the only place we can call home.

Being ourselves, according to the former premier of Quebec, consists essentially in maintaining and developing a personality that has lasted for three and a half centuries.

(1555)

We cannot enforce this vital difference. That has not been possible for some time now.

For all these reasons, I support the motion by my hon. colleague from Rimouski—Témiscouata proposing the following amendment:

*Government Orders*

That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "That" and substituting the following: "Bill C-53, An Act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other Acts, be not now read a second time [—]"

[English]

**Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville—Milton, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to take part in the debate on the bill to create the Department of Canadian Heritage.

The proposed legislation is a technical measure that officially recognizes a departmental structure that combines official languages, Canadian studies, native programs and state ceremonies from the former Department of Secretary of State of Canada. It combines arts, heritage, cultural and broadcasting responsibilities from the Department of Communications. It brings in multiculturalism programs from the Department of Multiculturalism and Citizenship, amateur sports from the Department of Health and Welfare Canada and Parks Canada from the Department of the Environment.

At this juncture in our nation's history, with forces that are trying to dismantle this entity we call Canada, and with technology changing the borders of the world, combined with the increasing diversity of our population at the same time that dramatic changes are occurring within mature economies throughout the world, I feel it more important than ever to have a department such as Canadian heritage.

The department, although only a year old, has already begun to face up to the dramatic changes that Canadians are facing. The Secretary of State for Multiculturalism has already recognized the daunting task of nation building in a culturally diverse nation, reconciling that cultural diversity with national identity and the overwhelming need to maintain national unity.

Another important aspect of the new department is development of both cultural and heritage property. The Minister of Canadian Heritage recognizes the importance of new technologies and the burgeoning information highway. The minister also understands that this information explosion will have important ramifications for Canadian artists.

The Department of Canadian Heritage is of the utmost significance to Canadians. Its programs are inextricably linked to our everyday lives and their relevance, be it cultural or economic, is felt by each and every one of us.

I believe that the new department embodies the democratic principles that are inherently Canadian. Canada is a nation forged on the principles of respect for and use of its two major languages, of respect for cultural diversity, of respect for the traditions and contributions of its aboriginal citizens and the fundamental underlying respect for basic human rights and values.

Another major sector of the department which should not be forgotten is Parks Canada. Parks Canada commemorates, protects and presents, both directly and indirectly, places which are significant examples of Canada's cultural and natural heritage in ways that encourage public understanding, appreciation and enjoyment.

The economic activity in tourism generated by the department's operations are of significance to many local economies throughout the nation. Our parks service has been at the forefront of efforts for innovative partnership arrangements with private and not for profit enterprises in carrying out its mandated responsibilities.

In closing, the Department of Canadian Heritage encompasses elements that set us apart from the rest of the world with wide ranging concepts that are truly Canadian: cultural development, official languages, multiculturalism, and human rights.

With these principles in mind, I eagerly anticipate the enactment of this legislation.

(1600)

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage and to amend and repeal certain other acts.

On October 18, 1994, as we are about to celebrate or lament the first anniversary of the election, because that was when the Liberal government came to power, we have to take a look and say: "What is this Liberal government trying to do?" Here we are 12 months after the election, the first time that the Liberals have been in power after nine years. We would have thought that they were bursting at the seams with new ideas, new policies and new philosophies to get this country back on track, bring the deficit under control, create jobs in this country and we find that we have another of a long list of reorganizations that was started by the previous Prime Minister who led a party that is no longer even represented in this House. We can only assume how well the Canadian people endorsed the idea.

Let me just quote Bill C-46, reorganization of the Department of Industry, Science and Technology to change its name to the Department of Industry; Bill C-47, reorganization of the Department of External Affairs into the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade; Bill C-48, reorganization of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to the Department of Forestry and Department of Natural Resources; Bill C-49, reorganization of the Department of Agriculture into the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food; Bill C-52, reorganization of the Department of Public Works into the Department of Public Works and Government Services; and now we have Bill C-53; a long list but not I am afraid an impressive list from a government that in its first year we would have thought would bring forward some serious policy.

*Government Orders*

As I mentioned these are strictly holdovers from the previous government. I would like to ask the government of the day, the Prime Minister of the day and all these ministers of the day when we are really going to get down to the business of running this country. The next election is going to be looming long before the 1997 date that we had anticipated if they keep up this speed.

The hon. Minister of Finance as we speak is talking about his new paper, creating a healthy fiscal climate and economic and fiscal update. Yet all the other ministers can talk about is reorganization and renaming their departments.

We really do want to attack this gross budget deficit that we have and the horrendous debt that we have accrued. I read in the transitional part of the bill, clause 9(1), that nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the status of an employee who immediately before the coming into force of this subsection occupied in essence any other position in all these other departments that are being renamed.

We have gone through all this for nothing, just simply nothing. There is no effort, attempt, or serious recognition by these departments. If they are going to reorganize surely this would be the time when they would seriously review everything that is being done by their departments.

The Minister of Human Resources Development tabled a document a couple of weeks ago telling us how he was going to review all the programs by the department under his control. What did we end up with? It was hardly even rated a discussion paper as Canadians still wait for the government to produce serious policy on how it is going to handle the reorganization of the major programs that we give to Canadians. As we speak, as I mentioned, the Minister of Finance has given us another fluffy warm statement that contains nothing, just nothing, about what he is going to do to accomplish his timid objective of bringing the debt down to \$25 billion by 1996–1997. I have to admit I am at a loss that this government cannot do more.

(1605)

The previous speaker talked about the great and wonderful things this department is doing. One of them of course is (a) under clause 2, the promotion of a greater understanding of human rights, fundamental freedoms, and related values. The Minister of Justice under his Bill C-41 wants to bring hate crimes or sections of our community that many people find abhorrent. We are not going to protect them with additional rights because the Minister of Justice wants to bring in these.

I am questioning why the Minister of Canadian Heritage is also responsible for doing the same thing. How many civil servants are thinking and working and spending our taxpayers' dollars trying to bring forth policies that Canadian taxpayers do not want?

Next is (b), multiculturalism. We in the Reform Party say that a Canadian is a Canadian and is equal from coast to coast. With this policy of multiculturalism the government feeds and channels large amounts of money to individual groups in our society to keep us separate and apart, yet at the same time hoping we will all come together. I find this mind boggling. If we can offer any advice to this government then surely it would be to abolish this whole idea of multiculturalism and start talking about Canadians being equal from coast to coast. Everybody is the same.

It goes on to the arts including the cultural aspects. These are nothing new and surely we could review and save many millions of dollars.

The public accounts were tabled this morning. I have not had time to go through them. I will. I have not had the time. I have had only had a few hours and there is a large amount of money, \$165 billion, spent by this government last year. We will be going through that. We will find there are many instances where this government is wasting taxpayers' money ad infinitum. We can quite easily tell the Minister of Finance where he could cut.

I remember several months ago in this House we raised the point that the Department of Heritage gave a \$10 million grant—I beg your pardon, it was a smaller grant—to a conference in Vancouver that was racist. Because of the fact that we raised the issue the minister of heritage withdrew the grant.

We are paying these ministers to do the job and I do not think they are doing the job. They bring no policy. They bring no fresh ideas. Therefore I find that this whole idea of reorganization to accomplish nothing is totally abhorrent and a waste of taxpayers' money.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this debate today on Bill C-53 to create the Department of Canadian Heritage.

*[Translation]*

I must say that I certainly do not agree with what I have heard the Bloc Quebecois members say earlier today. It may come as no surprise to you, but allegations were made to the effect that, by amalgamating three or four departments into a single one, the federal government was attacking provincial powers. That is nonsense! As if it made a difference to have one minister accountable for three or four departments instead of one Secretary of State and different ministers, in terms of attacking these powers. That is absurd! And the people of Canada, particularly those living in Quebec who have heard these remarks made by Bloc Quebecois members, must know the truth. They must be told that what these members said is not true. I have to use parliamentary language even if I disagree with my colleagues opposite.

*Government Orders*

(1610)

*[English]*

I have also heard the Reform Party say that it is wrong to group those ministries together in an effort to save taxpayers' dollars. I really do not understand the logic of the Reform Party on this one. Of course that is true of most things Reformers.

The Prime Minister reduced the size of cabinet. I remember there were as many as 44 ministers in the last cabinet. There were so many of them that the area outside the west door looked like a used car lot with all the limousines there. Our Prime Minister cleaned that up. When he was sworn into office he named 22 ministers. He cut it down to size. When you cut it down to size you have to unite the departments under one minister in an effort to save money. That is what the Prime Minister did.

The people in the Reform Party pretend to be frugal. I know that sometimes when you pretend to be frugal there are allowances that make it otherwise. Shall I say that sometimes the suit is a little different from the reality in that particular party.

The fact still remains that the Prime Minister produced very positive initiatives.

*[Translation]*

We have cut spending. We have cancelled projects, although we have not yet been able to get rid of the aircraft bought by Mr. Mulroney, the former Prime Minister. We have implemented the Gagliano plan to cut costs here in the House of Commons. And the list goes on. Just today, as we speak, the Minister of Finance is indicating ways by which further savings could be made.

*[English]*

There are the people across the way who say that this is an attack on provincial autonomy or some such thing. That is the usual diatribe as indicated very eloquently by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister in her usual forthrightness and eloquence. She indicates of course that this is complete and utter nonsense. How correct she is. We do need a Department of Canadian Heritage.

I want to tell members something. Last week I had a meeting in my riding with a group of constituents in an effort to preserve what is known as the Sir John Johnson manor home. Sir John Johnson is one of the pioneers of this country. His body is buried in the eastern townships of Quebec. He was the leader of the United Empire Loyalists who came to Upper Canada from the Mohawk Valley of New York in 1784. He brought with him the community known as the United Empire Loyalist refugees. Remember the word refugees. That is what they were known as then.

Today the Department of Heritage owns that building, the building of one of the founders of this country. You certainly

could call Sir John Johnson the founder of Ontario without contradiction. After all he established a colony there in 1784. He personally owned lands in that area. The John Johnson manor home belongs to the Department of Canadian Heritage through what used to be known as Environment Canada Parks Service. That has been amalgamated into that department.

We had a meeting the other day with officials of that department, recognizing the budgetary constraints, to see what we could do to bring the community together with Heritage Canada to save that structure. What do we get from people in the people across the way? People in the Reform Party say that a national treasure like that should presumably be disposed of and the people in the Bloc Quebecois say there is no role at all for the federal government to preserve national heritage and significant sites.

I see them nodding in approval as if there were no such things as founders of Canada. They have a lot to learn. I suggest they spend some time in my constituency, or in their own, speaking to constituents who know better, who know the truth. They know that the national historic sites belong to all of us as Canadians. I feel there is a role for the Government of Canada in this kind of thing.

(1615)

At any rate, the people of Canada through their government already own these assets.

*[Translation]*

And the same holds true for Fort Frontenac and other structures elsewhere in Ontario and Canada, monuments and historical sites that belong to the people of this country through the Department of Canadian Heritage.

I cannot understand and never will understand this attitude of the hon. members opposite, the Reform Party extremists who advocate getting rid of everything because the people of Canada are not entitled to their heritage, their buildings, their monuments, as well as those from the Bloc Quebecois who claim that Canada no longer exists as we speak.

No, I disagree with both positions held across the way. I for one am very attached to the history and heritage of our country. As the member of Parliament for Glengarry, this high place of Canadian history, I must at least be an amateur historian. That is part of the heritage of my riding.

*[English]*

It is the heritage of the great people of that area. I see Canadians of Scottish origin who came to Glengarry, and the mix they have had with the French Canadians who came shortly afterwards, and also the Irish who came in the 1840s and 1850s. Those three groups together created the area which I now have the honour and privilege to represent.

*Government Orders*

The parliamentary secretary just said very eloquently: "That is what Canada is all about". She is right.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, B.Q.):** Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on this bill to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

On reading the bill, I felt that I sensed Pierre Elliott Trudeau's ghost reading over my shoulder. This bill contains everything that has characterized Canada's federal system, especially since the Trudeau years. First of all, Quebec's identity is diluted. At the same time, an effort is made to create a culture and a heritage that exist nowhere but in the minds of those who created this artificial federal country, Canada.

The bill says that the Department of Canadian Heritage was created to instill in Canadians a deep feeling of identity and belonging based on bilingualism and multiculturalism. Well, there is quite a long way to go.

Here are a few statistics on bilingualism, because you might have lovely images, high-sounding speeches, but there is nothing like reality to help you understand. Statistics Canada's figures, which should not be challenged by the government or other interested parties, show the assimilation rate of francophones in Newfoundland was 24.7 per cent in 1986 and 55.3 per cent in 1991. What a success! In Prince Edward Island, it was 42.6 per cent in 1986 and 47.6 per cent in 1991, an increase of 5 per cent. These are signs that bilingualism, at least the model that has been proposed, has not worked very well.

I shall give another example. In Nova Scotia, the assimilation rate was 31.8 per cent in 1986 and 41.1 per cent in 1991, an increase of 9.3 per cent. At that rate, in the time it takes to create the Department of Canadian Heritage, there will be no French-speaking minority left in the rest of Canada.

The second element is multiculturalism. Multiculturalism, which is as difficult to pronounce as it is to understand, is a product of the thinking of the Trudeau years.

(1620)

To support this statement, I will quote Claude Corbeau, the rector at the University of Quebec in Montreal, who does not boast about being a Quebec separatist. In his policy report, he said that "multiculturalism may marginalize Quebec's identity". This is a rector at a Quebec university who popularized a certain image of Quebec's culture and reality.

His reasoning is not so hard to understand. Let us look at the areas that will come under the purview of Canadian Heritage. This is duplication country. On that there can be no compromise from Quebec. These are not minor sectors; they are of vital importance to Quebec.

The arts, heritage, culture, broadcasting are all in there. These sectors are not purely economic. It is a matter of survival. In broadcasting, for example, Quebec even created Radio-Québec, not yesterday but in the 1940s under Duplessis. Since then, we had to fight for every inch, while the Supreme Court, which always leans on the same side, kept telling us that we had no control over this important cultural element.

Culture gives us another good example of duplication, as we have two stakeholders in cultural matters in one country. We heard earlier the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell tell us about the Canadian people and therein lies the problem. As long as we do not recognize that the Canadian Confederation was founded by at least two peoples and by the Natives who were here before us, as long as we do not recognize the equal value and contribution of these founding peoples, we are developing what I would call an utopia, the utopia of the Department of Canadian Heritage. Try to find another country in the world where you have to qualify the word "heritage" by adding "Canadian".

Have you heard about the department of Norwegian or Swedish heritage? A simple, normal, natural country would not feel the need to add anything to "department of heritage" as it should be understood that it is that country's heritage. The problem is that, in Canada, people never realized that there are in fact two countries.

There is another provision explaining the department's role. It says that the department is to develop and offer programs which support a strong sense of identity among Canadians. But you cannot force a sense of identity on people. Let me give you a few examples which show why Quebec cannot really identify with the rest of the country.

During the war, when the referendum on conscription was held, 96 per cent of voters in my riding of Kamouraska opposed that measure. That response pretty well reflected the overall results for French-speaking people in Quebec. In spite of that strong opposition, the federal government went ahead and imposed conscription. You will have to talk about Canadian heritage for a long time and show pictures of those who died overseas before you can convince us, considering that we did not even want to go to war. This is not to say that we overlook the contribution made by veterans, but the fact is that this episode deeply affected people.

There is another episode which also deeply affected people. In this case, it is the Liberals and in particular the current Prime Minister who are responsible. I am referring to the 1982 unilateral patriation of the Constitution.

The government can say what it wants about a department established to promote a strong sense of identity among Canadians, it can try to force it upon us, but this will not work. As long as we are not accepted for who we are and as long as our



*Government Orders*

signature does not appear on the Constitution, the government cannot expect us to promote Canadian heritage.

Let me give you one last example which is of particular interest to me. In the seventies, the community of Forillon was expropriated to create a federal park. Today, that park is a good tourist attraction for the region, but I can tell you that back in the seventies, those who were forced to move did not develop a strong sense of Canadian identity, nor would they have seen the need to establish a department with such a mandate.

There are plenty of sectors which relate to the French reality in Quebec and in North America.

(1625)

We cannot be forced to accept that as a model for all of Canada. Quebec has its own identity, which must be recognized by Quebecers, by Canadians and by our society as a whole because of our decent contribution to it.

To conclude, we are against the establishment of a Canadian Heritage Department because this would be a constant negation of the exclusive jurisdiction needed by Quebec to ensure its own cultural, economic and social development. In order for Quebec to contribute to the richness of North American life, its needs must be met. As long as the Canadian government does not recognize and acknowledge this reality, francophones in North America will continue to insist on ensuring their survival.

Today, the proposed Canadian Heritage Department is yet another proof for Quebecers that the only way to ensure their development is to have their own country.

**Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this bill to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

This is a technical piece of legislation that formalizes the structure and the sharing of departmental responsibilities implemented when our government took over.

However, as several of the previous speakers pointed out, this bill refers to fundamental areas over which, within the federal government, the minister will have jurisdiction. These areas include, for example, culture, national identity, official languages, national parks, multiculturalism, etc. During the few minutes I have, I want to address one of these areas, the issue of culture.

Some of our colleagues opposite are questioning the legitimacy of the role played by the Canadian government where our culture and our cultural development are concerned. By arguing that the federal role is not legitimate, they are questioning the bill's rationale. Unlike them, I believe that this role is crucial and has been tremendously beneficial to our country and all the regions, especially Quebec.

Culture is not an exclusive jurisdiction; it belongs to everyone. In this sense, and despite all the constitutional exegesis put forward by the Official Opposition, the Act of 1867 does not give one level of government more jurisdiction over culture than the other.

Cultural development concerns the provinces; it concerns the federal government; it concerns all municipalities, professional groups, the creators themselves of course, as well as the cultural businesses, the volunteers and the private sector. Finally, culture is also a question of individual choice, because if each and every one of us is the product of a specified cultural environment, the creation of a work of art, just like the decision to appreciate this work of art, to read it, to listen to it, to watch it, always results, in fact, from an individual choice.

I sincerely believe that, in order to offer a vast, fair and wide array of choices, we need a large number of cultural development officers and governments which play their roles. The goal of the federal government in this area is to ensure that the Canadian artists, creators and cultural businesses can work and that Canadian citizens have access to their productions.

One of the great ironies of this debate in which the opposition forces us to engage is that some people feel that we have to apologize for having public policy objectives that are so normal—to use an adjective of which the opposition is very fond—for there is nothing in these objectives that is unacceptable or threatening to anybody, especially not to the province of Quebec.

It is also ridiculous that we should have to defend ourselves against allegations that we are ignoring the cultural distinctiveness of Quebec or of other regions in our country. Ottawa plots Quebec's cultural demise? This could have come from the *Union nationale* in the Duplessis years. By the way, Duplessis had nothing but contempt for culture.

(1630)

The federal government, an agent of cultural standardization imposed by a ruling group against the wishes of the powerless? These sound like the cries of a people oppressed by one of those totalitarian regimes recently condemned by history. The Department of Canadian Heritage, a machine used to create an official culture? If it were true, we would all be trembling, starting with the creators of this country who do not seem to see this as a serious threat. If we look closely at this issue, how can we sum up the federal government's intervention in cultural matters over the few decades in which it has played an active role in this area?

The fact is that several generations of creators and performers from Quebec have produced and presented their work to the public through institutions created, managed or funded by the federal government. Let us just mention Radio-Canada, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, Telefilm Canada, the National Arts Centre or the department whose minister is

*Government Orders*

responsible for these institutions before the House, namely the Department of Canadian Heritage.

As far as I know, half a century of efforts by those institutions, of support and assistance programs for artists, publishers, museums, producers and the sound recording industry did not hinder the profound originality of artists in Quebec, on the contrary. Those efforts nurtured and developed their creativity, and their works gained exposure not only in Quebec, but also in the rest of Canada and abroad. In short, those programs and institutions have been important contributing factors in the cultural vitality of Quebec, and all Canada can be proud of that.

The works of the likes of Michel Tremblay, Jacques Godbout and Denys Arcand did not lose any of their Quebecois identity for that. It is absurd, sad and distressing that our colleagues across the way cannot understand that what is done in Quebec can also be considered Canadian.

Of course, the federal government must look after Canada-wide, interprovincial and international aspects, but that responsibility complements those of other levels of government. In reality, except in sectors where it has a clear constitutional jurisdiction, like copyright, federal action is limited to cultural products with an interprovincial or international scope like broadcasting. The federal government is also active in the promotion and sharing of cultural treasures outside provincial or national boundaries.

For art lovers, the names of Emily Carr, Alex Colville, Tom Thomson, Geneviève Cadieux and Jean-Paul Lemieux bring to mind landmark works that gained international recognition. Should we be satisfied with saying that one belongs strictly to British Columbia, the second only to Nova Scotia, the third to Ontario alone and the last two to Quebec? They are also Canadian artists.

That is why Canada created the National Gallery and supports a country-wide network of museums and museum-related institutions. That is why Canada encourages artists to attend schools of higher learning like the National Theatre School of Canada and that is why Canada supports artists who get to perform across Canada and abroad and who even reach international fame.

(1635)

In a world-wide marketplace where artistic recognition as well as economic profitability is often decided abroad, the Canadian government has a mission to accomplish. The international free trade negotiations gave us a good example of the role played by our country and of the complementarity between this role and that of other levels of government.

When it negotiated the cultural exemption in the free trade agreements with the United States and Mexico, Canada not only assumed its responsibility but also maintained the responsibilities of the provinces towards their own artists and cultural industries.

Therefore, I would say that the Department of Canadian Heritage is a basic institution if we are to carry on with our cultural development which has given such excellent results until now and which should be sustained by the federal government and the provinces. If we do not provide ourselves with the necessary tools to carry on this mission, we are virtually abandoning a responsibility which has proven to be a most profitable one for Canadians.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** 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 Honourable Member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve (Mr. Ménard)—Defence Industry Conversion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to Bill C-53. I do so for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the inclusion of a royal recommendation.

This provision allows the government to spend money implementing the bill. If the bill is meant to streamline government operations, why is there a need to spend money in order to save money? How much will this cost and will it really save tax dollars? We do not have the answers to these important questions. These are vital matters for future debate.

I have chosen today to focus my remarks specifically on how the bill relates to official languages. I would like to preface my comments by clearly stating that the Reform Party in no way discourages individual bilingualism. Unfortunately the bill will legislatively entrench something we do not believe in. I am speaking of the holus-bolus financing of any group which claims to have as its mandate the furthering of official languages in Canada.

While we support the efforts of these groups, we believe they should be self-financing. With health care, unemployment and welfare programs in jeopardy due to a lack of funds, how can we continue to spend millions promoting something as divisive to Canadians as official languages?

This year alone the Ministry of Canadian Heritage is poised to give away over \$31 million of hard earned taxpayers' money to these special interest groups. Not only are many of the grants of questionable value, the real travesty is that there is no way of determining how the money is used.

*Government Orders*

The government appointed watchdog of official languages programs and policies is the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages, which meeting I just left to attend this one. However that committee has openly stated that its mandate does not include spending. In fact the committee has twice voted down motions which would have resulted in comprehensive studies on how much money, such as these grants, is actually being used.

This brings me to section 88 of the Official Languages Act which will be amended by this bill. This section refers Ministry of Canadian Heritage reports, including spending estimates, to the standing joint committee for review. As I have already stated, this committee has neither the will nor the intestinal fortitude to conduct any meaningful review.

(1640)

I make this statement not out of any sense of malice toward the committee but because of what I experienced during my time in it.

For example, when I proposed a motion to study all official languages' spending, I was greeted with scorn and distrust. To quote one of the hon. Liberal members, "This motion"—meaning Ringma's motion—"is inflammatory and illegal and it calls national unity into question. The member should be ashamed of acting like this and trying to divide the country". What nonsense.

I have sat on this committee since its formation under the auspices of the 35th Parliament. It has only issued one brief report to Parliament, which was more of a summary than a report, and it has not submitted even one recommendation to the House. In fact, my research shows it did not issue a single recommendation during its last two years under the 34th Parliament.

Given these facts, I have to ask how we can even consider legislatively entrenching such an important duty to a committee that is really more of a lapdog than a watchdog.

Another area of concern is the ministry's mandate for official languages as spelled out in the bill we are discussing. The mandate calls for the advancement of the equality of status and use of English and French. Under this mandate the ministry will spend \$245 million this year on official languages in education. The constitutions of 1867 and 1982 clearly state that education is a provincial responsibility. Why then is this ministry spending a quarter of a billion dollars in this area of provincial jurisdiction?

Similarly, the ministry will spend \$65 million to promote official languages. Again I have to ask: Why? When programs like old age pension, unemployment insurance, welfare and health are under constant attack due to a lack of funding, why is the government placing such a high priority on spending in areas where it has no jurisdiction?

The government has shown it cannot even handle the areas where it has responsibilities. Why on earth is it looking for ways to spend money it does not have in areas where it does not belong?

The biennial assembly, or convention if you will, of the Reform Party which was held here in Ottawa a few days ago passed a resolution calling for the repeal of the Official Languages Act. At the same time, it passed another resolution which would give responsibility for language and culture to the provinces. We believe this arrangement would be practical and would get the federal government out of the business of promoting languages.

The federal government has a responsibility for language equality clearly expressed in the Constitution, in section 133 of the BNA act and in sections 16 through 23 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Let the central government exercise its responsibilities under the Constitution. Let the provinces and special interest groups do whatever promotion of whatever language they want without a subsidy from Ottawa.

Reform supports freedom of speech, not comprehensive language legislation. Reform recognizes that the linguistic reality in Canada is that French is predominant in Quebec and English is predominant elsewhere. We support the philosophy of territorial bilingualism which will recognize this reality.

(1645)

Reform believes all Canadians are equal and oppose funding of special interest groups which are claiming distinct status. As I said, we endorse individual bilingualism and extend this to languages other than French or English in recognition of the fact that over 12 million Canadians are of an origin which is neither French nor English. These other languages also give Canada strength and character.

Other than the constitution, if Canada needs other language policies these should be decided upon by the people as a whole and not by an elite here in Ottawa.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mac Harb (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of International Trade, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, this bill confirms the structure of the Department of Canadian Heritage and brings together the various components that promote our national identity. My colleagues who have already taken part in this debate have well established the importance of this grouping to the new Department of Canadian Heritage.

Personally, I think that it will be a useful tool that will allow us to face the new realities and new challenges of the Canadian society. One of these major realities is the multicultural nature of Canada which is evolving very quickly.

According to the 1991 census, no less than 42 per cent of Canadians say that at least one of their parents is neither French nor English. In fact, in all major urban centres in

*Government Orders*

the western part of Montreal, for example, a majority of the population is neither French nor English. It is expected that, by the year 2000, the percentage of Canadians from visible minorities will go from 13 to 18 per cent.

Some even maintain that this percentage could reach up to 50 per cent in Toronto. This rapid growth of Canadian diversity raises deep challenges that our society will have to face very quickly.

There is no question that Canada is a land of welcome and that our country provides a peace and a security that are seldom seen elsewhere.

Finally, we recognize that Canada is a country of openness and opportunity which millions and millions of people all over the world only dream about. We have the chance to live in this country and we are fully committed to its continued economic and social development.

We must avoid conflicts and maintain social harmony. That can only be achieved by defining wise policies based on the equality of every Canadian. Better still, we must ensure that all Canadians, whatever their origin or religion, can participate and fully contribute to the life in our society. We must make more efforts to develop policies that are well adjusted to Canadian diversity.

I believe that all the members in this House understand why Canada is a country that foreigners wished they lived in. Sometimes, some people do not seem to understand how we all benefit from the numerous cultures that the people who chose to live here bring with them. Too often, we understand multiculturalism in terms of ethnic food, and the folkloric dances and customs of the various ethno-cultural communities.

There is much more than that. Thousands and thousands of immigrants have developed the resources of this country. They have colonized vast territories and they have helped to build our cities.

(1650)

Most Canadian regions have inherited the characteristics of various cultural groups. This diversity gave a unique character to the Canadian identity and to our culture. Canadian multiculturalism has two main characteristics. It encourages Canadian citizens to contribute actively to our society in either of our official languages.

Multiculturalism also encourages us to eliminate the barriers to a full and equal participation. Teaching of heritage languages, supporting artists in ethno-cultural communities and the promoting of transcultural activities are initiatives that help develop cultural harmony in our country. We acknowledge the fact that the roots of every citizen play an important part in his or her identity.

In Canada, no one is forced to forget his culture to be welcome. This is what makes Canadians a unique people. While acknowledging that our roots constitute an important part of our identity, Canadian multiculturalism is calling on us to commit ourselves to Canada. It respects the cultural identity of every citizen, it encourages creativity and intercultural exchanges.

Multiculturalism helps us to become aware of our duties but also of our responsibilities towards society. The multiculturalism program will now become very logically a part of the Department of Canadian Heritage. I must pay tribute to my colleague, the hon. Secretary of State for Multiculturalism and member for Mount Royal, for the outstanding job she is doing, building bridges between the ethno-cultural communities and the rest of the Canadian society.

I admit that we are all taken aback at one time or another when we see how quickly the face of this country is changing. All too often, we claim to be open to multiculturalism in Canada, but not next door, not in our backyards. That is why so much remains to be done to make all Canadians aware of the advantages and benefits of multiculturalism.

One major benefit we derive from our diversity is that it acts as a valuable asset in our trade relations on the global market. The chairman of the Royal Bank of Canada explained just recently that our future as a nation depended on our capacity to channel this wealth arising from our diversity to improve our competitiveness internationally.

Canadian businesses must open up new channels of trade. This is certainly easier and faster to achieve by drawing from our cultural communities a manpower that knows the languages, ways and customs of target countries. In the end, that is how our business leaders develop local resources and assests to get ahead of their foreign competition.

My point is that we must continually ask ourselves about the kind of country we are building. We must be confident and serene enough to shape our national identity according to our reality and our needs. In that sense, the establishment of the new Department of Canadian Heritage opens up such fascinating prospects.

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, B.Q.):** Madam Speaker, on October 3, the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata tabled an amendment to Bill C-53. This bill is ambitious, because the purpose of this big shake-up is to shamelessly take control of what is called Canadian culture in this country. It is not surprising that, with this amendment, the Bloc Québécois seeks to return this bill to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

In other words, what the Official Opposition is saying to the House is this: Members of Parliament, show political maturity and demand that the government do its homework again. In his speech on October 3, the minister gave us the following definition to think over: "Heritage is the set of signs that enable us to recognize ourselves as individuals who belong to a group or

*Government Orders*

even a country. Heritage is closely linked to questions of individual and national identity, which is why it can have such far-reaching and important influence”.

(1655)

While the traditional definitions of heritage as found in the dictionary refer essentially to a specific past which we recognize as our roots, the minister speaks of the set of signs by which Canadians would define themselves as belonging to the same reality. Some questions come spontaneously to mind. What do you think Quebecers, even federalists, will choose as the sign of what they are and what they want to be: the maple leaf or the fleur-de-lis?

Who can say out loud that our national anthem, which was written by Basile Routhier, generates the same sense of belonging from sea to sea as *La Marseillaise* in France or *God save the Queen* in England? And what about the Rockies, the Mounted Police and our coins bearing the effigy of the Queen?

The minister's plan, you will readily admit it, goes way beyond these heritage symbols. Suffice to quote here very briefly the minister: “We hope to rally the mighty forces of multiculturalism behind a cultural identity that is uniquely Canadian”.

Since he only referred in his speech to the French Canadian culture when he talked about the official languages and the TV5 network, how could we not infer that we must absolutely bring back not only the Quebec culture but the aboriginal culture as well in the ideal and so-called safe melting pot of multiculturalism, in this world where the American culture is prevailing everywhere?

Madam Speaker, you will easily understand that, given all of this, it would be suicidal for the Official Opposition to support Bill C-53.

In spite of the minister's noble intentions, how can the Canadian Parliament not be concerned that today's culture, our writers, our artists, what I call our heritage in the making, are considered to be an industry in the same way as steel, shoes and chickens?

As for the review of the Copyright Act, for example, who will eventually have the last word? The Minister of Industry or the Minister of Canadian Heritage? We can safely assume that the Department of Industry, which already has this power, will retain it, since nothing in Bill C-53 clearly allocates responsibilities to either department.

Here is another example which should be cause for alarm in this House. With the emergence of the information highway, the speed of communication is approaching Mach 2. Is it reasonable to limit the stakes to marketing fibre optics? This is however, the

conclusion we must reach since once again the Minister of Industry will be the project manager. But it also means that we are refusing to recognize that the major revolution brought about by the information highway is bound to rapidly and profoundly change the global culture.

It is often said that war is too serious a matter to be left up to generals; could it be that culture is too serious a matter to be left up to businessmen? Quebec culture is too precious to be left up to the goodwill of the federal government. The State of Quebec must have exclusive jurisdiction over Quebec culture.

For the past 30 years, the federal government, using its powerful spending authority, has shamelessly interfered with Quebec culture. Its objective was clearly to weaken Quebec culture. It has resulted in overlapping and duplication and created a dependence on the federal manna on the part of our creative minds.

In 1991, the total budget of the Quebec government for cultural institutions amounted to \$426 million whereas that of Ottawa was \$2.8 billion.

(1700)

I wonder whether I understood what the minister meant when he said that both official languages “are inextricably linked to Canadian identity and culture. For this reason it is vital to promote them and broaden their sphere of influence”. Am I naive in thinking that Radio-Canada's budget is sizeable enough to make a major contribution to the survival of francophone communities? Is it naive to think that when a number of the French network's stations were closed down recently in the regions, this was a clear indication of the strong position of French in these regions, a position so strong that these stations were no longer needed?

I am not naive, and few Quebecers are, as we can see in the following extract from the conclusion of the Arpin report: “Harmonizing action by both levels of government has never been easy”. The federal government has always refused to recognize Quebec's leading role in cultural matters.

In 1992, Mrs. Frulla-Hébert, at the time Minister of Culture in the Bourassa government, went even further, saying there was little or no consultation on programs by the federal government with Quebec. Genuine co-operation was practically nonexistent, and when it did occur it was often at Quebec's request.

Recently, UQAM president Claude Corbo criticized the tendency of federal policies to downplay and ignore Quebec's identity. I hardly think Bill C-53 would change his mind.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage referred to Bill C-53 as the flag ship of Canadian identity. Metaphors are often not very apt, and this one is no exception. The cargo does not seem to be

*Government Orders*

properly stowed, and the ship may not be able to weather the storms ahead.

Any admiral worth his salt does not go out to sea with a ship that is poorly equipped. In concluding, I would therefore like to offer the Minister of Canadian Heritage some thoughts by Marcel Rioux, whom he must have met, considering his abiding interest in things cultural: "Why, at the slightest spark of life, do we go on hoping and manage to resist the pessimism and cynicism that lies at the root of so many foolish and unthinking decisions? To me, it is an act of faith in all those who built this country, and that is why I keep on hoping against hope".

[English]

**Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina—Qu'Appelle, N.D.P.):** Madam Speaker, it is with pleasure that I join the debate today. Bill C-53 is an important bill because it establishes a very important department, the Department of Canadian Heritage. Yet I am afraid I will have to vote against the motion and the bill in front of us.

May I hasten to add for entirely different reasons than the reasons I have heard from both opposition parties today that I cannot accept the arguments put forward by members of the Bloc. There is a need in Quebec and in other parts of Canada for a cultural presence by the federal government. I think the first people to recognize that would be the artists in Quebec.

The artists in Quebec would abhor just having to depend upon the Quebec government. Just having to depend upon one source of support and assistance in the arts is not in the interests of the artists. All too often they have found in terms of past governments, and I suspect the present government as well, that the political agenda of the provincial government is at variance with the artistic interests of the artists.

Artists in Quebec also want to have the federal government, the Canada Council, the National Film Board, the SRC, all the federal cultural institutions. They also want them. I am not surprised by the objections raised by the Reform Party though I am saddened by them. Surely they also must recognize that cultural institutions are really what define the people in a nation.

(1705)

Our cultural institutions help define what Canada is. They allow us to be able to see and hear and listen to other Canadians without the intervention of the government. Surely the Reform members are not so naive to assume that if you just leave it to market forces Canadian culture would be totally swamped by American culture. The economics would dictate that. Surely it is a naive belief in saying the federal government should get out of this area. They will do as much damage as what the Bloc is doing to the well-being and the maintenance of this country. Once you destroy the cultural identity you have destroyed this country. In

this way the Bloc and the Reform are indeed in cahoots and working well together in that.

May I quote quite an excellent article that appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on May 8, 1994, by Michael Valpy. "Why, indeed, maintain a multibillion dollar military establishment—when what is under attack in Canada is largely militarily indefensible; the alien control of our commerce, our resources, our jobs, our entertainment, publishing and other forms of communications". Mr. Valpy was discussing a paper that was written by University of Toronto political scientist Franklyn Griffiths. He quotes Mr. Griffiths and this is the quote I wish to put on the record: "The state of our cultural life", he writes, "is now of greater importance than the state of our armed forces in determining our ability to make choices for ourselves in a world where military challenges to our country have diminished relative to non-military or civil dangers".

Again, I wish to agree with Valpy's thesis which is that the attack on Canada as a nation is really more in terms of non-military areas like our cultural sense of identity and sense of who we are.

I oppose this bill because this government's record in this area has been dismal. We have a weak minister and a weak department. It was referred to by members of the Bloc when they expressed their concern about issues like copyright and as well questions concerning the information highway, whether it is the ministry of industry or the ministry of heritage that is really in control.

I suspect it is the ministry of industry rather than the ministry of Canadian heritage. We have a weak department and a weak minister. The Canadian cultural institutions and values are not being well protected.

The other reason why I would have to oppose this bill is that the government as well as the previous government when it signed the FTA and the NAFTA continued to refuse to release the documents both on the FTA and the NAFTA on cultural discussions. We really do not know yet what is allowed and what is not allowed under the free trade agreement and under the NAFTA. How can we operate in terms of defining, strengthening and protecting Canadian cultural institutions when the public and as well those cultural institutions do not know what has been given away? How can we continue?

Historically in this House all political parties have supported the notion that the federal government has a role to play in our cultural institutions. That is why Conservatives started the CBC as well as Liberals, generally supported by New Democrats or the CCF, even the Social Credit Party when it had members in this House.

There was a recognition by those who are part of the English culture part of Canada, standing so close to the American border with its dynamic and very powerful cultural industries, that

*Government Orders*

unless we had an interventionist government, unless we followed something other than just market forces, our cultural identity as a country would be swamped.

(1710)

There is a belief that all political parties in this House have traditionally agreed to, that as Canadians we have some identity, some values as Canadians that are unique, that are important and that are worth preserving. This is our contribution to the civilization of the human race.

It is worth the money we invest there. Without that investment, the Canadian cultural identity would disappear and then one has to once again ask oneself: "What do we have as a country?" We might as well then join the United States.

There is another important reason that I wish to mention in my remarks in terms of the importance of Canadian cultural industry. It creates jobs, many jobs. There are more jobs in the cultural sector than in fishery or in forestry. It is also a source of foreign earnings.

I hear members of the Reform Party talk about our taxpayers. Yes, indeed, taxpayers' dollars are involved but artists also create tax revenue. There was a study that was done in Toronto in the spring of 1993 which showed that the cutbacks in the Canada Council in fact decreased government revenues greater than the cutbacks.

They went through numerous performing companies after the cutbacks of their support by the Canada Council. They determined how many musicians were laid off, how many productions did not occur. Those performers, musicians, artists, actors and actresses were no longer working, were taking UI or welfare and were no longer paying taxes.

There was the loss of tax revenues from the loss of admission tickets. They found in this study that the government lost more money through revenue loss than had it continued to support the arts the way they it had formerly done.

I am also concerned, very much so, with our deficit. There is a need as well for wise spending and for trimming government expenditures. Let us do it with intelligence because in some areas when one cuts one will create more harm and there will be a greater loss of revenue than the money one will save from the cuts in those areas.

In conclusion I wish to restate that it is with sadness that I cannot support Bill C-53 because of the reasons that I have stated in my speech.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak today on Bill C-53, an act to establish the Department of Canadian Heritage.

I want to use this opportunity to talk about what it means to be Canadian. In 1993 when the Right Hon. Kim Campbell announced the reorganization of her government, the big selling point was the reduction of federal departments from 32 to 23 and the elimination of all minister of state positions.

She further justified the new structure by selling it as a significant step toward streamlining government. This was going to give Canadians a leaner, more accessible government. Multiculturalism was placed under her new Department of Canadian Heritage together with a mishmash of other programs and responsibilities.

Recognizing the level of public support for reducing the size of federal bureaucracy, the new Liberal government kept most of her changes and multiculturalism remained quietly buried in a new superministry of Canadian heritage.

This Liberal government failed to inform the Canadian people that the public perception of a government commitment to downsizing is unfounded. We have fewer ministers than we had under the previous government but now we have nine secretaries of state in addition to the full fledged ministers.

One of these new secretaries of state has a portfolio solely devoted to multiculturalism and the status of women.

(1715)

The only major difference between a secretary of state and a minister is the name. Secretaries of state are not allowed to sit in cabinet and must report through the minister, but they have offices, staff and responsibilities for policy development in the departments to which they are assigned. They also receive an extra \$35,000 a year salary and a car allowance.

This is not downsizing. What about the Canadian heritage department itself? Will taxpayers save any money through this restructuring and reorganization? Apparently not. When announcing the official establishment of this new department, top bureaucrats made it very clear that there would be no layoffs. Civil servants are being shuffled between new ministries but their jobs are secure, even if the future of some of the programs is not.

The number of employees in the multicultural program will remain at approximately 6,000, the same as 1992-93 levels. Multiculturalism now falls under another department but it is possible to compare current funding to that of previous years. In 1992-93, \$39.8 million was spent on multicultural programs. Last fiscal year it was \$36.9 million, and this year's forecast is \$38.8 million. This does not include some of the spinoff programs that fall under the government's multicultural agenda.

For example, although the proposed Canadian race relations foundation is not functioning yet, the federal government

earmarked \$24 million for it. This is hardly what I would call a stellar performance in cost reduction or downsizing.

Why do we have the multicultural policy we do? Why do we spend money to support special interest groups to maintain or rediscover their differences, rather than for the promotion of our shared symbols and positive Canadian qualities?

Immigrants have come to Canada for countless reasons over the years. For many it represented a place of safety to rebuild lives shattered by wars. For others it was a land of opportunity; if they worked hard they could become financially secure, send their children off to university and express their will within a democratic society.

These people came to Canada to become Canadians. They willingly left their country of birth and chose Canada as their new home. They came here to build a new life and a new reality for themselves and their children. To them, Canada symbolized hope. It was not just a place where they could become rich. It represented freedom from oppression or tyranny, from hunger or civil strife.

It was a land that, for the most part, accepted them as newcomers and tolerated their differences until they learned more about their chosen country and its culture.

Refugees come to our shores for many of the same reasons. Because Canada is isolated from refugee generating countries by vast oceans and by the United States, refugees must make a conscious decision that this is the country they want to move to. They must make extensive plans and pool their resources just to get here to claim refugee status. I believe they choose Canada for the same reasons that immigrants have in the past; an opportunity to get ahead in a country they are proud to be part of, a country that respects human rights and freedoms, a country where they will not have to live in fear.

Although immigrants and refugees left their homes to find the Canadian dream, what do newcomers to Canada find today? They discover a government that promotes cultural diversity, that tells them it is more important to maintain the identity they left behind than it is to become a Canadian. How many years is it before they are truly considered a Canadian? With our multicultural policy, how many generations will it take before people start thinking of themselves as Canadians rather than as outsiders? How can we eliminate racism or ghettoization if we perpetuate hyphenated Canadianism? How much time will it take for this government to understand that being a Canadian to a Canadian is more important than where you or your ancestors came from?

Everyone should be proud of their roots but they should also be proud to be a Canadian. We should be working toward the creation of a single national identity that we can all live with.

### *Government Orders*

Being Canadian is more than holding down a job, it is people pulling together for a common purpose and a common goal. This country is built on the efforts of people who came from all over the world to help create a nation they are proud to call home.

Throughout our history immigrants have worked hard to help forge the country we see today. They started out as immigrants but they built it as Canadians, for Canadians.

(1720)

We are among the most tolerant people in the world. Regrettably, we have also had black periods in our history during which certain groups were not respected for their contribution or were denied access to our institutions and to some fundamental human rights.

We have grown a great deal over the past several decades. We have abolished institutionalized discrimination and promote respect for human rights at home and abroad. We must remain vigilant to ensure equality of opportunity for all Canadians but we must not let the pendulum swing so far toward accommodating special interests that we lose sight of who we are.

By promoting all cultures we will end up with none. What glue will hold our nation together?

As the make-up of our population changes, our national culture will naturally evolve to reflect that diversity. It is not something government can legislate or control. When government steps in, as it has, to encourage differences between people rather than fostering unity by encouraging common Canadian values other segments of our society will feel threatened because they will perceive their cultural values to be under siege.

When the cultural make-up of our population has changed to the point that our institutions no longer reflect the Canadian identity then there will be overwhelming public support and pressure for those changes to occur.

Government cannot dictate culture and government cannot control its expression. The government's role should be to clarify our similarities, not aggravate our differences. Cultural change occurs over generations but a nation must have a touchstone for its national identity, a reference point that immigrants from other countries can refer to.

We leave them floundering, having to rely on our multicultural policy of celebrating diversity as a guide to what it is to be a Canadian.

Canada has a distinct identity. We can all feel it. We know it is there but most Canadians cannot articulate it. When asked what it is to be a Canadian, many people used to respond that it is not being an American. We are more than a negative. We have our own positive sense of national identity and it must be communicated to all newcomers to this land.



*Government Orders*

To me being Canadian is many things. Being Canadian is truly believing in our inherent right to freedom of speech and expression, freedom of religion, the right to assemble and to demonstrate peacefully, freedom of the press, tolerance for differences and respect for human rights and democratic institutions. These are some of the common values I believe make us Canadians.

There is also an expectation held by the majority of Canadians that we will continue to support and, if necessary, defend our individual and collective rights to these freedoms.

**Mr. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I listened with great interest to the members of the Bloc and the members of the Reform Party, particularly on their views on multiculturalism. It is obvious they do not have a clue what multiculturalism means and what it is all about.

I want to tell them a little bit about what multiculturalism is. Multiculturalism is a vision of Canada. One of the things that is really lacking on that side is a vision of Canada. It has no real vision of Canada. It does not understand that multiculturalism is valuing our cultural diversity and how important it is to value our cultural diversity.

As someone who came to Canada as a young boy at the age of six, I know a lot about multiculturalism. I know a lot about some of the barriers that immigrants face when they come here. Our family came here in 1906. If some people would read the history of what happened in British Columbia they would understand that at that time we did not have a policy of multiculturalism and there were laws that discriminated against certain groups. If we talk about the *Komagata Maru*, I ask everyone to read about that or the exclusion act. All of those things will give members a better idea of why multiculturalism is so important.

One of the Reform members said that everybody is the same. Everybody is not the same. I have three children and they have different needs. They are not the same. For some reason the Reform Party thinks if we treat everyone the same we are treating them equally.

(1725)

People have different demands. People have different needs, just as the aboriginal community has different needs. As a society we have to recognize that. We have to make sure that they participate.

The Reform Party members are the same people who took the lead to campaign against Sikhs in the RCMP even though it was against the charter of human rights. The legal courts have shown that. Do members think they will change their policy even though the courts have ruled it is against the charter in a recent decision?

The Reform Party members actively have a policy which discriminates. I say that they do not understand what multiculturalism is. It is about bridging, about communication. That shows how little they know because they are not interested in listening when somebody has a different view.

Multiculturalism is about communication between different cultures. It is about bridging, about participating, about including Canadians. That is what multiculturalism is.

For members who want to talk about treating people equally, in their convention they had a resolution that says that immigrants should not get any social benefits for the first five years, but they want them to pay the same taxes. They do not want to give them a break on the taxes. They do not want to give them any social benefits for the first five years. Is that treating people equally? That is not treating people equally. That is about dividing Canadians. That is what we do not want. We want to include Canadians, not divide them. That is what the Liberal Party is all about and what this Liberal government is all about.

I am very proud of my culture and heritage and I believe it is very important that people know about their roots. If you do not know your roots you do not know where to go. I have learned that it is very important.

There are many business people in the Reform Party and they should understand how important multiculturalism is in this global economy. In the province of British Columbia people recognize that. The recent government has said in the schools it wants to be able to teach Mandarin, Cantonese and Punjabi where the needs are. That is important for the global economy and for us from an economic point of view to have growth in jobs. We cannot work in isolation. That is why it is so important.

In my own riding there is an area called the Punjabi market where many Indo-Canadians have their shops. The other day I opened a convention at the Pan Pacific and a tourist from the U.S. said: "I have heard about the Punjabi market. I would like to go down there and do some shopping". That is how important it is from an economic point of view to have that cultural diversity.

In the area of arts and culture the members of the Reform Party think that we can cut all the funding for arts and culture and then when we have the money all of a sudden all the artists and the infrastructure will come back; that sure, we can cut all the funding for arts and culture and five years from now it will be very simple to all of a sudden fund it again and all the art and culture will flourish. Life is not that simple. Art and culture are very important to this country and it is very important to maintain them.

I was on a trip to Europe this summer and when you visit a museum like the Louvre or a city like Edinburgh you really understand how art and culture are very important. I hope members of the Reform Party will also look at that with an open

*Government Orders*

and broad mind, not in a narrow focus. I am sure they will understand a lot better.

Multiculturalism is ensuring that all Canadians participate fully in Canadian life. Recently when I was vice-chairman of B.C. Hydro it adopted a vision that its employees should reflect the community it serves. That is what multiculturalism is all about. It is about equal opportunity. I will not go any further because my time is running out.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT**

The House resumed from October 17 consideration of Bill C-49, an act to amend the Department of Agriculture Act and to amend or repeal certain other acts, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and of Motion No. 1.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** It being 5:30 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on Mr. Easter's motion at report stage of Bill C-49. Call in the members.

(The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division):

(Division No. 86)

**YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Asselin
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brien	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bryden	Bélisle
Canuel	Caron
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Daviault	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Easter	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazer	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Gouk	Grubel
Guimond	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hart	Hayes
Hermanson	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Jacob	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Manning
Marchand	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McLaughlin	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Penso	Picard (Drummond)

Plamondon  
Ramsay  
Ringma  
Rocheleau  
Scott (Skeena)  
Solberg  
Speaker  
Steckle  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Venne  
Williams—103

Pomerleau  
Riis  
Robinson  
Schmidt  
Silye  
Solomon  
St-Laurent  
Stinson  
Thompson  
Tremblay (Rosemont)  
White (Fraser Valley West)

**NAYS**

Members

Alcock	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Berger
Bethel	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Belair	Calder
Campbell	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Culbert	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepolo
Duhamel	Dupuy
English	Fewchuk
Fils	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Galloway
Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Regan	Ringuette—Maltais
Robichaud	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Speller	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—133	

*Government Orders*

## PAIRED MEMBERS

## Members

Adams	Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Collenette	Goodale
Guay	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Lincoln
Mercier	Sauvageau
Vanclief	Wells

(1800)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I declare the motion negated.

**Hon. Ralph Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

## DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY ACT

The House resumed from October 17 consideration of the motion that Bill C-46, an act to establish the Department of Industry and to amend and repeal certain other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; of the amendment; and the amendment to the amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment to the amendment of Mr. McClelland at the second reading stage of Bill C-46.

(The House divided on the amendment, to the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 87)

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Chatters
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gouk	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Ringma
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson

Strahl  
White (Fraser Valley West)

Thompson  
Williams—48

## NAYS

## Members

Alcock	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Berger	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bethel
Blaikie	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Calder	Campbell
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Culbert
Dalphoné-Guiral	Davialt
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepolo	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Godin
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knudson
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Riis

*Government Orders*

Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	Solomon
Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Valeri	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—189	

Plamondon  
 Rocheleau  
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
 Venne—45

Pomerleau  
 St-Laurent  
 Tremblay (Rosemont)

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott  
 Alcock  
 Althouse  
 Anderson  
 Assadourian  
 Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
 Barnes  
 Bellemare  
 Berger  
 Blaikie  
 Bonin  
 Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)  
 Bridgman  
 Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
 Bryden  
 Calder  
 Catterall  
 Chamberlain  
 Chatters  
 Clancy  
 Collins  
 Copps  
 Culbert  
 Dhaliwal  
 Discepolo  
 Duhamel  
 Dupuy  
 English  
 Fewchuk  
 Fontana  
 Frazer  
 Gaffney  
 Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
 Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)  
 Godfrey  
 Graham  
 Grose  
 Guarnieri  
 Hanrahan  
 Harper (Calgary West)  
 Harper (Simcoe Centre)  
 Hart  
 Hayes  
 Hill (Macleod)  
 Hoepfner  
 Hubbard  
 Irwin  
 Jennings  
 Jordan  
 Keyes  
 Knutson  
 LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)  
 MacAulay  
 MacLaren (Etobicoke North)  
 Malhi  
 Manning  
 Marleau  
 Massé  
 McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)  
 McGuire  
 McLaughlin  
 McWhinney  
 Mifflin  
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
 Minna  
 Morrison  
 Murray  
 O'Reilly  
 Parrish  
 Payne  
 Peric  
 Peterson  
 Pillitteri  
 Ramsay  
 Regan

Ablonczy  
 Allmand  
 Anawak  
 Assad  
 Augustine  
 Bakopanos  
 Beaumier  
 Benoit  
 Bethel  
 Bodnar  
 Bodria  
 Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
 Brown (Calgary Southeast)  
 Brushett  
 Bélair  
 Campbell  
 Cauchon  
 Chan  
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)  
 Cohen  
 Comuzzi  
 Crawford  
 de Jong  
 Dingwall  
 Dromisky  
 Duncan  
 Easter  
 Epp  
 Flis  
 Forseth  
 Fry  
 Gagliano  
 Gallaway  
 Gerrard  
 Gouk  
 Gray (Windsor West)  
 Grubel  
 Hanger  
 Harb  
 Harper (Churchill)  
 Harris  
 Harvard  
 Hermanson  
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
 Hopkins  
 Ianno  
 Jackson  
 Johnston  
 Kerpan  
 Kirkby  
 Lastewka  
 Loney  
 MacDonald  
 MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)  
 Manley  
 Marchi  
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
 Mayfield  
 McCormick  
 McKinnon  
 McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)  
 Meredith  
 Milliken  
 Mills (Red Deer)  
 Mitchell  
 Murphy  
 Nault  
 Pagtakhan  
 Patry  
 Penson  
 Peters  
 Pickard (Essex—Kent)  
 Proud  
 Reed  
 Richardson

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Members

Adams	Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Collette	Goodale
Guay	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Lincoln
Mercier	Sauvageau
Vanclief	Wells

(1815)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I declare the amendment to the amendment negated.

\* \* \*

**DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES ACT**

The House resumed from October 17 consideration of the motion that Bill C-48, an act to establish the Department of Natural Resources and to amend related acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a), the House will now proceed with the taking of the deferred division on the amendment of Mr. Canuel at the second reading stage of Bill C-48.

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 88)

**YEAS**

Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien	Bélisle
Canuel	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Dalphond—Guiral	Davialt
Debien	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Guimond	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfé)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)

*Government Orders*

Riis	Ringma	Chamberlain	Chan
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud	Chatters	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Rompkey	Schmidt	Clancy	Cohen
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)	Collins	Comuzzi
Shepherd	Sheridan	Copps	Crawford
Silye	Simmons	Culbert	de Jong
Solberg	Solomon	Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Speaker	Speller	Discepola	Dromisky
St. Denis	Steckle	Duhamel	Duncan
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)	Dupuy	Easter
Stinson	Strahl	English	Epp
Szabo	Telegdi	Fewchuk	Flis
Terrana	Thompson	Fontana	Forseth
Tobin	Torsney	Frazer	Fry
Ur	Valeri	Gaffney	Gagliano
Verran	Volpe	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Wappel	Whelan	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	Gerrard
White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams	Godfrey	Gouk
Wood	Young	Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Zed—189		Grose	Grubel
		Guarnieri	Hanger
		Hanrahan	Harb
		Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Churchill)
		Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
		Hart	Harvard
		Hayes	Hermanson
		Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
		Hoepfner	Hopkins
		Hubbard	Ianno
		Irwin	Jackson
		Jennings	Johnston
		Jordan	Kerpan
		Keyes	Kirkby
		Knutson	Lastewka
		LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)	Loney
		MacAulay	MacDonald
		MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
		Malhi	Manley
		Manning	Marchi
		Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
		Massé	Mayfield
		McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick
		McGuire	McKinnon
		McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
		McWhinney	Meredith
		Mifflin	Milliken
		Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Mills (Red Deer)
		Minna	Mitchell
		Morrison	Murphy
		Murray	Nault
		O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
		Parrish	Patry
		Payne	Penson
		Peric	Peters
		Peterson	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
		Pillitteri	Proud
		Ramsay	Reed
		Regan	Richardson
		Riis	Ringma
		Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
		Rompkey	Schmidt
		Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
		Shepherd	Sheridan
		Silye	Simmons
		Solberg	Solomon
		Speaker	Speller
		St. Denis	Steckle
		Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
		Stinson	Strahl
		Szabo	Telegdi
		Terrana	Thompson
		Tobin	Torsney
		Ur	Valeri
		Verran	Volpe
		Wappel	Whelan
		White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams
		Wood	Young
		Zed—189	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Members	
Adams	Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Collette	Goodale
Guay	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Lincoln
Mercier	Sauvageau
Vancielief	Wells

(1820)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** I declare the amendment negated.

[English]

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to proceed immediately with the main motion on second reading of Bill C-48 and that you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote just taken, in other words the vote on the amendment, in reverse to the main motion.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 89)*

## YEAS

Members	
Abbott	Ablonczy
Alcock	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Benoit
Berger	Bethel
Blaikie	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon

*Government Orders*

**NAYS**

Members

Asselin	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien	Bélisle
Canuel	Caron
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gagnon (Québec)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Godin
Guimond	Jacob
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Marchand
Ménard	Nunez
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	St-Laurent
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne—45	

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Members

Adams	Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Collenette	Goodale
Guay	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Lincoln
Mercier	Sauvageau
Vanclief	Wells

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Therefore the motion of Ms. McLellan is agreed to.

(Bill read the second time and referred to committee.)

\* \* \*

(1825)

[English]

**DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND  
GOVERNMENT SERVICES ACT**

The House resumed from October 17 consideration of the motion that Bill C-52, an act to establish the Department of Public Works and Government Services and to amend and repeal certain acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Pursuant to Standing Order 45(5)(a) the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment of Mr. Marchand at second reading of Bill C-52, an act to establish the Department of Public Works and Government Services and to amend and repeal certain acts.

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the result of the vote at report stage on the amendment to Bill C-49 to this vote.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Do we have unanimous consent?

**Mr. Lee:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I would be delighted to participate in the unanimous consent for the most recent division.

I was absent from my seat and I would ask that as the votes are being applied my vote be applied with the government caucus.

**Ms. Meredith:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I was also absent for the vote on Bill C-49 and I would appreciate if my vote would be recorded on Bill C-52 as supporting it.

**Mr. Cowling:** Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained; I was not able to be here. However I would have voted with the government had I been here.

**Mr. Bryden:** Madam Speaker, I would like my vote to be recorded as being with the government on this amendment, if I may.

**Mr. Silye:** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We had an agreement with the government whip that we would apply to this vote the same as we voted on Bill C-49 and the last member of Parliament who just rose to say he wanted to vote with the government voted opposite to the government on Bill C-49.

**Mr. Easter:** Madam Speaker, I just want to be sure that this vote is opposite to the report stage motion, or is it the same as the report stage motion and not the recorded amendment?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Order. This motion is opposite to the amendment of the hon. member for Malpeque on Bill C-49.

**Mr. Easter:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I would wish that my vote be applied in the reverse to what it was on the amendment to Bill C-49, in other words with the government.

(1830)

**Mr. Dromisky:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I wish to vote with the government on this motion.

**Mr. Steckle:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I also wish to cast my vote on the side of the government on the motion itself.

**Mr. Peterson:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I would like my vote to be applied—

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

[Translation]

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negated on the following division:)

## Government Orders

(Division No. 90)

## YEAS

## Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Asselin
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brien	Brown (Calgary Southeast)
Bélisle	Canuel
Caron	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dubé	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Epp	Fillion
Forseth	Frazier
Gagnon (Québec)	Gauthier (Roberval)
Godin	Gouk
Grubel	Guimond
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jacob
Jennings	Johnston
Kerpan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Manning	Marchand
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McLaughlin
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Ménard
Nunez	Paré
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Riis
Ringma	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Solomon
Speaker	St-Laurent
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams—100

Cohen	Collins
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crawford
Culbert	Dhaliwal
Dingwall	Discepolo
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dupuy	Easter
English	Fewchuk
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Galloway
Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Irwin
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren (Etobicoke North)	MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Proud	Reed
Regan	Ringuelette—Maltais
Robichaud	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Tobin	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—138

## NAYS

## Members

Alcock	Allmand
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopoulos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Berger
Bethel	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Calder	Campbell
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Clancy

## PAIRED MEMBERS

## Members

Adams	Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Collenette	Goodale
Guay	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Lincoln
Mercier	Sauvageau
Vanclief	Wells

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** The amendment is therefore negated.

*Government Orders*

[English]

**CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-41, an act to amend the Criminal Code (sentencing) and other acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent that the vote on Bill C-46 be applied in reverse to the bill that we are discussing now.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Mr. Silye:** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, we agree but there might be some on the government side who might want to change their minds.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 91)*

**YEAS**

Members

Allcock	Allmand
Althouse	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Berger	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bethel
Blaikie	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélisle
Calder	Campbell
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collins	Comuzzi
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Culbert
Dalphond—Guiral	Daviault
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Deshaies
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepolo	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gaffney	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Gagnon (Québec)
Galloway	Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Godin
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harb
Harper (Churchill)	Harvard
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Irwin

Jackson	Jacob
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren (Etobicoke North)
MacLellan (Cape/Cap Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Manley	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLaughlin	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest)
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Parrish
Paré	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Riis
Ringuette—Maltais	Robichaud
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Simmons	Solomon
Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Ur
Valeri	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—189	

**NAYS**

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brown (Calgary Southeast)	Chatters
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gouk	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Penson
Ramsay	Ringma
Schmidt	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)	Williams—48



*Private Members' Business*

## PAIRED MEMBERS

## Members

Adams	Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bouchard
Collenette	Goodale
Guay	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lefebvre	Lincoln
Mercier	Sauvageau
Vanclief	Wells

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** Accordingly I declare the motion adopted.

(Bill read the second time and referred to committee.)

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

## REMEMBRANCE DAY ACT

**Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-251, an act to provide that Remembrance Day be included as a holiday in public service collective agreements, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, I know the hour is late and we have just been through a number of votes but I am hoping that the members who are still here, or those that are watching from their offices or on their way to their offices, could take a few minutes to pay some attention to the bill presently before the House.

(1835)

This is actually the second time that I have brought the bill forward. I presented the bill in the last Parliament as Bill C-289. The title of the bill is the Remembrance Day Act.

One of the problems we have had in the past in dealing with Remembrance Day is that the farther we get from the time that we have actually had a conflict where loss of life has taken place, the more likely it is that we will forget the sacrifices that were made by the many men and now women of the Canadian Armed Forces in the pursuit of liberty and freedom for people all around the globe.

Remembrance Day goes back quite far. It used to be called Armistice Day and it was celebrated at Thanksgiving. Then around 1931, it became Remembrance Day. Everybody in the country believes that Remembrance Day is a holiday and I guess by definition that is what it is.

What exactly holiday means is quite another thing. Does holiday mean, as I used to think it meant, that it is a day set aside and nobody, unless they are deemed to be an essential employee, goes to work? Does holiday mean that it is time to go to the beach or to take a few hours off and relax?

The Remembrance Day holiday is quite different. It is different than any other holiday on the books. It is different because it is not meant as a time for people to take time off. It is meant as a time of solemn remembrance of those who fought for liberty, for freedom, for those who have given up their lives in pursuit of these very noble goals.

Every member in this Chamber represents veterans. In Canada today there are over 700,000 veterans, many of whom were wounded, many of whom have lost very good friends. They saw their best friend die in front of them far away in a foreign land with no shoulder to cry on. It was done in the pursuit of that tangible called freedom.

It seems the further we get away from the date of a conflict where lives are lost, we forget. It is far too easy for me as a 39-year-old and certainly for my children who are three, eight and ten to forget how important that contribution has been for us.

I introduced Bill C-289 in the last Parliament. The importance of that bill at the time was to make sure that at least in the area that we control as a government in the agreements that are entered into under the Public Service Staff Relations Act, we ensure that we honour the memory of those who have given their lives and of the veterans who are still out there, many of whom have been wounded.

There are people like my father, Sharkey, as they called him because he was a good boxer in his day, who was shot twice. He fought in the Italian campaign after the liberation of Holland, and lost many of his friends. The bill will ensure that my children see the example set by the federal government in ensuring that every collective agreement that is entered into by the Government of Canada, that this holiday, this special time of remembrance, is not traded away.

Members are going to ask: "Is that not the way it is?" Yes, that is the way it is. The reason I introduced the bill two years ago and the reason I reintroduced it is that there seems to be a possibility—and if it is a possibility, it is a probability—the federal government negotiators through Treasury Board—it is no different even though the government has changed—with the same mandate who hammer out collective agreements may change the holiday. I support the collective bargaining process.

However there may come a time, because it always happens, that the federal government through its Treasury Board negotiators and a union of the Public Service of Canada through its negotiators will decide to trade away Remembrance Day for another holiday. It darned near happened two years ago at Canada Post.

That is when this came to my attention. My father who is a veteran, president of the Cape Breton Highlanders Association,

*Private Members' Business*

called me and said: "What am I reading in the paper? They are trying to trade Remembrance Day away, maybe for an extra benefit, maybe for a little bit more hospital coverage". That was never the purpose of the holiday in the first place.

(1840)

I introduced the bill and it received an unusual amount of support, so much so that the Conservative government, even though Treasury Board told Tory members not to support it, rose above partisanship and supported the bill in sufficient numbers that even a lowly Liberal backbench opposition member's private member's motion passed at second reading.

It was one of the proudest days I have had as a member of Parliament. It showed that this place can work. If the principles are noble, the motives of members will be above reproach and they will support the right things. Unfortunately it did not get through committee.

Therefore I introduce it again today in honour of the 60,000 men who died serving our country in the first world war and all those who died during the second world war. Over 1.1 million Canadians served proudly, people like my father. During the Korean war over 300 Canadians gave their lives and hundreds, perhaps over 1,000, more were wounded. We must not forget those who served in the Persian gulf—thank goodness there was no loss of life—and our peacekeepers who are out there in some of the worst conditions in the world. They are down in the hell on earth that is Rwanda. They serve us proudly in Bosnia, where some have been injured and killed while serving our country abroad.

I reintroduce the bill and I seek support from members. This bill will not encumber Treasury Board. That is bogus. I heard that argument from Treasury Board officials. Tomorrow I will try to get some assurance from the minister that before decisions are made about what does and does not encumber Treasury Board that they at least consult with the members who put the bills forward.

The bill does nothing more than seek to entrench in law the current practice and that is to make sure that Remembrance Day is a holiday in federal collective agreements. It does not do anything to the business community. It does not do anything to collective agreements under the labour code. It simply says that for agreements entered into by the federal government with its own employees, under the Public Service Staff Relations Act, that unless one is a designated employee whose services are essential, one shall have Remembrance Day as a day of solemn remembrance for those men and now women who have been injured or killed defending peace, liberty and life abroad for our country, and that day will always be in federal public sector agreements as a day of solemn remembrance.

I ask the members who are prepared to speak to keep that in mind. When we last raised this in the House I could not believe the response from nearly every legion in Canada. The president of the Royal Canadian Legion came to see me. Letters were sent in. Veterans from the second world war feel as they are getting older that it is far too easy for their grandchildren and maybe their great grandchildren to forget the sacrifices that many of them have made.

I am seeking the support of the House to debate this bill. It will tell the veterans across Canada that the contribution that they made for this country and also what they gave up, is not going to be forgotten by the Parliament of Canada. It is a very small thing to do. Remembrance Day must always be held as a solemn day of remembrance for those who have gone before us in serving their country.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today on behalf of the Official Opposition in this debate on the bill that would include Remembrance Day as a holiday in public service collective agreements.

This is not the first time that the member for Dartmouth has proposed such a thing. Indeed, he presented a similar bill in the previous Parliament. Unfortunately for him, the Conservative government arranged to defeat his bill when it was considered in committee. That was on February 18, 1993.

That bill, like the one before us, was intended to prevent the government from putting the Remembrance Day holiday on the negotiating table with the unions. It was feared that this holiday would be traded for an extra day after the Boxing Day holiday.

(1845)

Some guarantee had to be provided to enshrine this sacred holiday in our collective memory. This is the day when we remember the ultimate sacrifice made by those who went to war and enabled us to enjoy again the most precious gift: peace.

This initiative reflects numerous decisions made over the years to that effect. This holiday is already in the official list of holidays included in section 166 of the Canada Labour Code, part III. It is also included in the Public Service Terms and Conditions of Employment Regulations. Every collective agreement signed by the Public Service Alliance of Canada with Treasury Board includes Remembrance Day in the list of holidays.

Already in 1921, a day of commemoration was established in the Armistice Day Act, which said, and I quote: "Throughout Canada in each and every year—the eleventh day of November—being the day in 1918 in which the great war was triumphantly concluded by an armistice, shall be a legal holiday and shall be kept and observed as such under the name of Armistice Day".

*Private Members' Business*

In 1931, another act specified that this legal holiday would be called "Remembrance Day" and would be observed on November 11. In the Holidays Act, chapter H-5, Revised Status of Canada, 1985, Remembrance Day is the second holiday mentioned, right after Canada Day.

One might wonder why have a bill to protect a holiday which already seems to be formally recognized. The purpose of this legislation is to eliminate the risk that this holiday might be used as a bargaining tool and be replaced by an additional day elsewhere in the calendar, a measure which would be at odds with the purpose of Remembrance Day, which is meant to be a day of commemoration and respect.

The fact is that such a substitution is a possibility. There is a provision in section 195 of the Canada Labour Code which says that "Any other holiday may be substituted for a general holiday". Consequently, this substitution is a right which can be exercised or claimed. According to section 195, the parties to a collective agreement can notify in writing the Minister of Human Resources Development that a specified day has been designated as a holiday in lieu of a specified general holiday. Under the same section of the Canada Labour Code, where no employees of an employer are represented by a trade union or where a class of employees is not provided for under a collective agreement with regard to general holidays, the Minister may approve the substitution of a designated holiday, at the request of the employer, if satisfied that a majority of the employees or class of employees concur with the application.

This goes to show that such provisions do exist and continue to exist, unaltered, without excluding holidays like Remembrance Day. We therefore take this opportunity to caution the sponsor of this bill. This piece of legislation would give a clear indication to the government. It would send a clear message to labour, but it would not eliminate the present loopholes that allow the substitution of general holidays and are likely to continue to allow it after this bill is passed.

(1850)

We know how important the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month is since 1918. It is important not only for the veterans for whom this day represents the quintessence of their existence, for the soldiers who made the ultimate sacrifice in order to restore the world peace we now know, for the civil servants and the workers, but also for the children, the future generations who need tools to remember all the lessons passed down to them, from the most marvellous to the most tragic. We must protect the Remembrance Day to preserve our collective memories, pay tribute to the past and accept responsibility for the future.

I am convinced that the government as well as the unions and the citizens realize the importance of the Remembrance Day, a

day to pay tribute to our veterans, to remember the horrible lessons the war has taught us, and to pass on a message to future generations.

In brief, we support this bill in principle. We hope that the Remembrance Day will never be abolished, moved or replaced and that, in order to achieve this goal, all current federal labour legislation will be modified accordingly.

[English]

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to speak on this motion. I, too, have lost relatives, in fact close relatives, due to these tragic wars. It has always been in my heart to make certain that these memories are not forgotten.

We have before us Bill C-251 to provide that Remembrance Day be included as a holiday in public service collective agreements. This bill asks that Parliament negotiate on behalf of the public service.

Parliament should never be involved in negotiating contracts for the public service or any other union. Bargaining is the role of union officials, union employees and union bargaining teams, not members of the House of Parliament. It is my understanding that the public service has already bargained for its workers to observe Remembrance Day as a holiday. Why then is this bill before Parliament?

It seems that under the current negotiated contracts that workers deemed essential for the public safety or public interest must work on Remembrance Day but do not receive extra remuneration. Essentially this bill will provide extra payment for those deemed essential or required to work for the public safety.

Let us think for a moment why it is that we pause at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month to remember: Lest we forget the sons and the daughters of Canadians in the time of the country's greatest need who chose to travel to foreign lands and defend this country against tyranny and dictatorship. Lest we forget many of the sons and daughters who did not return to the arms of their loved ones following the long, long journey to fight for democracy and freedom, yet they ensured that the same highest qualities remained in our government. Lest we forget thousands upon thousands of Canadians who offered up the ultimate sacrifice, their lives, so that we at home could remain free to choose how we should live our lives.

I have heard tales of the carnage of war. I have listened to veterans of the wars talk about their time over there. Not too often do these men and women talk about the battles over there. They talk about the times that bring fond memories, the detailed preparations for battle, the training for battle, or the nights of quiet reflection remembering home.

The reason those who faced the horrors of battle do not talk of seeing friends or comrades in arms who entered the fray but did not return is because of the pain that such recollections would bring.

Those of us who have not experienced total war do not really understand the cost in human lives and human memories that such conflicts inflict. Those veterans of such times recall the horror, and believe me, none I know of say that those times were filled with glory.

(1855)

Veterans ask us all to remember those who gave their lives for our freedom because they want Canadians to recall the total price that war brings. Veterans want those living today to remember total war costs. The cost is lives.

No one in this House would dare ask Canadians to not honour the memory of those who offered the supreme sacrifice, their young lives, so that we today can stand on Remembrance Day to thank and remember them.

By not supporting this bill, I do not make light of the sacrifice. None of those who died sought death. They were seeking to give life to this country and in doing so they died.

I cannot support this bill, not because I do not believe we should not remember them but because I believe this House should not diminish the freedom of workers and management to choose on what terms they will agree to work together.

As for the portion of this bill that will make it mandatory for those required to work on Remembrance Day to receive extra remuneration, I say this. If those we are remembering could freely choose to give the ultimate sacrifice so Canadians can be free, surely Canadian workers can freely choose to work on Remembrance Day without complaining about extra money.

Our young of years gone by were prepared to travel across the sea, live in mudholes and dwell in the cold and damp to preserve our freedom. They chose to do that. Surely it is not too much to ask those required for public safety or essential services in these times of peace to do so without thinking of their paycheques.

Members of this House must never allow the memory of our young men and women who died so we may be free to diminish in this land. We must honour them so we will continually recall the price we must pay when we involve this country and our young in war. Surely we can remember them without a bill that essentially removes a freedom they fought for, the freedom to negotiate working conditions. Surely those who are needed to labour on Remembrance Day can do so without demanding extra pay.

### *Private Members' Business*

Our young of the past died so we could be free. Our young of the present can pause at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month to remember those who died and why we must remember that war has a price.

Surely that price is more than time and a half on a paycheque and that price is more than removing one freedom from those who fought and died for our many freedoms.

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-251 has in this House a history which today I would suggest we have a chance to rewrite, not in the sense of being revisionist historians but rewrite perhaps out of a sense of duty.

On May 20 of last year this bill died in this Chamber—it was known as C-289 at that time—because of many factors, the principal of which was somewhat of a disagreement among and between parties and interest groups. That is, I would suggest, tragic because an act of remembrance is not a political or partisan fact.

We have seen in this same House in the past several months debates concerning the role of Canada in its military and peacekeeping. Although we as a country are not necessarily one of the major military leaders globally, we have garnered much respect internationally because of the extreme competence of our personnel and their effectiveness on these missions.

I really should ask the question: Why have we for many years been sending soldiers and our armed forces everywhere in the world? I think the response is quite simple. It is simply because in this country there is a belief that we Canadians should try to look for and from time to time make peace.

I believe that Canadians share a common set of beliefs, attitudes and values and that one of these elementary or core principles is our role as makers of peace on this globe. Surely I do not need to tell those present in this place of the hundreds of thousands of lives lost in this century.

(1900)

These were lives that were freely given because we as a country believed that it was a basic value shared in this country and the importance of our place in the world order. Of course, those who contributed the most are not here to ask us as a national collective to remember them.

Next year, 1995, will mark the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II and one would expect and undoubtedly there will be many national and international ceremonies to mark the end of the war. One obvious conclusion to be seen at these ceremonies is the fragility, the aging process, of those who were directly involved.

Wars or armed conflicts always operate on two distinct levels. On an individual basis it has a profound effect on those who

*Private Members' Business*

were directly involved. Today the veterans of World War II in this country are on average in their seventies and are declining rapidly in number. That unfortunately is a simple fact of life.

There is a second level to this. Wars have affected and moulded national identities and impressed, which is surely the case in this country, and reinforced the attitudes and values in our dealings with other sovereign states.

In Canada there is no doubt a realization that we as a country became an international entity and acquired a national conscience and identity because of our role in the major conflicts in the first half of this century; conflicts in which, unfortunately, the youth of this country fueled our endeavours. Today we do virtually nothing as a country or on a national basis to recognize the importance of the sacrifices made.

I know that this bill has reached the point of national consensus from a provincial perspective. There are a number of individuals in this country who are vitally interested in this bill.

One principal proponents of this bill is a lady by the name of Mrs. Wilma McNeil, to whom I spoke this afternoon. She has written to all ten premiers. The responses have been unanimous in support.

It is interesting to note and to put on the record here today that at least one premier in this country believed and put it in writing to her that he thought it was some sort of a holiday already. He did not realize the lack of the role of the federal government in this day.

Mrs. McNeil has also waged an information war to advise veterans organizations in this country about this bill. These groups, the core of which represent those who survived the war, have unanimously endorsed this bill.

Finally, I am speaking here today in support of this because I think it is an opportunity for the government and for members of Parliament to recognize the importance of this, not only on an individual basis because that will fade with time, but we as a national collective, as a country, recognize that this represents a day which has great importance to the national attitude and belief and, most important, the national values of this country.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in addressing Bill C-251, members will recall that this same bill was introduced by the same member three years ago. It was designated a votable item at that time and it passed first and second reading and was referred to committee. The committee voted against the bill four to three, even after appearances from the army, navy and air force veterans and the Treasury Board. After that the bill was returned to the House and eventually dropped from the order paper.

It seems that the subject of this bill has already been carefully considered and the substance of it rejected by the House. With so

many other priorities in the House of Commons and so many other good private members' bills that have never seen the light of day, I am perhaps not all that surprised to see that this bill has come back to the House.

Why would the committee choose this particular bill and this particular topic unless it somehow intends to choose bills that have been rehashed or bills of little import, unless it intends to make the business of Private Members' Business even less relevant than it is already?

(1905 )

Perhaps the committee choosing these bills is trying to deflect the political troubles that inevitably arise when this House considers weighty topics that are truly relevant to the issues of the day.

We must not avoid talking about the things that Canadians are talking about. The direction of this government should be put into reverse by tackling the tough issues first instead of putting off the repairs until tomorrow, wall papering over the cracks and ignoring the holes in the ceiling of Canada's national House.

On to Remembrance Day in this particular bill, it appears to me that this bill really is redundant because in many ways the matter is already entrenched in federal legislation. Canada's labour code lists Remembrance Day as a general holiday. It is also included in the regulations attached to the Financial Administration Act and the Federal Holidays Act lists it as one of three national holidays.

If Remembrance Day were the subject of much dispute it might be different. If hundreds of thousands of public servants were not already receiving Remembrance Day as a holiday I might be more inclined to agree that the heavy hand of legislation must be applied to this matter.

This is not the case and on the contrary allow me to quote from article 12 of the master agreement between the federal government and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada a union representing about 31,000 federal employees: "The following days shall be designated paid holidays for employees: New Years Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, the Sovereign's birthday, Canada Day, Labour Day, Thanksgiving and Remembrance Day". The list goes on.

This is a voluntary agreement arrived at in a consensual manner between 31,000 federal public servants and the Government of Canada. The master agreement already designates Remembrance Day as a paid holiday.

There is even a more sweeping document that says the same thing. It is the master agreement between the Public Service Alliance of Canada and the government representing another total of 170,000 federal public servants. It too designates Remembrance Day as a paid holiday.

*Private Members' Business*

It is clear that I must oppose this legislation for a number of reasons. The first reason is that it is not necessary. Treasury Board tells me that a grand total of 382,000 federal employees already stay home on November 11, receiving time and a half pay, giving them the opportunity to consider the tremendous price that was once paid by so many courageous Canadians.

This bill must also be opposed because from a Reform Party point of view we believe there should be a minimal involvement by the state in these types of matters. The state should not be legislating on matters that can be negotiated voluntarily between parties. This of course has been a problem with Canadian governments for far too long.

The government needs to become involved where there are clear practices of obvious abuse but we can see from the master agreements I have quoted from that the government has been very generous to give the day off even when many private sector workers do not receive Remembrance Day as a holiday.

Do you know the costs to the taxpayer of this part of the agreement, Mr. Speaker? The Treasury Board estimates it at \$50 million to \$75 million for this one day's pay.

We have already paid a big price for Remembrance Day observances. Obviously there is no need whatsoever for government involvement in this case.

That leads naturally to the second reason for my opposition to Bill C-251. Why should the federal public service have another holiday entrenched in law when the private sector does not? If the member for Dartmouth really thought that Remembrance Day was important enough to be included in collective agreements why stop at the public sector? Why not extend this bill to include the private sector?

Perhaps he does not realize what he is doing, that he is unwittingly offering a special privilege to the public sector toward enlarging the benefits and powers enjoyed by governments and government workers.

I would ask the member also to consider an unfortunate side effect to this bill which is to unconsciously deepen the wedge between private and public sectors. While the private sector has already weathered the storms of recession, while it has experienced massive layoffs and is now leaner than ever before, the member for Dartmouth would entrench public service benefits even more deeply than they are already. In essence he would further secure the isolation of public servants from our devastating fiscal problems, problems that may one day bring this government crashing down.

We have a public service that is respected worldwide. Our public service is the equal of any and as much as we might like to shield our public servants from decades of indulgent spending

by federal governments, the chickens are proverbially coming home to roost.

(1910)

Yesterday the finance minister could do nothing but crow about the debt and deficit and warn that government services and programs and yes, even jobs, must tumble in the coming months. This is the third reason I oppose the bill. It is not financially possible to guarantee the benefits that public servants have now, much less offer them more security and more insulation and isolation from what is happening in the real world.

The final reason for my opposition to this piece of legislation is more broadly philosophical. A collective agreement is by definition an agreement between two parties. This implies a process of negotiation in which items are traded back and forth until both sides agree on an acceptable package of items they can both live with. It is a process of mutual compromise.

When the government begins to legislate more and more elements of collective agreements it puts both parties at a distinct disadvantage because it reduces the number of possible compromises that can be made by either party. This makes agreements harder to negotiate. It is sort of like trying to sell a car with a precondition that the buyer must be willing to pick the car up in another city. It makes the sale much harder to negotiate when some of the terms are set beforehand.

I would remind members that the president of the Public Service Alliance of Canada has mentioned that it might be possible that all holidays will be subject to negotiation between parties in the months ahead. I wonder if even the union representing our federal workers would support this type of legislation.

My opposition to this legislation has nothing to do with Remembrance Day. It has nothing to do with the respect and gratitude I feel for those who sacrificed so much to bring me and my generation peace and prosperity. I guess I would be called one of the baby boomer generation and I have never experienced the agonies of war. However, I am not that far removed, even from World War II.

My father joined the air force during the war. Allow me to read from a book written about my father entitled *A Canadian Story*: "On October 26, 1943 he went to the number six recruitment centre in Winnipeg to enlist and when he arrived he was informed that he could indeed sign up but that anyone under the age of 18 had to have his parents' permission. Bill", my father's name, "took the necessary form, walked outside the building, forged his mother's signature and went back in".

My dad was just a 17-year old kid but he was willing to do just about anything to do his part for the country. He served with the air force for two years even here in Ottawa: "On October 9, 1945 Bill was discharged from the air force. His two years in the

*Private Members' Business*

service of the king was similar to that of many other young men. He had volunteered to serve his country when it needed him, as did millions of others”.

I am not untouched by the war and I am not untouched by the sacrifice of people like my father. In the end, he only had to spend two years of his life in this cause, but he was willing to lay down his entire life if that is what his country asked of him. I can only hope that if, God forbid, the necessity arises again, I would be willing to do as much to serve my own country.

Remembrance Day is a vital reminder of the price Canadians paid for the things we hold dear and let us hope that Canadians in both the private and public sectors, in homes and in businesses, in their personal and public statements will remember the sacrifices made by our ancestors.

Legislating additional public service holidays is both unwise and unnecessary in order that they may be remembered.

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak on Bill C-251, this piece of legislation.

I want to commend my colleague for having brought it forth. I want to correct a couple of things. First of all, this is now a recognized holiday in the collective agreement. It can float. That is the issue. The point about an extra \$50 million to \$70 million is totally erroneous. One could counteract by pointing out that if it is worth that much in a collective agreement it could be traded off.

What my colleague is seeking to do is make absolutely certain that it is a holiday on that day. Why is that? It is because of the sacrifice of the soldiers and their families and their supporters. Because of their sacrifice, we want to set this day aside to make absolutely certain that we remember what they contributed to this nation, the freedom that we have today, the greatest gift apart from health that anyone could possibly have. Because of their sacrifice we have one of the finest, if not the finest, nations in the world. We started with a real head start because this is a wonderful country, but when we think of what they have contributed to the very fabric of the nation surely we can set a day aside throughout the nation to remember what they have contributed.

(1915)

Unfortunately we take what we have for granted. I remember going to church services where the pastor indicated that we take our good health for granted until we start losing it. Then we suddenly we start to remember how important it is.

We take our freedoms for granted. We take the greatness of the country for granted. We take this wonderful, magnificent country of ours too much for granted. We have to stop and reflect, to think, and to say thank you. That is what we want to

say. We want to say thank you to our soldiers. We want to say thank you to their families. We want to say thank you to those who supported them. That is what this is all about.

We want to set a day aside to remember the wars, remember the destructiveness of wars, and remember that war should be passé. We want to remember those who died. We want to remember those who were wounded. We want to remember those who came back but who have passed on. We want to make sure that we do not forget their sacrifice, their tremendous contribution to the country, this free country.

[Translation]

My hon. colleague wishes to have this day set aside in memory of the sacrifices made by our soldiers, their families and those who supported them. We want to remember the wars. We want to remember those who died on the battlefields. We want to remember those who were wounded and those who came back, but have since passed on. We want to remember their contribution to our country, to what is probably the most beautiful and perhaps the best country in the world. We want to remember that they gave us a country where we can live in freedom.

[English]

That is really all I really wanted to say. This is an important initiative. This is an initiative that we should all be supporting. This is not an initiative that should be somehow shunted aside because of supposed costs. There are no costs. We simply ask that we set a day aside that is consistent throughout Canada so that we can remember those who served.

**Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on Bill C-251 this evening in the House. The bill will ensure that Remembrance Day is respected by public servants in the way that it was intended. For this reason I fully support the hon. member's bill and would like to commend him on bringing it forward.

Remembrance Day is much more than a holiday or a day off during the longer days of fall. It was introduced into our country as a day to do just that: to remember, to remember those who gave their lives so that we the people who stand before you today, Mr. Speaker, would be able to enjoy the freedoms we now have. It is to remember those who fought, those who made the supreme sacrifice with their lives, and those who sacrificed here at home during the two world wars and in Korea. It is to remember, simply so that we will not forget the sacrifices that touched so many Canadian families.

Children growing up today have no recollection of the sufferings that took place during those times of strife. To them it is another story in our history books. The recognition of Remembrance Day sparks questions in these children and in turn they will become informed. In this way the sacrifices and the

tragedies will never be forgotten, for it is when we forget that history repeats itself.

Remembrance Day has always been and should always be recognized on November 11. As it now stands the day can be used as a bargaining chip to obtain an extra day off at some other time of the year. Remembrance Day was not intended to be part of a lengthened festive season. It is a time to be solemn, to remember, to respect, and not to rejoice.

(1920)

Of course there are exceptions in the bill for those people who provide services that are essential to public safety or interest. These people will naturally have to work on this day and will be compensated appropriately. However in general Canadians should not be required to work. The country must hold on to those things that are most important to our history, not put them aside as if they belong to another era. We must teach our children it is important to respect those who died, fought and sacrificed so that we would be able to stand in front of the House today to debate the issue.

In my constituency of Carleton—Charlotte there are many veterans and many families of veterans who gave their all, in many cases loved ones who gave their lives, so that we might enjoy our Canadian freedoms. I shudder to think what might have happened to our world without their sacrifices.

I urge all members of the House to think of future generations and what will happen if we are allowed to forget.

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to participate in the debate and to pay tribute, as have past speakers who are either for or against the concept of Remembrance Day.

I had the opportunity to follow my father to Europe in the early 1950s when the Canadians went over and I saw the devastation in the countryside. I spent a lot of my younger life serving in the NATO forces. Nothing can teach like visiting a graveyard with the headstones of 5,000 to 10,000 soldiers. I refer to the second previous speaker who mentioned his father joining at 18 years of age. I went into Beny-sur-Mer and saw 19 and 20 year old sergeants; they hardly let them lead a section today. These young people gave their lives. I saw their graves for miles.

Nothing struck me more than when I went to Vimy Ridge and saw the massive battlefield and the Canadian monument which is part of Canada in France. Later I went to Verdun and saw on the hill, as far as the eye could see in the trees, the white markers where a million people had died in the first world war around

### *Private Members' Business*

Verdun, both German and French soldiers. The slaughter in those periods touched me deeply.

I hope we never have to see it again, but the remembrance of such an event was burnt deeply in my mind. As a consequence I hope we can teach in school about the history of wars. Although it can be a vicarious kind of experience for the teacher and the students, it can ask people to remember not to make the same mistakes of the past. We can imagine what it must feel like never to have returned.

Those are questions that are deep and piercing. Neither the teaching of history nor the experience of imagination come close to explaining the depth and intensity of the experiences of generations of Canadians who went through the first war, the second war and the Korean war. Some of them had such horrible experiences they will never talk about the war; they have a bond of silence concerning their experiences. Sometimes we can never get some people to stop talking about them, but that is the spectrum of the effect of those experiences on them.

(1925)

That is why we gather as Canadians to remember and to give thanks in our hearts for the peace and freedom our forefathers brought to us from those wars. Never as Canadians have we ever sought to go to a war with unjust cause. We have never sought to go to war to take a piece of another country's land. We have always gone for an honourable and just cause. For that we should be proud.

Some older people know about the personal way of the sacrifices but they are fast leaving us. There are few working people who experienced the second world war. There are some who experienced the Korean war. There are no oral histories to be given in the future. There must be some tangible recognition of that sacrifice which gives people a moment to reflect.

One thing struck me. Every family had a right to select what would go on the headstones. I was 21 years old when I saw the headstone of a 21-year old corporal from the Winnipeg Rifles. It read: "To all the world he was a soldier. To me he was all the world".

It was a rather choking experience because I never really got too emotional about it. I got into it as a young guy, all gung-ho, ready to go and do my bit for my country and to gain some experience. That may have the motivating force for some of our soldiers. However that headstone struck me as very sentimental.

These kinds of things are very tangible. I wish someone would make a reasonable video to capture the spirit, the headstones, the actions that took place on D-Day, and all other events they experienced. They should keep it short and sweet because war is hell. We must keep that in perspective. We never want to step into it.



*Private Members' Business*

The older people remember the dark days of war. It left great impressions with them. In my father's family there were three boys. One joined the army. One joined the navy. One joined the air force. They all had different experiences but all came back with different attitudes. However one thing they had as a group was that they never wanted to go to war again. That was significant. However the cause being just can be presented in a way that may motivate people like them to go at it again.

I have seen the news coverage of D-Day re-enacted and the role that Canadians played in a proud way, giving up their lives. When I was there I represented my regiment, the Queen's Own Rifles of Canada that landed at Beny-sur-Mer. I was serving with a fellow in the regiment who was had been there. He was a platoon commander. Of all 110 men in the company that went in, 19 survived. It is an awful to think about what we left on the beaches. We had with us some of the sergeants who had served in other companies at the same time. They kept our history alive by making an attempt at their objectives on D-Day, which as we know eventually broke the back of the Nazis and brought peace to the world for a short period of time until the Korean war.

I ask members to give due consideration to tangibly recognizing that sacrifice. The people in the employ of the government are perpetuating governmental institutions to some effect. That is why I stand today to support the bill.

**Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to follow my hon. colleague from Stratford to speak in support of this bill.

Several years ago I had perhaps one of the greatest experiences that one could have as a member of Parliament. I had the honour to go with the Canadian delegation to the 75th anniversary of the battle of Vimy Ridge in the company of 14 of the veterans of that battle, which was Canada's first. Many of us say

it was perhaps the battle that forged our country. All of the veterans were over the age of 90.

I remember one, a mere lad of 93, chasing one of his comrades age 95 around one of the monuments. I was astounded at the energy and the drive of these people at their great ages. I guess one had to have the constitution of a tank to survive in the trenches of 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918.

I saw some of the cemeteries that my hon. colleague talked about. I remember going through the largest Commonwealth cemetery. I cannot remember whether it was in France or Belgium. There were rows and rows of those little white headstones with maple leaves that said over and over again: "A Canadian soldier known only to God". I defy anyone not to be in tears after going through that.

I also briefly went with some veterans of World War II on this trip to Dieppe. I saw that fearsome and frightening beach where young Canadians fought and died in such great numbers.

Consequently, I would like to add my voice as the member for Halifax, the largest navy base in our country, a place where from all corners of Canada we remember with thanks and respect. I think that we should see Remembrance Day as a statutory holiday so that never, ever will we forget and so that the children and future generations will also know what Canadians have done to preserve their freedom and their heritage.

**The Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1) the order is dropped from the order paper.

It being 7.33 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.33 p.m.)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tuesday, October 18, 1994

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Lower Churchill Development Corporation Ltd.

Mr. Rideout ..... 6815

### Petitions

#### Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Mr. Patry ..... 6815

#### Gun Control

Mr. Hart ..... 6815

#### Euthanasia

Mr. McClelland ..... 6815

### Committees of the House

#### Industry

Mr. Berger ..... 6815

Mr. Rocheleau ..... 6816

Mr. Schmidt ..... 6816

### Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Milliken ..... 6816

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Criminal Code

Bill C-41. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading ..... 6816

Mr. Lee ..... 6816

Mrs. Hayes .....	6818
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	6819
Mr. Telegdi .....	6821
Mr. MacDonald .....	6822
Ms. Cohen .....	6824
Mr. Robinson .....	6825
Mr. Hopkins .....	6826
Mr. Epp .....	6827
Division on motion deferred .....	6828

**Department of Canadian Heritage Act**

Bill C-53. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading and amendment ...	6828
Ms. Guarnieri .....	6828
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	6830
Mr. Solberg .....	6831
Mr. Morrison .....	6831
Mr. Bodnar .....	6833
Mr. Bryden .....	6833
Mr. Gallaway .....	6834
Mr. Morrison .....	6835
Mr. de Savoye .....	6835
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	6837
Mr. O'Reilly .....	6839
Ms. Bridgman .....	6840
Ms. Minna .....	6841
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	6843
Mrs. Bakopanos .....	6844
Mr. Thompson .....	6846

**STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

**Persons Case**

Ms. Torsney .....	6847
-------------------	------

**Employment**

Mr. Caron .....	6847
-----------------	------

**Trooper Kyle Brown**

Mr. Cummins .....	6847
-------------------	------

**Women**

Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) ..... 6847

**Pierre Elliott Trudeau**

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood) ..... 6848

**Women MPs**

Ms. Minna ..... 6848

**Management of Government Finances**

Mr. Bélisle ..... 6848

**Bilingualism**

Mr. Ringma ..... 6848

**Sports**

Mr. Patry ..... 6848

**Women MPs**

Mrs. Chamberlain ..... 6848

**Women MPs**

Ms. Cohen ..... 6849

**Government Finances**

Mr. Laurin ..... 6849

**Women MPs**

Miss Grey ..... 6849

**Youth Club Soccer Championships**

Mr. Cannis ..... 6849

**Paul Brodie**

Mr. Mitchell ..... 6849

## **Apprenticeship Programs**

Mr. Arseneault ..... 6850

## **Patrick Kelly**

Mr. Mayfield ..... 6850

# **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

## **Government Finances**

Mr. Bouchard ..... 6850

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 6850

Mr. Bouchard ..... 6850

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 6850

Mr. Bouchard ..... 6851

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 6851

Mr. Loubier ..... 6851

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 6851

Mr. Loubier ..... 6851

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 6851

## **The Economy**

Mr. Manning ..... 6851

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) ..... 6852

Mr. Manning ..... 6852

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6852
Mr. Manning .....	6852
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6852

**National Defence**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	6852
Mr. Collenette .....	6852
Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) .....	6852
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6852

**Taxation**

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge) .....	6853
Ms. Copps .....	6853
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge) .....	6853
Ms. Copps .....	6853

**Hibernia Project**

Mr. Brien .....	6853
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6853
Mr. Brien .....	6853
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6853

**Health Care Forum**

Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	6854
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6854
Mr. Hill (Macleod) .....	6854
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6854

**National Forum on Health**

Mrs. Picard .....	6854
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6854
Mrs. Picard .....	6854
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice) .....	6854

**VIA Rail**

Mr. Allmand .....	6854
-------------------	------

Mr. Young ..... 6854

**Public Accounts of Canada**

Mr. Williams ..... 6855  
Mr. Peters ..... 6855  
Mr. Williams ..... 6855  
Mr. Peters ..... 6855

**Intergovernmental Affairs**

Mr. Jacob ..... 6855  
Mr. Massé ..... 6855  
Mr. Jacob ..... 6855  
Mr. Collenette ..... 6855

**Canadian Security Intelligence Service**

Ms. Meredith ..... 6856  
Mr. Gray ..... 6856  
Ms. Meredith ..... 6856  
Mr. Gray ..... 6856

**The Environment**

Mr. Finlay ..... 6856  
Ms. Copps ..... 6856

**Coast Guard College in Sydney**

Mr. Guimond ..... 6856  
Mr. Young ..... 6856  
Mr. Guimond ..... 6856  
Mr. Young ..... 6856

**West Coast Fishery**

Mr. Cummins ..... 6857  
Mr. Tobin ..... 6857  
Mr. Cummins ..... 6857  
Mr. Tobin ..... 6857

**Foreign Affairs**

Mr. Bergeron ..... 6857

Mr. Ouellet .....	6857
-------------------	------

**Pearson International Airport**

Mr. Gouk .....	6857
Mr. Young .....	6858

**Immigration**

Mr. Dromisky .....	6858
Mr. Marchi .....	6858

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Department of Canadian Heritage Act**

Bill C-53. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading and amendment. . . .	6858
Mr. Thompson .....	6858
Mr. Duhamel .....	6859
Mr. Fillion .....	6860
Mr. McKinnon .....	6861
Mr. Penson .....	6862
Mr. Jackson .....	6863
Mr. Dumas .....	6864
Ms. Brown (Oakville—Milton) .....	6866
Mr. Williams .....	6866
Mr. Boudria .....	6867
Mr. Crête .....	6869
Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso) .....	6870
Mr. Ringma .....	6871
Mr. Harb .....	6872
Mrs. Dalphond—Guiral .....	6873
Mr. de Jong .....	6875
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	6876
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	6878

**Department of Agriculture Act**

Bill C-49. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	6879
Amendment negatived on division: Yeas; 103; Nays, 133 .....	6879



(Motion agreed to.) ..... 6880

**Department of Industry Act**

Bill C-46. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading ..... 6880

Amendment to the amendment negated on division: Yeas, 48; Nays, 189 ..... 6880

**Department of Natural Resources Act**

Bill C-48. Consideration resumed of second reading ..... 6881

Amendment negated on division: Yeas, 45; Nays, 189 ..... 6881

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.) ..... 6883

**Department of Public Works and Government Services Act**

Bill C-52. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading and amendment ... 6883

Motion negated on division: Yeas, 100; Nays, 138 ..... 6883

**Criminal Code**

Bill C-41. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading ..... 6885

Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 189; Nays, 48. .... 6885

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee.) ..... 6886

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Remembrance Day Act**

Bill C-251. Motion for second reading ..... 6886

Mr. MacDonald ..... 6886

Mr. Godin ..... 6887

Mr. Thompson ..... 6888

Mr. Gallaway ..... 6889

Mr. Strahl ..... 6890

Mr. Duhamel ..... 6892

Mr. Culbert ..... 6892

Mr. Richardson ..... 6893

Ms. Clancy ..... 6894