



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133 • NUMBER 234 • 1st SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, September 29, 1995

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, September 29, 1995

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

OCEANS ACT

The House resumed from September 28 consideration of the motion that Bill C-98, an act respecting the oceans of Canada, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and on the amendment.

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join with those in support of Canada's oceans act this morning.

Last November the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans released a document setting out the potential elements of an oceans management vision for Canada. The government sought the advice of all Canadians and the message was loud and clear: the federal government has a leadership role to play in oceans policy. Federally, ocean related responsibility has been fragmented and there is a need for focus in order to meet the needs of all Canadians.

Several key oceans programs are being brought together under one department to promote synergy in operational policy development, to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide a more efficient and effective service to Canadians.

In recognition of these principles, the Canadian Coast Guard was merged with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans last April. This merger has already improved the government's ability to manage and protect Canada's oceans and marine resources and has strengthened its commitment to marine safety.

This merger decision was not taken lightly. The decision to seriously consider a merger was made in mid-October of 1994. A study of the proposal was conducted by a joint program review initiative by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard, with input from the Department of the Environment, the machinery of government, the Privy Council

Office, the Treasury Board Secretariat and Natural Resources Canada.

• (1005)

The purpose of the study was to propose measures to strengthen the policy and program framework and policy delivery capacity for the administration of Canada's oceans.

The goal was, first, to ensure the environmental protection and sustainable development of Canada's oceans resource; second, to provide essential marine safety services; third, to foster efficient and competitive commercial and other marine activities in Canada.

The feasibility study was completed in November 1994 and it confirmed that a merger of the two organizations could result in a number of benefits at the policy and program level.

One of those benefits was improved policy development and direction of the environment and response to the United Nation's Convention on the Law of the Sea. Another was increased effectiveness with respect to fisheries management, enforcement, marine safety, environmental response and one focal point for industry.

With the merger, DFO has assumed responsibility for coast guard marine operations, including search and rescue, marine communications, vessel traffic services, aids to navigation, icebreaking and pollution response.

The Canadian Coast Guard and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans have many things in common. They have similar backgrounds and traditions. They have similar operations and marine policies and they both share similar views on improving ocean management.

While becoming the principal marine of the new Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the coast guard brings to the organization a reputation for distinguished service from coast to coast.

Collaboration is not new to the government. The coast guard and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans pull together as a strong team in responding to the Grand Banks fishing dispute on turbot. The coast guard played a valuable role in helping solve this dispute and one for which all Canadians are most grateful. Together the coast guard and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans demonstrated their commitment to preserve and protect our fisheries resources when others wanted to continue their destructive practices.

Government Orders

This merger can serve only to enhance Canada's efforts in conserving and protecting fishermen, fish and our marine environment. Together they now have a combined fleet size of 148 vessels, including 42 offshore vessels that will improve coverage in the area of search and rescue, as well as the ability to move more aggressively toward a tougher conservation regime through increased enforcement activities.

This will allow the maintenance of the frontline enforcement presence while strengthening surveillance, fishing enforcement and environmental protection activities. The coast guard has a well earned reputation reflected in its motto: Safety First—Service Always.

Both DFO and the coast guard are strong organizations with a common history of working in the marine environment and with shared goals and interests in ocean safety and environmental protection. Together they are building a stronger and more effective department.

With the merger, Canada has the opportunity to become a world leader in oceans and marine resource management.

To make our oceans vision a reality, we need to manage Canada's oceans and major waterways so that they are clean, safe, productive and accessible to ensure sustainable use of our fisheries resources and to facilitate marine trade and commerce. We need to build on our understanding of the oceans so that we can be more responsive to the changes and priorities.

• (1010)

With this merger we will be better able to deliver marine safety services effectively and efficiently while maintaining high national standards. Issues such as boating safety and licensing, marine navigation infrastructure, safety systems and emerging technologies, levels of service as well as user fees and other cost recovery mechanisms must be addressed.

As I pointed out, Canada's ability to manage and protect its oceans has improved with this merger. Amalgamation of the two fleets has increased offshore enforcement capabilities on both the east and west coasts. I am convinced this merger forms a very strong partnership that will streamline oceans management in Canada. I am delighted to speak in support of Bill C-98.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by pointing out that Bill C-98 before the House today on second reading is a typical example of the kind of bill I like to discuss.

Indeed, it will give me another chance to show Quebecers it would be both useless and dangerous to leave Quebec's development under federal control.

Consider the endless jurisdictional squabbles that would be generated by the passage of this bill. My colleagues from Laurentides and the Gaspé have already discussed this but I feel I must say more on the subject, at a time when Quebecers are about to make an important decision on their collective destiny.

The bill starts by identifying, in Canadian domestic law, Canada's jurisdiction over its ocean areas. To do so, however, the text merely incorporates provisions of the Canadian Laws Offshore Application Act and the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act. Since the legislation I just mentioned has not been amended in any way, this part of Bill C-98 is redundant. Especially since Canada's sovereignty over its ocean areas is recognized by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, of which Canada is a signatory.

Part II of this enactment is supposed to provide for the development and implementation of a national oceans management strategy based on the sustainable development and integrated management of oceans and coastal activities and resources. This is, in fact, one of the most ambitious attempts by the federal government to invade jurisdictions over which it has no authority and which it would be folly to cede to the federal government.

According to officials from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Part II of the bill could have been dropped, since it does not give the Department of Fisheries any new powers to manage a national oceans strategy. According to the preamble, the purpose of the bill is merely to encourage the minister to collaborate with his colleagues on identifying a strategy. Obviously, the minister cannot assume the authority to manage a strategy that has yet to be defined.

In the light of the foregoing, I wondered why the government bothered to table a bill that apparently is no more than a series of good intentions.

A closer look at the bill gave me the answer. First of all, the bill identifies two classes of intervenors in the process of implementing a national oceans strategy: the federal government and interested persons and bodies. In other words, provincial governments are considered on a par with any lobby group. This is one way of telling Canadian voters that "if you voted for the right side, we will consider what your provincial government wants".

• (1015)

In the case of lobbyists, particularly major ones, this government tells them "If you contribute to our slush fund—the slush fund of the right party—our government will lend a much more attentive ear to your concerns". For examples of this we need only think of the role of the Liberal government in the case of Power DirecTv or the purchase of MCA by Seagram, the sale of Pearson airport, and most recently the privatization of Petro-Canada. We have learned just this week that the sale of federal shares in the latter will be handled by Gordon Capital of Toronto, the Prime Minister's former employer. It will be

remembered very clearly that, when it came time to vote on a private member's bill on public funding of political parties, the government opposed it in order to be good and sure to go on playing the little game of "he who pays the piper picks the tune".

The parallel to be drawn between businesses contributing to the right party fund and voters supporting the right party is obvious, particularly since there is no obligation for the minister to follow any recommendations by the governments of Quebec and the other provinces.

Similarly, sections 31, 32 and 33 of Bill C-98 empower the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to develop and implement a national management strategy for estuarial, coastal and marine ecosystems. Such a strategy will require a number of elements to be created. First, activity management plans; second, administrative or consultative bodies; third, a number of programs; fourth, environmental standards; fifth, scientific data gathering and analysis on the ecosystems concerned.

These are already functions of either Environment Canada or the provinces. We have seen that the minister is seeking through this act to encroach on the provinces' influence over the environment. Thus, the only useful purpose that we can see in this bill is to invade areas of provincial jurisdiction.

It is also worthy of note that the bill before us, as I have already pointed out, will enable the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to encroach upon areas over which the Minister of the Environment has jurisdiction. Like my colleagues, I wondered why cabinet failed to see that and I concluded it was doubtless because, when the Minister of the Environment tries to invade Quebec's area of jurisdiction, she can be seen coming so far off in the distance that the job had to be given to someone else.

The fact that the minister is not obliged to come to an agreement with the provinces, which have a keen interest in the management of the marine environment, is both incomprehensible and unacceptable.

I would also like to point out that the environment is not one of the areas of jurisdiction the constitution attributes explicitly to one level of government in particular. It is what they call an ancillary jurisdiction and is subordinate to those jurisdictions the constitution explicitly mentions.

In theory, the Department of the Environment is responsible for the administration of this ancillary jurisdiction in co-operation with each of the departments concerned.

Until the mid 1980s, the Government of Quebec, which has jurisdiction over local and territorial matters, played a leading role in environmental matters, occupying the largest part of the field of jurisdiction. The federal government limited its involvement to areas relating to its jurisdiction, as the constitution provides.

Government Orders

After 1985, the federal government began to meddle in environmental matters. It did so primarily by virtue of its spending power and the new powers the courts had accorded it. That was the beginning of many instances of duplication and overlap. They continue to exist and have grown more numerous since the election of the present Liberal government, which is trying to centralize decision-making in Ottawa. The Government of Quebec considers Bill C-98 another step toward centralization.

In 1988, the Supreme Court of Canada, which Mr. Lévesque likened to the tower of Pisa, always leaning the same way, took management of the marine environment and surrounding territory away from the provinces and gave it to the federal government in a decision of four justices to three.

With Bill C-98, the federal government is trying to get the most out of this decision. Quebec fears that this centralizing tendency means the federal government will sooner or later claim management of the waters and the use of the tributaries to the coastal estuary and ultimately all fresh water rivers on the pretext that the contaminants in these waters are a source of degradation of the marine environment.

• (1020)

There is currently a great deal of overlap and duplication in federal and provincial environmental regulations. As a result, private businesses very often have to spend time, money and energy on many things such as collecting information on the many government programs, providing the two levels of government with the required data, participating in the various advisory committees and subcommittees in charge of regulating the industry, preparing for the inspections carried out alternately by the federal government and the province, and complying with the requirements of both governments.

In this regard, the toxic waste regulations are a convincing example. At this time, eight federal regulations overlap similar regulations that already exist in Quebec. Let us take, for example, the storage of PCB material regulations and the pulp and paper effluent regulations. Quebec sovereignty would effectively end this duplication.

Although it must recognize that it can no longer afford to take environmental action, since cuts of 32 per cent over three years were announced in its last budget, the federal government continues to usurp the role of the provinces in setting national standards and priorities. The new Environmental Assessment Act that came into effect in January 1995, which encroaches directly on provincial jurisdiction, and the eco-government policy in which the federal government favours relations with citizens and the private sector rather than with the provinces are striking examples of this kind of attitude.

Government Orders

On the face of it, the federal government has noble objectives and respects these areas of jurisdiction but, in practice, it bypasses the provinces, forcing its agenda on them and effectively taking over provincial responsibilities.

Bill C-98 adds fuel to the fire as the federal government, despite its financial situation, allows itself to create new structures to protect a particular ecosystem.

Bill C-98 sends an ambiguous message. It seems to reflect a concern for marine ecosystems while at the same time taking away from the Department of the Environment part of its responsibilities and treating provincial environment ministries on the same basis as the industry or municipalities. Will Fisheries and Oceans withdraw just like Environment Canada? It is obvious that Environment Canada is becoming a policy generating department instead of taking real actions—the Irving Whale is a case in point—mainly for budget reasons.

This leads to a number of problems. Here are the main ones. First, environmental concerns must clearly be identified by the grassroots. Policy coming from Ottawa is less likely to be suited to local circumstances, let alone be endorsed by the community. In fact, it has become increasingly clear that efficiency in terms of the environment is dependent upon a sense of ownership at the local level. For real progress to be made the people must be concerned about their rivers and marshes, their environment.

Second, one of the federalists' arguments for centralizing environmental management is that pollution knows no boundaries, travelling from one province or state to another. Acid rain and river pollution are good examples of that.

The federal government is apparently the only one who is able to legislate with efficiency and make international agreements, and to take a holistic approach in order to provide global solutions to global problems. Also, it is unthinkable that the minister not be required to work together with EC officials, as my hon. colleagues from Laurentides and Gaspé said earlier. Unsatisfied with creating jurisdiction conflicts with the provinces, the federal government has now set out to create jurisdiction conflicts between its own departments, all this in a context of fiscal restraint.

Once again, we have before us a bill which, like many others before, is designed to centralize it all in Ottawa.

[English]

I have much respect for my friends from the Reform Party because they say what they think and they think what they say. They are the only ones actually to speak about decentralization. They are pretending to offer decentralization for the good of all the provinces, including Quebec. I think that would be a good thing and I think they are really serious about it.

• (1025)

However, in that offer somewhere is a catch 22 because my friends in the Reform Party will never form any government in Canada as long as Quebec is a province. Quebec holds the balance of power in the country as far as the vote is concerned and Quebec will never vote Reform. It is not because we hate Reformers; we love them very much. It is because our philosophies are too far apart. We just have to look at our positions on gun control, gay rights, bilingualism and on all of the bills which have been presented to the House. Most of the time we and the Reform Party have voted differently.

My friends all know the country will soon hit the wall. They all know we are going bankrupt, as it was said in the *Wall Street Journal* not so long ago.

An hon. member: The second richest country in the world.

Mr. Pomerleau: We need a change and a fast one. My friends in the Reform Party should realize they should support the sovereignty of Quebec. I hope sincerely that somewhere down the road my Reform Party friends will finally see the light on their way to Damascus and find within themselves the courage to follow the logical path of their reasoning and bring it down to the right conclusion.

Most Canadians have actually come to three assumptions about Quebec: first, we are a bunch of troublemakers, never happy with what we get; second, we receive much more money from Canada than what we give to Canada; third, the economic disaster in Canada is partly due to the political instability in Quebec. If those three assumptions are right, then the sovereignty of Quebec should normally be seen by all Canadians as a good way to solve the problem once and for all and make money out of it, providing of course that we assume our fair share of the Canadian debt.

That is exactly what we intend to do through the negotiations which will start after the yes vote, although by all international rules and regulations Quebec has no legal obligation to take any part of the debt. Four studies were produced for the Bélanger-Campeau commission. Two were done in Canada, one in England and one in France. Those studies all came to that conclusion.

In 1994 David Crane in the Toronto *Star* stated: "Canada's foreign creditors would not want to transfer part of Canada's debt to Quebec. This is money they loaned to Canada, not Quebec".

That helps Quebec in a way. It means that Canada would have to reach an accommodation with Quebec since Canada cannot force Quebec to take its share of the debt. The article continued: "Technically Quebec could walk away from its share of the debt".

Government Orders

In the *Gazette* on December 13 William Johnson said: "Ottawa would suddenly lose one-quarter of all its taxpayers, but would be responsible for the entire national debt, some \$600 billion, nearly half of which is held by foreigners. Ottawa signed for the loans so only Ottawa is responsible before the creditors. Legally, Quebec would have no obligation to pay anything".

In spite of all this, we are offering to all Canadians that we will assume our fair share through negotiations. It is a shame the Prime Minister of Canada is refusing to negotiate. It jeopardizes Canada and Quebec at the same time.

Canadians should have the right to run their country the way they want without having to please Quebec at each moment. The referendum which will be held quite soon in Quebec will have an answer: yes or no. If it is a yes vote, and I think it will be—

[*Translation*]

Because every Quebecer remembers full well what Mr. Bourassa himself said, that status quo would be the worse solution for Quebec, and what we are being offered is exactly that, the status quo.

[*English*]

If it is a no vote what will happen? If it is a no vote we are back to square one. Fifteen years of constitutional debate to the next referendum. Nobody wants that.

• (1030)

I quote perhaps the greatest political analyst ever produced, Mr. Yogi Berra: "It ain't over till it's over". It will never be over with Quebec until we win because the Parti Quebecois and the Bloc Quebecois do not exist to support an idea. They exist because there is an idea to be supported.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-98, and I will conclude on this, demonstrates Ottawa's will to centralize, which permeates every bill. I would like to point out to my hon. colleagues that, in almost every committee we sit on, the Bloc Quebecois has had to produce minority reports each time Quebec's jurisdictions were at risk of being encroached on.

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before moving to questions and comments, let me say that I find it very regrettable for my constituents, many of whom are fishermen who work hard, to hear the opposition, and in particular a member representing an urban riding, say with such arrogance that the federal government is responsible for the problems in the fisheries sector.

What I find even more regrettable is that the member probably never set foot on a fishing boat, does not know that sector, and did not bother to meet fishermen and see for himself that these people are honest, hardworking people.

I find that regrettable and I think it is an insult to the intelligence of fishermen and plant workers from the Gaspé Peninsula and the Magdalen Islands to say that the only way to solve the problems related to fisheries, including dwindling stocks, is to become sovereign. The opposition is exceedingly arrogant when it makes such comments.

The fisheries sector must, to a large extent, rely on close co-operation with the provinces: New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and, of course, Quebec. But I can tell you that the federal government is also involved. It is there to look after the real interests of fishermen by protecting the integrity of Canada's 200-mile zone. What the Parti Quebecois and the Bloc are actually proposing is to close these 200 miles, this natural access, to Quebec fishermen, if that province becomes an independent country.

I find it regrettable to hear opposition members tell us that we will reduce the fishing rights of Quebec fishermen by 60 per cent in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic Ocean. The opposition did not even consider the ocean perch industry, for example, which will resume its activity some day, but our fishermen must fish that stock along the Nova Scotia and Atlantic shores. Unfortunately, the opposition does not take that into account.

It is only concerned with sovereignty, with independence at any cost, and that is what I find regrettable. The opposition could not care less about the plight of my constituents. I invite opposition members, and particularly their leader, to come to the Magdalen Islands and to tell us that they are prepared to protect the real interests of Quebecers—

Mr. Pomerleau: Mr. Speaker, before replying to the hon. member, I want to tell him that I was born in Val-d'Espoir, in the Gaspé Peninsula, about two minutes away from his riding. I spent all of—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, he used the word "traitor".

An hon. member: He must apologize.

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I heard the word clearly. You may not have heard it, but everyone on this side heard the member use the word "traitor".

Mr. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the comment. However, I invite the member to go back to the Gaspé Peninsula and withdraw his own comments.

The Deputy Speaker: It seems that the hon. member has withdrawn his comment.

Government Orders

Mr. Pomerleau: I am glad the hon. member opposite, who seems to think he is the only person from the Gaspé in this House, withdrew what he said.

• (1035)

I was indeed born in the Gaspé, in Val-d'Espoir, and my family still lives there. I know all about the problems of the fishermen down there. I also spent my holidays in the Gaspé, on Chaleur Bay in the hon. member's riding, and I have seen for myself what the problems are.

The hon. member mentioned the economic future of this country, Mr. Speaker. We want the sovereignty of Quebec for economic reasons. I remember when in 1980, at the time of the first referendum, Mr. Bourassa told us, and this will conclude my speech: "If you say yes to the sovereignty of Quebec in 1980, you can expect a lot of debt, taxes and unemployment". So people decided they should vote no. They did, and we remained a Canadian province. The federal debt rose from \$80 billion to \$600 billion; the unemployment rate practically doubled; the number of welfare recipients doubled; our young people no longer have a future, and we are still in Canada.

I think the hon. member should do his homework, visit his riding again and check with the people there, because in the Gaspé we are going to win.

[*English*]

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a warm wind blowing from this side of the House.

I was interested in hearing the remarks of the member from the Bloc. He made some statements with which I do not agree and I have some questions for him.

He suggested the Reform Party was honest in its approach. I agree with him that we are being direct and honest in our approach. He also suggested it is unfortunate that we are in a catch 22 situation. While the people in Quebec can identify with the aspirations of the Reform Party because we represent the aspirations of people in other regions of Canada, the Bloc feels that we will never have the opportunity to form a government because philosophically we are miles apart.

When the gun control legislation passed through the House we were approached by organizations in Quebec representing 1.2 million law-abiding gun owners in Quebec who could not get representation in the House or at the committee meetings.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I would ask hon. members, especially those who were here during the previous Parliament—the people of Canada must think we are pretty silly. I would ask members to show some courtesy to their colleagues who have

the floor, and the hon. member for Skeena has the floor at this time.

The hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm, on a point of order.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, I realize his microphone was not turned on, but since a few minutes ago, the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine has been uttering threats at me. I would like him to withdraw what he said, as well as his invitations to step outside the House. After all, this is not a kindergarten. I would like him to withdraw what he said.

Mr. Gagnon: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I never threatened a single member in this House, and I would invite the member to withdraw, because today I have heard nothing but personal insults from the opposition.

I only invited the junior member of the opposition, who is my age, to talk about this in a civilized way outside the House, and I invite him to do so now.

Mr. Speaker, I never uttered threats at anyone in this House.

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, this may be a matter of interpretation, but the gestures he made earlier along with his invitation to step outside, anywhere, anytime, were self-explanatory. In other words, the hon. member wanted to settle a matter in a way that is unacceptable in this House.

The Deputy Speaker: In the circumstances, I will again recognize the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General of Canada.

Mr. Gagnon: Mr. Speaker, this is not a school yard. This is the House of Commons. And as I said, if the hon. member has anything to tell me personally, I would invite him to do so outside, that is all, to settle this matter once and for all.

However, to say that we are threatening members of the opposition—I think it is unfortunate the level of debate should sink so low.

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I also witnessed this incident, and I can confirm to the House that the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine actually invited my colleague to step outside and fight.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have had enough of these denials of what happened and these attempts to convince others that this was not the case. It was. He invited my colleague to step outside of the House and fight.

• (1040)

The Deputy Speaker: My colleagues, I did not hear the words we are discussing now. I will review the blues, the minutes of the proceedings, and if I see anything, I will get back to it later in the House, if necessary. For the time being, we must take the hon. member at his word. The member for Skeena has the floor.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Scott (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, to finish my remarks before we get into school yard tactics here, the hon. member from the Bloc was suggesting the Reform Party would never form the government. I beg to differ with him. I feel genuinely sorry for those members because they earnestly believe they will achieve their goal. However we all know they will not.

When the people of Quebec vote no in the referendum on October 30, they will then be looking for alternatives and the Reform Party is the only political party on the national landscape right now that offers serious alternatives.

Members of the governing party have a vested interest in keeping the debate ongoing for the rest of their lives because there is a political gain in it for them.

The Reform Party has a completely different vision of that, a completely different point of view. If the Reform Party gets the opportunity to form the government, which we believe we will in the next federal election, there will be an opportunity to discuss a new federal arrangement with all the provinces, not just with Quebec.

Mr. Pomerleau: Mr. Speaker, I fully understand the trouble in the minds of my friends in the Reform Party, but it is a reality, it is a fact, that within the country there are three major voices. The first one goes to Ontario, the second one to Quebec due to the demographic compilation, and the third one goes to westerners. In my own opinion it is a shame. Even the Liberal government is always calling the Reform Party the third party because that is the way it is.

I sincerely think westerners should have a real say in Parliament. They should be entitled to run for power, which is not the case actually.

My friend suggests that if the no wins, the Reform will probably form the next government. However, if the no wins, for a short period of time the Prime Minister of Canada will be seen as the saviour, Captain Canada, and he will be elected again. We will be here too. To have the potential to take power the Reform Party must assume that it should support the sovereignty of Quebec.

Hon. Raymond Chan (Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have been sitting here listening to the complaints of the hon. member of the Bloc, the official opposition.

There are two points I would like to clear up before I deliver my speech. It is sad for me to see in the House that both the Bloc and the third party are seeking an alliance and to see the Reform Party trying to ask for friendship from the separatists. I could not take that.

An hon. member: That is not true. Tell the truth.

Mr. Chan: You were not here to hear the praise that was offered by that party.

As an immigrant I came to this country at the age of 17. My family went to Hong Kong and I came from Hong Kong to Canada. I came to Canada as it is. To hear the separatists day in and day out in the House trying to destroy the country that I came for is very sad.

There is also another point. The hon. member from the Bloc was talking about the provincial rights the bill infringed upon. This is not true. There is no change with respect to provincial rights. Where a province has rights today it will continue to have rights after the bill is law.

● (1045)

What all provinces and territories along our coast will gain is the federal government's commitment to work together with them to ensure an integrated approach to providing greater protection of our marine environment, improve the management of our ocean resources, and ultimately better economic opportunities for our coastal communities. The Bloc's accusations are not true.

I am pleased to join my colleagues and members of the House in the second reading of the oceans act. I rise today in support of this legislation, which will establish major new rights over the oceans that surround our country. Canadians pushed hard in the councils of the world for the opportunity to establish these rights. The new zones grant Canada powers that go well beyond the powers our country asserted in the past.

As the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said, Canadians are not naive. We know that the oceans act will not forever end maritime disagreement with other countries. There are undoubtedly bound to be some problems in the future with our circum-polar and Pacific and Atlantic friends and neighbours.

What the act will do is put in place a clear definition of jurisdiction that is fully supported by global agreement. The world recognizes Canada's jurisdiction over Canadian waters and now we must continue to work hard. With ownership comes both opportunity and responsibility. With jurisdiction comes stewardship. With respect for the efforts of the past comes respect for the needs of the future.

For all of the excellent co-operation that went into establishing oceans jurisdiction, the truth is that Canada's policies for actual management of oceans were fragmented. The same spirit of partnership, co-ordination, co-operation, and innovation that enabled Canada to gain authority over ocean resources must now be used to manage those resources.

We have before us the task of making sure that the pieces all fit together: conservation and commercialization, deep ocean research and cold ocean rescues, emergency responses and sustainability, navigational safety and national security, national goals and regional initiatives, resource restoration and job creation, inspection and protection.

Government Orders

There are pieces of the puzzle that seem to grow larger and larger in size and importance: climate change, ecotourism, aquaculture, Arctic pollution, interrelationship of species, expanding human population, new technologies.

The oceans themselves are constantly fluctuating. They are independent, living ecosystems. Yet they are interconnected and linked with one another and with the entire global environment. Just as in the tropical rain forests, there are yet unknown medicines to be found in the oceans and yet unknown dangers to be faced.

The oceans act defines a new vision for Canada's oceans. It allows for the development of a new management regime to protect its oceans. This is a regime based on co-operation, collaboration and partnership. It allows the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to enter into collaborative agreements and partnerships with all stakeholders to implement this ocean management regime.

The oceans act does not attempt to create a fully developed ocean management strategy. It recognizes that we must work collectively. The bill before members of the House of Commons creates the jurisdictional foundation and some of the policy framework so that all Canadians can build the strategy together.

We must have a better understanding and knowledge of the oceans. Science must be multi-disciplinary. Partnership across organizations and disciplines and sectors of society is essential. Precisely because our ocean jurisdiction is so huge, our ocean sciences must be on the leading edge. Better information is essential for better decision making. Better science is essential for economic viability and ecological sustainability. Canada's credibility in future ocean negotiations and future ocean trade will depend on the quality of our science.

• (1050)

The oceans act is tailored to increase, co-ordinate, and disperse scientific, environmental, and management information relating to our oceans and their resources. Marine resource management will be an important policy element in the building of a successful oceans strategy. Traditionally governments have carried out their responsibilities in consultation with stakeholders but not in partnership with them. The distinction is critical.

The old way must change and it is changing. The Atlantic Fisheries Resource Conservation Council now brings together industry, academia, and government to make recommendations on fishery conservation and the federal government now follows through on those recommendations. The time has come to expand such partnerships beyond fishery conservation. The oceans act makes it possible to expand partnerships even further to encompass marine plants, underwater exploration, seabed mining and a vast range of development activities that could impact in a marine environment.

A key element of an effective oceans strategy must be the consideration of environmental consequences in management decisions. It will take time, effort and compromise to accomplish this, but Canada needs a functional ecosystems approach to oceans policy. Such an approach must converge across lines of jurisdiction and economic sectors. The issues of environmental concern must be addressed through a range of tools, including coastal zone management, pollution prevention, marine environmental quality indicators and guidelines.

Another key element of a successful oceans strategy is the facilitation of marine trade, commerce and development. It goes without saying that icebreaking, fish inspection, marine navigation services and ocean mapping have priorities in ocean trade and commerce. So do new ocean laboratory partnerships, technology development, regulatory harmonization and resource assessment. This synergy of collective interests and integrated capabilities is recognized in the act and is exemplified in the new Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

The increase in Canada's oceans jurisdiction marries well with the merger of the Canadian Coast Guard and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. The new organization will be comprised of the principal civilian marine operational component of the Government of Canada. We will be able to realize efficiencies, streamline operations, integrate the operation of the coast guard and fisheries fleets and promote multi-tasking. All of this will help us to work more effectively to provide high national standards and effective services.

For years we have supported commercial enterprises in the Arctic. We have ensured and will continue to ensure the safe movement of millions of dollars of cargo through ice filled waters. We have provided sophisticated analysis in the operation of the St. Lawrence.

Commercial enterprises must have easy access to government data. We have to ensure that new ideas and technologies are transferred from government researchers to the private sector.

The expertise that Canadians have developed in forging oceans policy can be and should be the backbone of extraordinary new global market opportunities. That leads directly to a key element of an oceans management strategy, international relations. From the days when others denied John Cabot's discovery of the new world to the days when others denied Canada's right to protect the turbot, international relations have been centre stage in Canada's maritime saga. Canadians have shown that fisheries conservation will never be sacrificed on the altar of economic trade or political relations. We have shown that conservation is not a bargaining chip in a larger game. Our responsibility now is to make this legislation the turning point in our approach to all international ocean issues.

• (1055)

Canadians need to establish a strong and credible international strategy to carry our messages on marine pollution from ships, on the control of ocean dumping and coastal zone management with our neighbours. Circumpolar oceans management, spill response assistance, international shipping, offshore energy, precise territorial boundary delineation and emerging high seas issues will all require thoughtful leadership by Canadians globally and thoughtful examples by Canadians domestically.

Support from all Canadians for Canada's international actions is of enormous importance. I look forward to the active involvement of Canadians in forging Canada's position on emerging global ocean issues.

As the minister stated on Tuesday, the oceans act signals renewed federal leadership for oceans management. It signals the federal government's commitment to a comprehensive and co-operative approach to oceans policy. It signals that shared information, shared planning and shared oceans stewardship are the wave of the future. It signals that Canada and Canadians are prepared to act in making the most of our ocean assets, opportunities and obligations.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have to respond to the initial comments of the parliamentary secretary as he described his reaction to this whole Bloc-Liberal fight that is going on this morning.

Somehow he is trying to tie in some association between the Bloc Quebecois and the Reform Party. When he is making that kind of an analogy, how does the minister reconcile the fact that when it comes to acquiescing to the Bloc and it comes to electing vice-chairs, when it comes to making sure that the water is never rippled it is always the Liberals making a deal with the Bloc?

The idea that the Reform Party somehow has any similar vision to the Bloc is crazy. We have repeatedly said the Bloc Quebecois will be defeated, hopefully at the end of the month, that it will hopefully lose its reason for being here, which would be another sweet treat. It surely has the wrong vision about how to fix Canada.

I agree with the minister when he says Canada is a great place. It does need some changes though, and the way to change it is not to leave but to work within the system to make a better decentralized Canadian federation that can be better for all Canadians.

The goal of the Reform Party—

The Speaker: My colleague, I noticed you were getting wound up. I thought I would give you a chance to catch your breath and come back at it right after question period, when the minister will also have a chance to get wound up.

S. O. 31

It being 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 30(5) the House will now proceed to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

ELLEN FOUNDATION

Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. John Willoughby, who has been working diligently for several years on a project called the Ellen Foundation.

In the late 1800s and early 1900s, a farm emigration policy on juveniles was established between England and Canada. This agreement brought 100,000 English children to Canada to work as farm labourers. These children came to be known as "home children".

Mr. Willoughby has just launched his book entitled *Ellen—The Story of a Home Child who was sent to P.E.I.* Ellen, as it turns out, was the inspiration for *Anne of Green Gables* by Lucy Maude Montgomery.

The Ellen Foundation is dedicated to assist home children and their descendants to establish and locate their roots in the United Kingdom, to preserve the history and heritage of the home children, and to provide the information here and abroad on their story and their strong contribution to the building of Canada.

I congratulate John and wish him much success.

* * *

[Translation]

DIVISION OF NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to Robert Fairholm, an economist from a prestigious American firm, the financial markets will force Canada to quickly negotiate division of the debt and to maintain the existing economic ties between the two partners. He says that they will be seeking each other out to sign such an agreement.

Since Canada has the worse external debt among the G-7, foreign investors will obviously want to protect their investments by forcing Canada to negotiate with Quebec. The financial markets will be there to cool down the emotions of those involved.

It is hard to believe that the Minister of Finance for Canada is incapable of grasping this and keeps saying that Canada could not negotiate a new partnership with Quebec even if it wanted to.

If the Minister of Finance forgets his duty as the manager of the Canadian debt, and if he forgets where the interests of Canadians and Quebecers lie, the financial markets and one of the worst debts in the western world will be there to remind him of that duty.

S. O. 31

[English]

MAJOR BRUCE HENWOOD

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday one of our Canadian peacekeepers, Major Bruce Henwood, was injured when the jeep he was riding in hit a mine in Croatia. As a result Major Henwood had both legs amputated below the knee.

It is this unfortunate and horrid type of incident which underscores the dangerous and perilous duties performed by our peacekeepers working abroad. Major Henwood is one of many Canadian peacekeepers serving abroad who comes face to face with this kind of reality every day.

On behalf of my colleagues from both sides of the House I extend to Major Henwood, as well as his family, friends and comrades in the field, our heartfelt regret over this tragic incident and our sincerest best wishes for his recovery.

* * *

DAY CARE

Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I draw to the attention of the House a concrete example of our government's commitment to day care.

In my riding of Brant we have day care centres attached to two of our local high schools. They provide care to the children of single adolescent parents who are continuing their education and to the children of mature students who are also parents.

Our thinking here is that if we provide appropriate day care to the children, their parents will continue with their education, which is so important to their future in terms of getting a job and in some cases to breaking the welfare trap.

Unfortunately because of significant provincial government cuts these facilities faced closure on October 1. Thanks to the quick action of my colleague, the Minister of Human Resources Development, we found funding through the human resources investment fund to keep the facilities open.

I congratulate him on recognizing the direct and important link between day care, jobs and education, and thank him for allowing us to continue this unique and effective day care strategy.

* * *

WAR MEMORIALS

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, within the past two weeks I have had the honour of attending the official unveiling of two important plaques commemorating Canadians who served overseas during the first and second world wars.

On Thursday, September 21 a plaque was unveiled at the National War Memorial, a gift from the British people as a symbol of their abiding gratitude for Canada's support during both World War I and World War II.

On Tuesday, September 26 Lech Walesa, President of the Republic of Poland, approved the posthumous award of the Polish Home Army Cross to 26 Canadian airmen for their support in the liberation of Poland.

That ceremony took place at the Canadian Airmen Memorial in Ottawa at Confederation Park. Both actions and plaques serve as a permanent reminder of Canadian bravery and sacrifice in the protection of freedom, democracy and peace.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am standing here to support the member for Churchill in his initiative to organize a sacred assembly. The assembly would bring together aboriginal and non-aboriginal spiritual leaders to begin a process of healing and reconciliation.

Spirituality, as the member says, has been the missing element in the political process to reclaim native land and the right to self-government. Spirituality has sustained native people for generations. The importance of spirituality was demonstrated during the recent standoff at Gustafsen Lake where a peaceful settlement resulted through the interventions of a native spiritual leader.

● (1105)

The member for Churchill has urged all his colleagues in the House to support his initiatives. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC TERRITORY

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is very pleased with something said yesterday by the provincial member for Vaudreuil and the leader of the No side, Daniel Johnson. Commenting on the Cree referendum, he again indicated his total agreement with the basic principles of international law and therefore with the position of the sovereignists concerning territorial integrity. He clearly affirmed that Quebec is indivisible.

It is to be hoped that the eminent good sense in his words will reach the ears of his federal counterpart, the hon. member for Vaudreuil, who suggests that the people of West Island and those in West Quebec could hold their own referendum, like the Cree, with a view to breaking up Quebec. Let us be a little more serious here. The Republic of Baie d'Urfé does not seem to us to possess all of the characteristics required of a state, particularly

in international law. Would the Liberal members for Vaudreuil on the two different levels please take the time to get their act together?

* * *

[English]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the publication *Agriweek* sums up the opinions of thousands of prairie producers affected by the Crow buyout. I quote:

The buyout exercise—is turning out to be distressingly like other government clerical undertakings: disorganized, confused, rigid, user unfriendly. Whoever designed this could not have had even a passing acquaintance with the workings of prairie agriculture and no one with experience in such things could have been consulted.

Except for the agriminister's admonition a fair arrangement should be made, there has been no guidance of any sort as to what would be fair and the payments office has scrupulously avoided giving any advice. Neither owners nor tenants could know what others were doing.

The landlord-tenant split of the payment will go down in history as among the most bizarre rules of any government farm program ever invented, as well as a source of owner-renter friction for years to come.

Prairie farmers know Liberal agricultural policies and programs usually end up a wreck.

* * *

INFORMATION HIGHWAY

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commend the Information Highway Advisory Council for its excellent report published Wednesday by the industry minister.

The council's vision for the Infobahn of the future is distinctly Canadian. It will be a powerful engine to promote Canadian culture and identity, make government more accessible and accountable, create new wealth and new jobs for the benefit of all Canadians and make Canada's health and educational sectors models for the rest of the world.

I am also pleased to see that the council's recommendation for dealing with illegal content such as hate propaganda mirror the intent of the motion I introduced in the House last January, which was adopted without dissent.

No doubt when these recommendations are fully adopted by the government we will have a guarantee that the information highway will be a highway of harmony, not of hate. No doubt we will have an effective tool to forge a renewed partnership among all levels of government as we face the social, political and economic challenges of the 21st century. I ask all colleges in the House—

S. O. 31

The Speaker: The hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River.

* * *

COMMUNITY OF RUSSELL

Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is creating a climate of opportunity for rural Canadians and the people of Dauphin—Swan River are seizing these opportunities to diversify their economies and create jobs at home.

In particular I commend the people of Russell who are forging ahead with an ethanol plant that includes a gluten extracting component and a feedlot operation. Within the same community another group is working to develop a ski hill. The belief the community has in itself and in its future is clear.

I am pleased to be working with both these groups to help them achieve their goals.

I commend the people of Russell and area for the leadership role they are playing in diversifying their local economy and their enduring commitment to their community. It is this community spirit, this commitment to the future, that will ensure Canada remains one of the best countries in the world in which to live.

* * *

● (1110)

[Translation]

DIVISION OF NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in his inaugural speech delivered to Quebec's National Assembly on November 29, 1994, the PQ premier said: "Today, I would like to conclude a pact of joint responsibility and solidarity with every Quebecer. Our government will collect from everyone what is owed to the public purse—but in return, we ask each Quebecer to help us put an end to the mad race toward illegality".

This righteous pronouncement by the PQ leader was not reflected in the comments made yesterday by his finance minister, who suggested that an independent Quebec might not pay his share of the national debt.

The time has come for the PQ leader to set the record straight and to tell us clearly and unconditionally whether he intends to assume his share of the debt if Quebec separates.

* * *

REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it seems that the group of business people supporting the No side has finally seen the light. Indeed, at a one-day conference of the Association du centre mondial de commerce, the chairman of the Canam Manac group, Mr. Marcel Dutil, made the following

S. O. 31

statement: "If it is yes, we will turn the page and carry on. We are all Quebecers, we are all nationalists, we all have different opinions, and the day after the referendum we will remain in Quebec".

Mr. Dutil's speech is in sharp contrast with the downright inexcusable and despicable comments made with regard to Quebecers by Messrs. Beaudoin and Garcia.

This common sense approach by the Quebec business leaders supporting the No side does not seem to be shared by Mr. Dufour, chairman of the Conseil du patronat du Quebec. While commenting Hydro-Quebec's withdrawal from his organization, he Dufour made veiled threats to Mr. Martineau when he said: "From now on, he will have to look for friends". End of quote. This type of insinuation must stop, and Mr. Dufour could learn a thing or two from Mr. Dutil about respect for Quebecers and for democracy.

* * *

ALLIANCE QUEBEC

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, before the quiet revolution, there were people in Quebec saying: "Keep quiet, stay there, and speak English". We do not hear that line in Quebec any more, but thanks to Alliance Quebec, it can now be heard in Alberta. Yesterday, in Calgary, Alliance Quebec warned the Reform Party to keep quiet during the referendum campaign.

The people of Alberta are aware that Alliance Quebec is an organization without public support, a front funded by the federal government to fuel misunderstandings between francophones and anglophones in Quebec and elsewhere, for partisan purposes.

The message from the Reform Party that Alliance Quebec does not want people to hear is that a No vote is a vote against separation while saying No to the status quo means no more subsidies for groups like Alliance Quebec.

If Alliance Quebec really wants the No side to win the referendum, they should keep quiet and remain in Alberta, where they could speak English all day long, like in the days before the quiet revolution.

* * *

DIVISION OF THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the PQ Minister of Finance has just sent a troubling message to the people of Quebec regarding the debt load an independent Quebec would have to carry.

Instead of coming across as and acting like a serious and responsible administrator, the PQ government's finance minister has decided to add to the uncertainty surrounding statements made by the Bloc leader by asking: "When Mr. Martin says that negotiations will be impossible, does it mean that he will shoulder full responsibility for the debt?"

Are we to understand from what the minister said that a PQ government might decide to stop paying its debts, while at the same time expecting its taxpayers to continue paying all their taxes? Is that the new concept of tax fairness that would be applied in an independent Quebec?

* * *

DIVISION OF THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in his budget speech, the PQ Minister of Finance announced that he was declaring war on "tax offenders". He said: "Before thinking about increasing the taxpayers' burden, we must make sure that everyone pays the government what they owe".

This is the same minister who, on February 8, made the following comment about the division of Canada's debt should Quebec become independent: "This is not our debt. It is Canada's debt". Yesterday, speaking before a student audience, he suggested that a separate Quebec may not assume its share of the debt.

How much confidence can the people of Quebec put in a finance minister who publicly tells taxpayers: "Do as I say, not as I do". On October 30, the people will say No to this kind of double talk.

* * *

• (1115)

[English]

WORLD SUMMIT FOR CHILDREN

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifth anniversary of the World Summit for Children. Under the leadership of Canada, 70 nations pledged that by the year 2000 they would eliminate illiteracy, reduce malnutrition by half and provide universal access to clean water around the world.

This year UNICEF reports that as a result of the summit four million children in the third world will not only survive but will become full productive members of society. However more needs to be done since 13 million children are still likely to die each year for lack of basic health care and safe water.

I rise today to salute the excellent work of Results Canada which continues to promote the summit ideals. As a government we must continue to step up our efforts to ensure that the basic needs of all children worldwide are met by the year 2000.

*Oral Questions***THE GRUMMAN GOOSE**

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in March 1994 I rose in the House to call on the government to delay the sale of the Grumman Goose while a dedicated group of Canadians in Prince George raised money to keep it in Canada.

This RCMP plane was built in 1944 and can land on water, snow or ground and has logged over 24,000 flying hours. It has seen service on both coasts, in Ottawa and the high Arctic. It has been used for drug busts, surveillance, rescues and air shows in addition to ferrying people and equipment.

I am pleased to report the federal and B.C. governments listened to the Save the Goose committee. Through the committee's efforts this piece of Canadian heritage has been saved for the enjoyment of future generations.

Today at 3 p.m. a retired RCMP pilot will formally hand over the log books of the Grumman Goose to the National Aviation Museum. I invite all members and the public to attend the ceremony.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC REFERENDUM

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers will decide their political future on October 30. In order to make an enlightened choice, they are entitled to know the whys and wherefores of the two options before them: sovereignty-partnership, on the one hand, and the status quo, on the other.

I am therefore asking the Prime Minister if he and his ally, Daniel Johnson, will agree to take part in a real four-way televised debate with Jacques Parizeau and myself. Does he recognize that it is all the more vital he take part in such a debate because he alone is in a position to tell Quebecers what exactly awaits them if they vote no?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised, having known Mr. Parizeau for so many years, that he is suddenly losing his self-confidence and is afraid to face the leader of the No side, Mr. Johnson.

As for me, when the Leader of the Opposition suggested last spring that Parliament be adjourned in the fall, I decided to come to Parliament to have the privilege of meeting the Leader of the Opposition every day, at every question period. We have been here for hours, and I do not refuse to answer. The leader of the No side is Mr. Johnson, I believe; he made an agreement with Mr. Parizeau. Mr. Johnson will keep his word; he will face Mr.

Parizeau. What is new is Mr. Parizeau's fear of facing Mr. Johnson.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we never asked that the House be adjourned. We were immediately delighted to learn that we could talk with the Prime Minister every day and converse about the future of our respective options and we will be here every day until the end.

We wanted to add to what we already have, because we only have a few seconds, which go by too quickly for my liking. I think that Canadians know full well that a question period, however practical it may be, does not provide the depth that a debate, a real intellectual confrontation on the things opposing us can give.

I think we would learn a lot more, because, had we not had the opportunity to see the Prime Minister for a number of weeks, we would not have known, for example, that he is refusing to recognize a democratic yes vote and we would not have known that he is preparing to slash the old age pensions of those approaching 65 years of age. We are learning things. The more we talk to him, the more we learn.

So we ask him, one last time, to agree to come, as the Prime Minister of Canada, and face those who do not think the way he does on television, live, for an hour and a half.

• (1120)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am answering all the questions here throughout the entire referendum debate. There is a leader of the Yes side, his name is Mr. Parizeau; there is a leader of the No side, his name is Mr. Johnson. The two of them reached an agreement on a debate. Mr. Johnson wants to have a debate with Mr. Parizeau. I have a debate with the Leader of the Opposition, here, every day. They try to frighten people every day, but if people want to live in Quebec and want to keep the security they currently enjoy in Quebec, the best solution, which involves no fear at all, is to vote no and stay in Canada.

The old age pensions will go on being paid out and Quebecers will be treated exactly like all other Canadians in unemployment insurance and old age pension matters. We have nothing to hide, but the Leader of the Opposition, instead of telling Quebecers why he wants to separate, used a new term today—sovereignty-partnership—to try once again to hide the truth. They will invent another one soon, more change, more illusion. Let them say the truth: "We want to separate from Canada". Quebecers want to stay in Canada and they will say so. This is what they will say in the vote on October 30.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we live in a democracy, and democracy needs enlightened opinion. One of the most crucial moments in any electoral or referendum campaign is when the protagonists with the highest profile meet face to face before the public and debate the merits of their options for an hour and a half or two hours.

Oral Questions

Could it be, as Canada and Quebec face their destiny and as the people of Quebec make a fundamental decision, that the Prime Minister of Canada, the defender of Canadian unity, is afraid of his option to the point of refusing to take part in a televised debate of an hour and a half?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in 32 years, this is the first time I have been accused of being afraid. Really! I have had debates with the Leader of the Opposition, I have a debate with him every day. Had I been afraid, I would simply have asked you, Mr. Speaker, not to recall us in September. I was the one who insisted we be here, to give the Leader of the Opposition the opportunity, on television, every day, to tell Quebecers why he wants to separate Quebec from Canada.

And again today, he used another little term. What was it again?

An hon. member: Sovereignty-partnership.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): Ah yes, sovereignty-partnership. Another word, another change, another pirouette. Why not have the courage to say that you are separatists and we shall see clear results on October 30.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we learned that we had to thank the Prime Minister for our right to sit in this House and, today, that we should thank him for summoning Parliament.

Mr. Bouchard: He thinks he showed courage by summoning Parliament. But that is his job.

Mr. Gauthier: Since the Prime Minister used all kinds of tricks to avoid answering the question directly, I will go back to the same issue.

I will go back to the same issue and ask him, quite sincerely and honestly, on behalf of the people of Quebec, on behalf of those who want to know what he has to offer the people of Quebec when he is asking them to vote No, would the Prime Minister be willing to take part in a debate with his boss, the leader of the No forces, and the leader of the Yes side, the Premier of Quebec, as the Leader of the Opposition offered him? Will he agree to explain his own proposal to the people of Quebec?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise every day in this House. I am not the one who passed the referendum bill.

• (1125)

The Quebec government's referendum bill names Mr. Parizeau as the leader of the Yes side. He is the one who challenged the leader of the No side, Mr. Johnson, to a debate.

This challenge was accepted by Mr. Johnson, the legitimate leader of the Yes side, who is doing a terrific job. He agreed to a debate with Mr. Parizeau. Mr. Parizeau is now trying to get out of it. I myself face the Leader of the Opposition every day, and I am very seldom here on Fridays. But I am here today. I am still the Prime Minister of Canada with all the problems of a prime minister, but I take whatever time is needed to be in the House of Commons every day. Mr. Johnson is eager to meet with the leader of the Yes side, Mr. Parizeau, but clearly Mr. Parizeau is not eager to meet with Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister not agree that Mr. Parizeau, the Premier of Quebec, wants to speak with the real boss, the one who can provide answers on cuts in social programs, on the proposal that he is now hiding but that we know he has in mind? Does the Prime Minister not agree that he should participate in this debate because he will be the one shaping tomorrow's country if Quebecers dare to vote No?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do so every day in this House, and I am not trying to avoid my responsibilities in any way. We are answering the questions. The Minister of Finance gave an important speech this week. Other ministers are criss-crossing Quebec to answer questions. I myself will be in Quebec on several occasions until the referendum. However, under the referendum bill, the leader of the No side is not me but Mr. Johnson, who, as I said earlier, is doing a terrific job. I think it is obvious that, for the first time in his life, Mr. Parizeau has lost his self-confidence. This surprises me, however, because it is unlike him. He should nonetheless have the courage to face Mr. Johnson. In the meantime, the Leader of the Opposition may find the courage to tell Quebecers that he is a separatist. I myself am here and I—

Mr. Bouchard: You are afraid of Parizeau.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): It is obvious that Mr. Parizeau needs Mr. Bouchard, because he has lost his confidence. Mr. Johnson is quite capable of defending himself.

I face the Leader of the Opposition every day in this House, and he has not yet given us a single good reason why Quebec should separate from Canada.

* * *

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the last election campaign the government ran on a policy of creating jobs and growth. This year there have been absolutely no new jobs and today's GDP figures confirm there has been no economic growth this year.

Since the Minister of Finance has failed to deliver on his promised financial and economic statement what is it exactly that he intends to do?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as is so often the case, the basis for the question is without foundation.

Within the first year of our taking office this country created over 430,000 jobs. Since November of last year there have been over 230,000 new jobs created in the private sector.

Yes it is true there have been job losses in the public sector at the federal, provincial and municipal levels. I find it surprising the Reform Party would not point out that this is because governments are cutting their spending. There is a lot less job loss in the public sector than there would have been if the slash and burn policies of the Reform Party had been brought in.

We came into office intending to reverse the terrible destructive policies of the previous government, a government this member worked for. We have done it and the Canadian economy is now well poised for long term sustainable growth.

• (1130)

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I left the Conservative Party in 1986 because of economic policies such as this minister's. It is surprising that it has taken him 10 years to figure it out.

Yesterday investment dealer Wood Gundy released a scathing indictment of the government's policies on jobs and growth. According to the report, we have "experienced the weakest recovery in domestic spending in the post-war period because of high taxes and tax increases".

Would the Minister of Finance agree the country needs fiscal policies that allow for tax relief in the next budget?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when reading these studies the hon. member should read them all.

It is very clear that as a major exporting country we are affected by the declines in the economies of Japan and the United States. That is obviously going to affect us.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, I have to say they sound like a cow herd in heat.

Mr. Stinson: Only you would know.

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard): Mr. Speaker, that is parliamentary.

Oral Questions

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I think the minister should not display to us his lack of knowledge of the beef industry.

It is domestic spending that has not recovered since 1991 because federal and provincial government tax increases have pulled more than \$12 billion out of the pockets of consumers, an additional \$155 for every Canadian every single year.

Will the government admit that it has increased taxes because it has only rolling deficit targets instead of a firm date for deficit elimination?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to refer back to the study, the tax increases that led to that \$12 billion the member referred to occurred under the previous government, of which he was a very ardent worker until he decided to skip town.

This government, in its first budget and in its second budget, did not increase personal taxes one iota. The tax increases, of which there were 39, occurred under the previous government.

I am quite proud to say I do have a beef herd, so when I hear the Reform Party I sure as heck know what a cow herd in heat sounds like.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Yesterday, in response to one of my questions, the Minister of Human Resources Development stated that he would agree to support a youth project in his riding if I would vote no in the October 30 referendum. He said and I quote "I am very pleased to say that I would certainly like to give him the assurance of supporting that project if he can give me the assurance of supporting the no vote on October 30".

Does the Prime Minister not find it indecent that his minister of human resources development is formally tying funding to organizations in my area to my political opinion?

[English]

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I think what we should be focusing on from his question is what the government is doing for the young people of the country.

Oral Questions

I had the pleasure during the summer months to introduce the summer job action plan, which created over 44,500 new jobs for young people.

The hon. member should be a bit more consistent with what he is saying. On the one hand, when we introduced the program he said that we were intervening into provincial jurisdiction. On the other hand, in a letter written to the minister he asked us to support a project that deals with Youth Service Canada, a project that he said was intervening in provincial jurisdiction. It is clear that we have a confused bunch on the other side.

[Translation]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would say that the parliamentary secretary is the one who is confused because I put my question to the Prime Minister but he did not reply.

• (1135)

By refusing to denounce the Minister of Human Resources Development who linked funding with my political opinions, does the Prime Minister not realize that once again he is demonstrating his lack of respect for democracy?

[English]

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member cannot have it both ways. On the one hand he is saying that Youth Service Canada is intervening in provincial jurisdiction. On the other hand, for young people in his riding he wants this program. He should make up his mind.

I have an idea for him. Support federalism, support a united Canada, and those kids can prosper just like every other young Canadian.

* * *

YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Meritt asked the Prime Minister to explain glaring inconsistencies in the government's pronouncements about Canada's mandate in the former Yugoslavia. The Prime Minister's response was flippant and I would like to ask for clarification.

In March the Prime Minister expressly declared that following a debate in the House the government was renewing our mandate for another six months. That time expires this weekend, but officials of both the Department of National Defence and the Department of Foreign Affairs claim that the mandate does not expire for another month or even two months.

I seek clarification from the Prime Minister. When does Canada's formal commitment to the mission in the former

Yugoslavia expire? Has the government undertaken to extend the mandate that was debated in the House?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers to a debate in the House, and I remember the position of the Reform Party. It was actively encouraging the government not to keep our troops in ex-Yugoslavia for the reason that progress was not being made.

I think the hon. member, with his experience, would very much appreciate that in Croatia our troops were withdrawn when the job was done, with no further ado.

Right now I think the House is entirely aware of the progress that has been made in Bosnia and how close we are to the peace process. To suggest that progress has not been made I think was wrong in the spring and it is wrong now.

Specifically, the United Nations mandate will expire on November 30. The Canadian rotation for the troops is due in mid-November. In view of the progress that has been made, the government will decide by the end of October on the future of Canadian participation.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the issue here is not progress in the former Yugoslavia. The issue here is the mandate of our troops and the discussion in the House.

Last September and again last March the government pretended that Parliament and the people of Canada had a voice in determining our peacekeeping commitments. We remember that in March the debate was held only two days before our mandate expired. Now we find that the government is acting unilaterally, without any consultation.

Canada's peacekeepers have always been faithful in their duty and they are right now. Along with other Canadians, they deserve a clear indication of the mandate and deserve a better answer from the government than the Prime Minister gave yesterday or what I heard just now.

When does our mandate expire, and why has the government not consulted Parliament about its extension?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member his colleague, then the defence critic, as a member of the standing committee, agreed to a report that in essence said that with respect to the committal of peacekeeping troops in mandates such as the one under discussion, under normal circumstances the House would have a debate. He agreed, somewhat reluctantly, that there were occasions when a debate could not take place. This may be one of them.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]***IMMIGRATION**

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In August we learned that the government had decided to increase the rate with which it was issuing citizenship certificates in Quebec so as to allow the greatest possible number of new citizens to exercise their right to vote in the coming referendum, close to 10 000 people.

• (1140)

The Prime Minister says he would never use new Canadians for political purposes. Would he indicate to us whether this is standard practice when an election or referendum is in the offing?

[English]

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the question asked by the hon. member relates to the voting process in the province of Quebec. The province of Quebec obviously handles these matters on their own. The Canada–Quebec accord is such that it is an example of federalism at its most flexible and at its best. If the hon. member does not understand that, she does not understand the accord.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I fear that the hon. member has not understood my question, because speeding up this process does not depend on Quebec but on the federal government.

How can the Prime Minister explain, for instance, that the processing of citizenship applications is being accelerated in Quebec at this time, but that was not the case when elections were held recently in New Brunswick and Ontario?

[English]

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member looks at the citizenship process through jaundiced eyes. The citizenship process in Canada goes on the same for those who wish to become citizens, whether they are from Quebec, New Brunswick or British Columbia. We have one system. It works well and it will continue to work well.

* * *

CENSUS

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, next year Canadians will be asked in the Statistics Canada census to identify themselves by race. Citizens will be required by law to answer this question. The

question is there so that the government can calculate its racial targets for its employment equity program.

Will the Minister of Industry confirm that the government intends to prosecute Canadians who refuse to participate in the exercise of racial identification?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that the purpose of conducting a periodic census is to determine the composition of Canadian society. This is useful for a wide range of purposes.

On the issue of race, in the past people have made calculations based on language rather than a specific question on racial origin. This time we think the provision of fuller information will give us a much better understanding of the make-up of Canadian society. That should be beneficial for a wide range of purposes.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians answering this question will have the option of stating whether they are Chinese, Japanese, Korean, South Asian, West Asian, or Southeast Asian. However, those who want to identify themselves as Canadians will have to select the category “other”. In our own country we will have to be considered “other”.

Can the minister explain why the government is so adverse to having respondents identify themselves as Canadians?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the Reform Party has repeatedly both in the House and elsewhere failed to recognize that the face of Canada is one of many colours and many languages. In looking at Canada it sees it only through its own eyes and is not able to understand how varied and diverse a mosaic we have created here. This is one of the strengths of Canada. It is unfortunate it has taken this approach to what is a very simple gathering of information for very useful purposes.

* * *

*[Translation]***CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION**

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Recently, the president of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation recognized the existence of two separate networks within the corporation, the English network and the French network. Predictably, Mr. Beatty refused to admit there were inequities in the financing of the two networks.

Does the minister agree that these inequities exist and does he intend to make up for this flagrant injustice to the French network by exempting it from the cuts announced last February?

Oral Questions

● (1145)

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is examining and is, in fact, engaged in a thorough analysis of its budgetary requirements. On behalf of the government we have initiated a process to examine the mandate of the CBC. We will also consider the finances of the CBC in the next budget, and that is our position at this time.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Heritage knows perfectly well that the inequities in financing between the English and French networks are obvious proof that francophones are discriminated against within the CBC, especially since the French network is far more successful than the English network in reaching its target audience and does so at a lesser cost. Would the minister at least have the courage to admit this?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I most certainly agree that the CBC's French network plays a magnificent role in developing the "francophonie" in Canada and throughout the world. I certainly agree with that, and I will do everything in my power to ensure it continues to do so.

* * *

[English]

AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. Harold Culbert (Carleton—Charlotte, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Over the past few years the New Brunswick Bay of Fundy aquaculture industry has grown to be a \$100 million industry in the Carleton—Charlotte constituency. An infestation of sea lice is threatening the industry.

What is the minister doing to fast track the approval of new drugs to control the sea lice problem in this region and save this important industry in Carleton—Charlotte?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Health Canada has received an application for registration of a pest control product called salmosan.

This application is being given priority attention. Every effort is being made to assess the product as quickly as possible. Health Canada remains in contact with officials in the New Brunswick government.

Over and above that, the pest management regulatory agency recognizes the aquaculture industry's needs and has already responded to requests by giving emergency registrations for two other products which have not proved as successful as we would

have liked them to be, namely hydrogen peroxide and pyrethrum.

* * *

SOMALIA INQUIRY

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, because the Somalia commission is of pressing national concern, I address the Prime Minister regarding Mark Boland.

The commission admits that its refusal to grant standing to Private Boland violates strict logic. Further, doing so undermines the commission's terms of reference which stress that attitudes, discipline and decisions at all rank levels of the chain of command are to be investigated.

Boland's rejection sends a signal throughout the non-commissioned member community that this inquiry is by officers, for officers and discourages them from coming forward.

Will the Prime Minister uphold the perception of justice by ensuring that Mark Boland is given standing?

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I believe he is aware that the commission has taken this decision not to grant standing before the inquiry for Private Mark Boland. He is also aware that the authority to grant standing rests with the commission of inquiry which is constituted under the rules of Canada and their ruling on this is publicly available for all to know.

He is also aware that because the commission is an independent, properly constituted inquiry, it would be totally inappropriate for me to comment on it and for the minister to interfere.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the reason I went to the Prime Minister was that the inquiry, as I understand it, comes under the Privy Council which answers to the Prime Minister. My question was to him.

● (1150)

The Reform Party compelled a reluctant government to undertake this inquiry. I am now gravely concerned that the commission is being unduly influenced.

Numerous generals and senior officials with only a tangential relationship to the main point of the inquiry are given standing or called to testify immediately. A lieutenant-general has been quietly appointed to head DND's liaison office to the inquiry while another is doing research for the inquiry. Yet soldiers like Mark Boland are being squeezed out.

Can the Prime Minister assure the House that the Department of National Defence is in no way attempting to suppress this inquiry behind the scenes?

Oral Questions

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we want to have a completely independent inquiry. We have appointed a board that is very competent and it will make sure that it has all the facts.

The Department of National Defence is obligated under the instruction of the government to give all the facts to the commission that are needed to get to the bottom of the problem.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA COUNCIL

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage. The Canada Council has decided to go ahead with the implementation of its new development plan, despite the opposition expressed by the Quebec cultural community. As a result, there are no longer two linguistic sectors and francophones are left with no contact.

Does the minister recognize that, since Quebec's distinct culture will no longer be a factor, this decision means that requests for financial support made by francophone organizations will be like drops in the ocean?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Council has undertaken an in-depth review of its structures and business plan, the main objective of which is to increase the council's efficiency and effectiveness, not to hit one group or another with punitive action. I think it can be said that the Canada Council has been and will continue to be a driving force for the development of the French culture in Canada.

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the minister at least recognize that once again francophones are the ones bearing the brunt of federal cuts? Is this not another way for the federal government to minimize and trivialize our identity as Quebecers?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will not use the argument that this is an organization operating completely at arm's length from the minister. What I want to say, however, is that there are no signs indicating that the Canada Council is discriminating against francophones. Far from it, the Canada Council is one of the strongest supporters of francophones across Canada and in Quebec in particular.

* * *

[English]

MEDICARE

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government has no more cash for medicare, yet the demands go up. The

inevitable result is thousands of people in waiting lines while the minister has one simple response: line up or shut up.

Will the minister change that response for Canadians in waiting lines?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada is this year transferring to the provinces just under \$16 billion for health alone.

In return for those dollars, we ask they adhere to five principles: universality, portability, comprehensiveness, accessibility and public administration.

The Government of Canada will not compromise those principles. We remain the guardians of medicare in this country.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, medicare is splintering under this minister.

• (1155)

There is a Reform solution, a solution called medicare plus, medicare that Canadians love, plus choice. Will the minister consider innovation? Will the minister review medicare plus? Will the minister stop saying to Canadians to just line up and shut up?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know the Reform agenda. It is a U.S. style, two tier system of health care. Canadian taxpayers do not and should not be expected to support a system which would use their tax dollars to subsidize queue jumping by those who can afford to pay more, that is the rich. Quite simply, it is wrong.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. At the International Conference of Appeal Judges which took place in Ottawa this week there was a serious discussion to establish a permanent international criminal court. Such a court would try individual cases of war crimes, international terrorism and crimes against humanity that are not now handled adequately by domestic courts or ad hoc tribunals.

Would the minister say whether the government supports such a proposal for an international criminal court?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government does support that proposal enthusiastically. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of National Defence and the Department of Justice have been active participants in an ad hoc committee of the United Nations which has been working since last year on this proposal. That committee will report this fall to the United Nations Security Council.

Oral Questions

I can tell the hon. member because I know of his particular interest in this subject that the international community is making real progress toward a permanent international criminal court to deal with genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity.

If I may add one word, at the moment there is temporarily such a tribunal headquartered in The Hague. Its purpose is to deal with those crimes against humanity allegedly arising from the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

I can report to the House about something of which we should all be very proud. Two days ago I met with the chief prosecutor, Mr. Justice Richard Goldstone of the South African Constitutional Court, who reported that Canada is contributing enormously in legal talent, especially in the Rwandan cases. We should be very proud of the contribution we are making in that international effort.

* * *

[Translation]

BELL CANADA

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after being forced by the CRTC to abandon its monopoly, Bell Canada is closing several test centres, business offices and telephone offices, while increasingly centralizing its operations. The company is also setting up several specialized subsidiaries to which it subcontracts work, thus changing working conditions for certain categories of employees.

My question is for the Minister of Labour. Does the minister recognize that Bell Canada's relocated workers would lose neither their union nor their vested rights if they were governed by only one labour code, that is the Quebec labour code?

Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Bell Canada employees come under the Canada labour code and we are doing our utmost to ensure that their rights are protected in compliance with that code.

* * *

[English]

PORCUPINE CARIBOU HERD

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in 1987 the Government of Canada signed an international agreement with the U.S. to protect the herd and the habitat of the Porcupine caribou which migrate between Yukon and Alaska.

Now the U.S. Congress is blatantly ignoring the agreement and passing legislation to open the sensitive calving grounds in Alaska to oil and gas exploration.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. The government initiated gunboat diplomacy against the Spanish to

protect the turbot. What specific actions is she prepared to take to hold the United States to its commitment to protect this vital northern resource?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are hoping in a very few weeks to be able to sign an agreement with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Bruce Babbitt, to set aside the particular calving grounds in question so there will be no exploration.

* * *

● (1200)

PUBLIC SERVICE OF CANADA

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian awards of excellence will kick off Quality Month on Monday, October 2. The awards celebrate outstanding achievements in the private sector.

During the last few years the federal public service has gone through tough and sometimes demoralizing challenges. Will the President of the Treasury Board tell us what the government is doing to improve morale and promote excellence in the Public Service of Canada?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to say that for the first time the quality awards that will be given out next week will not only recognize people who have done innovative and excellent things in the private sector but will also recognize those in the public sector.

The federal public service has a fine and well deserved reputation of providing quality services to the people of Canada. We need to applaud that kind of effort on the part of our employees. We need to share the success stories. We need to recognize the innovations that have been carried out by federal public servants.

In this Quality Month as the government focuses more and more on client focused quality services for the people of Canada, I believe we are in a situation where we can make a better work environment for our employees and provide better service to Canadians. That is what Quality Month will help us focus on.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of Her Excellency Anita Gradin, member of the European Commission for Immigration, Justice and Home Affairs.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS***[Translation]***TRANSPORT**

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to the third report of the Standing committee on Transport entitled *A National Marine Strategy*.

* * *

*[English]***THE ENVIRONMENT**

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a strong commitment and a strong attachment to the environment. I was pleased only a few moments ago to entertain a question from the Reform Party on calving grounds for the Porcupine caribou herd. It is certainly an indication that environmental issues are not exclusive to party lines and every Canadian believes that our environment is a part of our heritage and a part of who we are.

Since becoming environment minister I have met some incredible people from across the country, people who spend most of their waking hours working on environmental issues such as climate change, biodiversity and reducing toxins.

[Translation]

Yesterday evening, I was in Montreal to attend the Second International Hydrogen Summit, where I met people who really take seriously the technological opportunities which will be the major challenges of the 21st century.

[English]

I have also seen communities like my own that have fought back against environmental degradation to achieve great things. There are communities that have restored waterways, reduced waste, protected wildlife habitat, created jobs and at the same time have sparked innovative, fledgling incubator industries, communities like my own hometown of Hamilton.

In Hamilton people from all walks of life came together to transform our community from a city that was polluted and full of economic, environmental problems to a community that is cleaner and full of environmental and economic promise. The efforts of Hamiltonians have even been recognized by the United Nations. Hamilton was named Canada's only model sustainable city.

Hamilton was a city which only a few short years ago at the wake of tremendous transition in the steel industry had an unemployment rate of around 16 per cent. Today Hamilton has the lowest unemployment rate in the country and the fastest growing industries are the environmental industries.

● (1205)

[Translation]

Based on what I have seen in my home town and elsewhere, I know that the real power to make changes does not rest with politicians but, rather, with Canadians and their communities.

It goes without saying that governments and businesses have an important role to play to better protect the environment. However, without a degree of awareness and understanding, and without some initiatives by the various regions of the country, we will never reach our goal of ensuring sustainable development.

This is why I am pleased to announce a new program called Action 21. We are keeping the red book promise where we said we would give Canadians the necessary tools to protect the environment in their daily lives.

Action 21 will help regional groups carry out their environmental projects. We will match any community financing initiative by giving an amount equal to the community's participation for all admissible projects pertaining to the improvement, the depollution or the protection of the environment.

Action 21 will have to emphasize the measurable advantages of any initiative and favour activities dealing with air pollution, climate changes, biodiversity, toxic substances, and the preservation of ecosystems.

Action 21 includes a public awareness program which will encourage Canadians to make the environmentally friendly choices. We must all learn to care about the environment in our daily lives because we are all responsible for creating a healthy environment in our community.

Action 21 will help only non-governmental and nonprofit organizations. We want to support service clubs, senior citizens associations, youth groups and environment protection groups.

[English]

We want to support car pooling and transit initiatives because we think it is critical to reduce vehicle emissions and the effects of climate change. We want to support initiatives which reduce the use of pesticides in fertilizers in non-farm settings because it is important to improve the health of Canadians.

My hope is that we can particularly give a boost to young Canadians in their efforts to improve the environment in their own communities. They will have to do the work. We will match them dollar for dollar, but they will have to raise half of the money. I know they will do that because it is obvious that young Canadians understand that the environment is the key to our future.

Routine Proceedings

We have a lot to do. A recent study by Dr. Sverre Vedal of the University of British Columbia estimates that in that province alone 82 Canadians die prematurely every year as a result of air pollution in the form of inhalable particles. The Government of Canada has the responsibility to take whatever action is necessary to prevent those premature deaths.

Through action 21 we are empowering Canadians to join us in that battle. We are giving Canadians the means to make their own decisions, to build on community based environmental protection and to make sure that Canadians are not only part of the problem, but that every single Canadian is part of the solution.

Action 21 will have an annual budget of \$10 million. I will repeat it for the benefit of the taxpayers of Canada: Every dollar we give to any project must be matched by a dollar raised in the community.

Canadians want to find a role in being a part of the solution to the environmental challenges of the 20th century. With action 21 we will be able to achieve that into the 21st century. I know there is not a member of Parliament in the House, whatever his or her political stripe, who does not understand that the future of our children depends not only on the role of government, not only on the important role of business to clean up its own act, but also on the chance for Canadians to change the way we live and to build sustainable development as a cornerstone in all of the actions in every day of our lives.

Action 21 is a small step to get Canadians involved in choosing the right solutions for a better environment into the 21st century. Action 21 will provide them with a small vehicle to get government help to achieve that.

• (1210)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as you know, Quebecers care a great deal about the environment. It is part of their culture and of what they are.

Some of them have dedicated their lives to protecting the environment, raising their fellow citizens' awareness, as well as studying nature and its interaction with man. Some even called on the courts to prevent the federal government from going ahead with projects which were potentially harmful for human health and the marine ecosystem.

Local initiatives to clean up riverbanks, reforest urban spaces or even organize carpools are often taken on by individuals convinced they can and must preserve a safe environment for their children. They deserve our grateful thanks.

Clearly, I share the minister's vision regarding the appropriateness of helping initiatives aimed at reducing man's impact on nature.

However, there is a major flaw in the minister's argument. The program she announced today is obviously the kind of measure which upsets programs and priorities established by provincial governments, creates new expectations, and constitutes dubious management practice.

Action 21 is a perfect example of what Quebecers, sovereignists as well as federalists, have been fighting against for decades. The environment minister seems to have trouble understanding that. And yet, it is rather clear: Quebec no longer wants to see the federal government clumsily step in and negate its efforts. Many provinces share the same feeling.

The only purpose of Action 21 is for the federal government to use its spending power in areas of provincial jurisdiction.

The Quebecers have heard this song before. Its intent is laudable, and just about everybody recognizes how important it is. The federal government is setting itself up as a saviour generously handing out mana.

What the minister does not realize is that Quebecers know that government funding will be reduced, even stopped, within a few months or a few years. Budget constraints will then be blamed, as is already the case now.

Groups who have initiated projects will then turn to Quebec for the kind of assistance they really need, at which time the province will be faced with the following choice: either completing ongoing projects or putting an end to them. In one case, the federal government will have shifted to the province responsibility for part of its expenditures and, in the other, responsibility for quashing the projects.

This is something Quebecers have experienced over and over in many areas. Take for example the contaminated sites rehabilitation program and the greater Montreal greening program.

By being very careful not to mention in her speech the amounts earmarked for and actual duration of Agenda 21, the minister confirmed the misgivings we had.

Action taken under Agenda 21 is based on a fifteen year old philosophy aimed at giving the federal government the sole initiative on environmental issues. Relying on the authority of the Supreme Court and on its own spending power, the federal government is gradually taking over this area of responsibility, establishing new national standards which, in many cases, add to existing provincial standards.

In closing, I wish to thank the hon. minister for just proving to us that her government never intended to change the federal system in any way and that all it has to offer Quebecers is the good old Trudeau-style centralization. As long as it is able to get away with it, the federal government will use its spending power in areas of provincial responsibility, disregard priorities

set by Quebec ministers and attempt to gain legitimacy by going over the heads of the provinces. The only way to stop this is to opt for sovereignty for Quebec, even for the fishermen of the Gaspé Peninsula.

[English]

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today on action 21.

Across our beautiful country from our lush forests in British Columbia, the beautiful Rocky Mountains, the great beautiful forests in northern Ontario and Quebec, to the rugged coastline in the maritimes, we indeed have been given an Eden. Unfortunately that Eden is being decimated and desecrated. Unsustainable resource utilization and widespread pollution are occurring in so many areas and it is imperative that we address these problems.

• (1215)

We applaud the intent and intention of action 21. It will help Canadians to deal with environmental considerations in their lives, to deal with sustainable development, recycling, and to increase environmental awareness.

However we have some concerns. Where is the \$10 million that is put forth annually coming from? Is it being used for more bureaucrats? Will the money actually go where it was intended to go? We also have some concerns in that the November 1994 environmental partners fund, a program which is virtually identical to action 21, was shut down. Here we are creating another system to do exactly what the environmental partners fund was supposed to do.

Could the Deputy Prime Minister provide us with some information? Why are we creating a new program to fulfil one that we just closed down?

We also have concerns about the assessment process, accountability, monitoring and follow up. I am sure the Deputy Prime Minister would agree that it is critically important to ensure that the moneys actually go to where they are intended to go, which I am sure is her intent.

I hope the program does not become like the Tory green plan, a \$2.5 billion boondoggle that went nowhere. The hon. minister knows that. I am sure she will look into ensuring that the same mistakes are not made.

I ask the minister to look at her own back yard in Hamilton. Hamiltonians have worked very hard to address significant environmental concerns on their doorstep, but yet the two largest dumpers of benzene, Dofasco and Stelco, are in Hamilton. I ask the hon. minister to provide us with information so that we know what is being done in those areas.

Routine Proceedings

I also ask that we ensure the program has an identifiable framework, that we have adequate monitoring and follow up, and that the groups receiving it are accountable. We agree with the matching concept in action 21. It is something the Reform Party has continually put forth in other areas. It is a good idea because it shows ownership for those who are receiving the moneys.

We should also focus on school programs. The minister mentioned that she was very interested in youth. If we focused on youth and school programs we might be able to supplement the moneys in the program from existing programs. It might be a cost effective way of expenditure.

As an aside, we speak about the environment and yet 40,000 people die in the country of smoking related illnesses every year. Tragically the government's smoking platform that it has put forth since inception has caused the greatest increase in tobacco consumption we have seen in the last 20 years.

The hon. member mentioned that 82 people tragically die of diseases related to the inhalation of toxic substances. That is a very big tragedy. However let us put it into context with respect to the 40,000 people who die of smoking related illnesses and an indeterminate number who die of second hand smoke. Also one-ninth of all women get breast cancer which might have a genetic toxic component. Let us also look at some of these larger issues.

Our intent is the same as the government's in trying to increase awareness in environmental degradation, sustainable development and environmental awareness. We hope the program will do what it was intended to do, that is increase awareness among Canadians. Let us make sure the moneys go to where they are supposed to go and not to developing more bureaucracy.

* * *

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House the eighth report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association where I represented Canada at the committee meetings of the North Atlantic Assembly held in Ottawa and Washington, D.C., June 11 to June 16, 1995.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

CODE OF CONDUCT

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Special Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct.

Routine Proceedings

With leave of the House, I intend to propose that it be concurred in later today.

• (1220)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I move that the first report of the Special Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

PETITIONS

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I wish to present a petition that has been circulating all across Canada. The petition has been signed by a number of Canadians from B.C. and Alberta.

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

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

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

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to table a petition signed by a constituent who is looking for some money to table a report on the environment, economic and social problems.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a petition signed by the constituents of Lambton—Middlesex and duly certified by the clerk of petitions, pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The petitioners call on Parliament to ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no changes to the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

AGRICULTURE

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise, pursuant to Standing Order 36, to present a petition on behalf of members of the agricultural community in my riding of Kent.

They humbly pray and call on Parliament to maintain funding for agricultural employment services so that they may maintain their assistance to the many underprivileged who rely on these personal services to find employment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 164 and 218.

[*Text*]

Question No. 164—Mr. Frazer:

Concerning the retirement of John de Chastelain from his position as Chief of Defence Staff in January 1993, his appointment as Ambassador to the United States and his subsequent re-enrollment in the Canadian Forces for services as the Chief of Defence Staff in January 1994, (a) what was the pay range for General de Chastelain at the time of his retirement in January 1993, (b) what were the retirement benefits received by General de Chastelain when he retired from the Canadian Forces in January 1993, (c) what termination benefits did Mr. de Chastelain receive upon leaving his position as Ambassador to the United States, (d) under what terms of service (Regular or Reserve) is General de Chastelain currently serving as the CDS and, if Reserve, is it Class B or Class C service, (e) what severance/termination provisions were made, if any, for General de Chastelain when he began his current tour as CDS, (f) what was the pay range of General de Chastelain at the time of his return to the Chief of Defence Staff position in January 1994 and what is his current salary range, and (g) is General de Chastelain currently receiving annuity payments under the CFSA and, if not, when were these payments stopped and when will they be resumed?

Ms. Jean Augustine (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): (a) \$128,100–\$155,800; (b) Upon retiring from the Canadian forces in January 1993, General de Chastelain received: i) severance pay in accordance with the Queen's regulations and orders 204.40 and the Canadian forces administration orders 204.10, and ii) a Canadian forces superannuation pension; (c) none; (d) General de Chastelain is currently serving in the regular force; (e) Salary and termination benefits were set by order in council; (f) \$140,100–\$170,500; (g) The Chief of Defence Staff, CDS, has not received an annuity since his re-enrollment on January 1, 1994. His annuity payments will resume when he is released from the regular force.

Question no. 218—**Mr. Simmons:**

With respect to the tobacco demand reduction strategy, (a) how much money did the federal government spend overall, under the strategy, in 1994–1995, (b) how was the budget allocated among the various components of the Strategy, namely education and promotion, national advertising campaign, research, monitoring of consumption, etc., (c) what was the amount initially budgeted for fiscal years 1995–1996 and 1996–1997, (d) what impact will the reductions announced on March 2, 1995, have on each component of the Strategy, and (e) has Health Canada made an attempt to assess the impact of these cuts on the incidence of tobacco use in Canada?

(b) & (c)

The following is the Health Canada tobacco demand reduction strategy, TDRS, summary of strategy initiatives in dollars

Initiative	1994-95 Budget	1994-95 Expenditure	1995-96 Budget ¹	1995-96 Budget ²	1996-97 Budget ¹	1996-97 Budget ²
Legislation/ Enforcement	4,097	3,114	6,277	3,822	6,072	3,860
Access to Information	1,300	1,300	1,400	1,400	1,600	1,600
Public Education and Awareness Programs	14,254	10,459	43,505	26,345	34,760	21,360
Message Promotion	8,240	8,644	19,460	8,760	17,300	3,700
Research	4,665	4,928	5,305	3,893	4,105	2,490
International Programs	675	571	1,130	755	1,030	705
Evaluation and Coordination	2,769	1,219	2,299	1,393	2,407	1,545
Total	36,000	30,235	79,376	46,368	62,274	35,260

¹ Budget before reductions

² Budget after reductions

(d) The tobacco demand reduction strategy remains the largest, most comprehensive tobacco control initiative ever undertaken in Canada. While the scope and pace of some activities will be reduced, none of the components of the TDRS has been eliminated as a result of the cuts. The essential balance and integrity of the overall strategy have been maintained.

(e) No attempt has been made by Health Canada to assess the impact of these cuts on the incidence of tobacco use in Canada. As previously stated, although the scope and pace of some activities have been reduced, none of the components of the TDRS has been eliminated. For instance, many community action initiatives funded under the community action initiatives program, part of the TDRS, will build a base of programming, expertise and co-operation in the voluntary sector that will make an on-going contribution to achieving the goal of tobacco use reduction in Canada.

Government Orders

[Translation]

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

OCEANS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-98, an act respecting the oceans of Canada, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: The Secretary of State for Asia-Pacific was to reply to the question of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East. I believe the member for Fraser Valley East had completed his question or comment.

The member is indicating that he had not. I ask him to do so briefly.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister.

● (1225)

In what way does he see the government moving to decentralize the Canadian federation to provide services at a cheaper rate with less taxation, and at a cheaper expense to Canadians, to promote businesses and promote a better delivery of services in the Department of Fisheries and Oceans?

Mr. Chan: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I will respond to his concern that I was pointing to the alliance between the separatists and the Reform Party. When the separatists propose to separate the country, the onus is on the separatists to demonstrate why they want to separate. What we have to offer is Canada which has been regarded by the UN as the number one country to live in and so on.

During debate today a Bloc member tried to praise the Reform Party because of its tactics and so on, and there was applause from the member's benches. That is what triggered my comment. I hope I have answered that part of the question.

On the decentralization process, during the process of refining government actions the government has been negotiating with provincial governments on all sectors, trying to reduce redundancies and trying to make things more efficient.

Government Orders

The same is true with the oceans act. We are proposing a partnership to bring people together, the provincial side, the private sector and the federal government, to find ways to simplify and to promote harmony in our policies.

I would be glad to support the bill and I hope we will get the support of the Reform Party too.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I wish to inform the House that, because of the ministerial statement and answers, Government Orders will be extended by 16 minutes today.

[*English*]

There have been five hours of debate on Bill C-98 and we are now into 10-minute speeches without questions or comments.

Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be given an opportunity to address the House on second reading of the oceans act.

As we consider the legislation before us, we must also take into account the vastness of Canada's ocean area on all three coasts. We must also recognize the increasing stresses on our oceans environment, especially in our coastal areas.

These stresses have resulted in resource depletion, habitat degradation and marine pollution. If we do not act decisively and now, the problems will only worsen. We are becoming increasingly aware that oceans are subject to impacts and influences of both natural and human origins.

We now recognize that we must manage oceans to achieve economic opportunities while sustaining the environment, including the living resources of our oceans. That is true of the Atlantic Ocean, the Pacific coast and the Arctic. Whether it be improving the safety of Atlantic shipping, restoring fish habitat in a Pacific estuary or protecting the fragile Arctic environment from marine pollution, all these require leadership by the Government of Canada.

The time has come for leadership in integrated management of Canada's oceans, a leadership that will be provided by the government through the oceans act. We know that this cannot be done by the federal government alone. Jurisdiction is divided among federal, provincial, local and aboriginal authorities. That will not change. We embrace this reality and will address it through co-operation and partnership.

What will change, however, is regulatory duplication, conflict and inadequacy that result in inefficiencies, failure to protect the environment and impediments to development. Private sector, public interest groups, non-governmental organizations, academics and federal advisory bodies have all called repeatedly for a comprehensive approach to oceans management, an approach that will foster innovative internationally

competitive ocean industries and preserve and sustain our oceans.

• (1230)

First Nations have special concerns. Comprehensive land claims can involve important implications for protecting and developing both renewable and non-renewable ocean resources.

These challenges are obvious in the Arctic. Use of the Arctic ocean and sea ice must take account of the fragility of the Arctic ecosystems and ensure that traditional patterns of hunting and fishing can be sustained.

The recognition of the need for an oceans act is not new. The previous federal government said it would do all of this. In 1987 the government of the day announced an oceans policy and that policy was not acted on by it. It said it would submit to Parliament a Canada oceans act but it did not bring forward a proposal.

The legislation for this long awaited act is now before us and because this government is acting. Not only is it acting on a promise from the red book but acting out of the recognition of the need for a more cohesive approach to oceans management.

The National Advisory Board on Science and Technology's report on Canada's oceans policy released last year condemned the federal government for neglect of its oceans responsibilities. It recommended an oceans management strategy and an oceans act to provide a firm legal basis for this strategy. These recommendations were supported by provinces, municipalities, businesses, unions, academics and others.

The government realizes we must turn away from partial, ad hoc, short term measures based on expediency. We must manage our oceans on an ecosystems basis, not on the basis of single sector resource considerations separate from, say, the regulation of shipping or separate from environmental protection. Integrated resource management requires decision making that is open, transparent and based on sound science. It must apply multi-disciplinary approaches and it must integrate economic, environmental and social considerations and the involvement of all affected stakeholders.

Stewardship of ocean and coastal resources is a responsibility that we must all share: federal, provincial, territorial, municipal and aboriginal governments in partnership with business, unions, non-governmental organizations and academics.

As all members are aware, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans took an important step toward integration of oceans management when it merged with the Canadian Coast Guard last April. This merger provided the department with the tools to more effectively provide cohesive oceans management. The merger brought together the key elements of oceans management: shipping, fisheries, ocean sciences and environmental protection. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the coast guard fleets became one and in the turbot dispute last

winter the red vessels of the coast guard fleet and the grey vessels of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans performed admirably as a team in the service of their country.

While Canada has taken many steps in the past year to protect and conserve all of our oceans resources, environmental organizations like the World Wildlife Fund, the Canadian Arctic Resources Committee and the Canadian Nature Federation have long called for the creation of marine protected areas under the oceans act. The government has listened to their concerns.

The oceans act will provide for the creation of marine protected areas to protect biodiversity and endangered species. There will be two types of areas. One will be developed in consultation with the stakeholders, the other will be designated by the Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans on an urgent temporary basis in response to the resource crisis.

The ocean act signals a renewal of Canada's leadership in oceans management, a renewal that is long overdue. From the mid-1960s until the early 1980s Canada led the world. In the intervening years our initiative faltered. The federal government in the late 1980s and the early 1990s no longer led Canada in the forefront of global oceans policy. Now this government is reclaiming Canada's role as a world leader.

● (1235)

While Canada has a major domestic interest in its oceans, it has the responsibility to manage them as a shared global resource and we must lead by example. The government is well aware that if Canada is to once again be a world leader in the oceans it will require that the oceans act establish a clear federal lead for the implementation of the oceans management strategy. That is the goal of the government and the legislation. It is to ensure there is a place under the federal leadership of the Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans in close co-operation with other federal and provincial ministers and stakeholders, mechanisms to manage all of Canada's ocean resources. The goal is for our oceans to be clean, safe, productive and accessible.

The oceans act is a key part of the government's commitment to a new oceans management strategy. Developing and implementing that strategy will take the work of many people across Canada. It will be an ongoing process. The government is committed and ready to act on then development of an oceans management strategy. The oceans act signifies a commitment to all Canadians, a commitment to the world.

I ask that other members in the House join with me in voting in favour of this very important legislation.

Government Orders

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York—Simcoe, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the previous member for Dauphin—Swan River has stated, our oceans represent a shared global resource. Canadians watching this debate today may not be aware that 80 per cent of the world's population lives in coastal areas attached to oceans. Not only are oceans an important and integral part of Canada's key to survival, they certainly are for the world. The bill before us today calls for Parliament to formalize Canadian jurisdiction over vast new areas of ocean waters and resources off our coasts.

This August in New York the United Nations Conference on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks reached agreement by consensus on a new UN convention on high seas fisheries. When this new UN convention is properly implemented it will provide permanent protection for straddling stocks on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. This is an enormous step forward. It is fully consistent with the oceans act. It completes the protection of some of Canada's most important ocean resources, the once great cod and flounder stocks on the Grand Banks.

While the oceans act is an important element in protecting these resources inside 200 miles, the new UN convention is key to providing permanent protection for them outside 200 miles.

There is massive fishing power deployed on the high seas. The nations of the world have often been unable to control it. The result has been destructive overfishing, depleted resources, human misery and conflict among states.

Before this new UN convention it was unclear whether the escalation of fishing power could devastate resources before the international community had crafted the legal tools needed to prevent that from happening. However, Canada had taken the lead by approving Bill C-29 to protect threatened straddling stocks until effective international means to do so were implemented.

To fill the gaps in international law and control high seas fisheries before it was too late required that coastal states as well as distant water fishing states do their part. All countries at the UN conference had to view matters in the global context.

There have been serious failures in conservation of straddling stocks in all of the oceans of the world. There will continue to be such failures as long as the international legal framework is incomplete. The foundation in the law of the sea convention is sound but by itself it is not adequate. That was recognized at the UN Conference on Environment and Development by the UN General Assembly when the UN conference on straddling stocks was convened. It is significant that the UN conference on straddling stocks arose out of the UNCED conference on the environment.

Government Orders

Over the past 20 years international environmental law has developed and found wider and wider application.

• (1240)

Environmental law and the law of the sea are becoming more integrated. Environmental concepts such as sustainable development, the precautionary approach and the ecosystems approach must be applied to achieve effective fisheries conservation. The new UN convention will greatly advance that integration.

The new UN convention contains the five principle elements needed for an effective international system for conservation. First, the international framework of rules must be legally binding. The new UN convention will be legally binding. Second, there must be proper conservation and management measures. The new UN convention provides for this, notably in the precautionary approach.

Third, there must be compatibility of conservation and management measures both inside and outside 200 miles. The new UN convention provides for this. Fourth, there must be binding and compulsory dispute settlement. Again the new UN convention provides for this. Finally, there must be some means to deal with the situation where the flag state is unable or unwilling to control its vessel fishing on the high seas. The new UN convention does this as well.

Let me explain why high seas enforcement is necessary for an effective conservation system. There are serious and chronic control problems in high sea fisheries. The FAO in its March 1995 report on the state of world fisheries highlighted problems of control and pointed toward pollution.

Renewed international attention is focusing on unauthorized fishing and the role of monitoring, control and surveillance. Fisheries conservation and management are being undermined by such fishing and, together with the lack of effective monitoring, control and surveillance systems is threatening the sustainability of fisheries.

The international community also acknowledges that the accurate collection and reporting of fisheries by catch and discards data are important aspects of monitoring, control and surveillance, issues that will attract increasing attention.

The most realistic and effective means of collecting, verifying and reporting these data are through the use of increased at-sea monitoring of fishing activities.

The FAO report has it right. At-sea monitoring of fishing activities is needed for an effective conservation system. It is a necessary element of the new UN convention.

The new UN convention will make the high seas fisheries provisions of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea work as they should but have not until now. Together, the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the new UN convention will constitute an effective international legal framework for sustainable development in high seas fisheries.

Under such a regime we can rebuild straddling stocks and harvest them on a sustainable basis. This is a great advance over the situation Canada has faced in the past: foreign overfishing, depleted resources, economic decline and conflict with distant water fishing states.

For responsible distant water fishing states like Japan, creating an effective international conservation regime is strongly in their interest. With us they should ratify and implement the new UN convention as soon as possible. Implementation of the new UN convention will be an important advance for humankind. It will be a giant step toward sustainability. In Canada it will be of great benefit to the tens of thousands of fishers and fish plant workers in Atlantic Canada whose livelihood and future depend on the straddling stocks of cod, flounder and turbot.

With the oceans act and the new UN convention in time those resources will be bountiful once more. I am happy to support the bill and I urge all members to join me in allowing the legislation to move forward quickly. The oceans act charts a wise course for the future of ocean policy.

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I rise to offer my support to the oceans act.

The legislation deals effectively with jurisdictional issues which have been under study for a long time. It also deals effectively with ocean management issues in a manner which will serve Canadians for many years to come.

• (1245)

For a long time Canada has worked to focus the world's attention on ocean issues. For a long time Canada has worked to establish formal jurisdiction over the ocean waters and ocean resources that border our country.

In the 1950s Canada played a leading role at the first UN conference on oceans. In the 1960s Canada played a leading role in calling for a UN convention on the law of the sea. In the same decade Canadians asserted their jurisdiction over the northwest passage by adopting the Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act and declaring new fishing zones off both coasts. In the 1970s we took unilateral steps to declare a 200-mile fishing zone and a 12-mile territorial sea.

Canadians are all well aware of the recent successful efforts of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to protect the fishstocks within our 200-mile limit from overfishing outside and to lead the world in reaching agreement on the conservation of straddling fishstocks.

Government Orders

The oceans act when passed will formalize Canada's jurisdiction over all our oceans. The bill before Parliament is backed by international agreement. The bill declares that Canada not only has jurisdiction over our internal waters, territorial sea, fishing zones and continental shelf, but we also have jurisdiction over a new 12 nautical mile contiguous zone and 200 nautical mile exclusive economic zone.

In the contiguous zone Canada will have formal jurisdiction to apply our fiscal, immigration, sanitary and customs laws. In the exclusive economic zone Canada will have formal jurisdiction for exploring and exploiting all economic resources, not only fish and for conserving and managing those resources.

In this zone covering nearly five million square kilometres of ocean, Canadians will also have jurisdiction over marine research and protection and preservation of the marine environment. If that was all this legislation accomplished it would be an important achievement. We have fought long and hard to establish Canadian ocean rights.

The bill does not stop there. It goes on to streamline and strengthen federal responsibilities for responsible ocean stewardship. It goes even further by establishing the legislative base for a new comprehensive and co-operative oceans management strategy.

The bill sets in motion a new approach to oceans policy, an approach based on the federal government working in partnership with all those who have a stake in the future of our oceans, from the provinces and territories, to the local communities, to fishermen and businesses and environmentalists. Our oceans are a wonderful shared Canadian blessing. They require a shared sense of responsibility and a shared plan for both development and environmental protection.

The bill sets out the objective of achieving sustainable development of our oceans and their resources through an integrated management strategy. The bill aims to achieve integrated planning of ocean activities, harmonized regulations and improved environmental protection based on a comprehensive ecosystems approach.

To reach those ends the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will be authorized to enter into partnership agreements with other Canadian jurisdictions and organizations and to co-ordinate a cohesive Canadian approach to sustainable ocean development.

The oceans act includes provisions for the establishment of marine protected areas, the development of ocean environmental quality guidelines and the application of Canada's current environmental legislation to the new exclusive economic zone.

When Parliament resumed this month, the Deputy Prime Minister introduced legislation to establish a commissioner of

the environment and sustainable development responsible for auditing the environmental performance of all federal government departments. In doing so the Deputy Prime Minister called on all ministers to become ministers for sustainable development and all departments to develop action plans for environmental stewardship.

The oceans act takes the same message forward. It empowers the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to push ahead with an oceans strategy based on the primary principle that the economic opportunities offered by our oceans are completely and absolutely linked to the environmental well-being of those oceans.

The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has indicated that he will act quickly, act seriously and act effectively, as he always does. He will not however act alone. He is seeking the advice and the input of all Canadians in developing an oceans management strategy that merges national objectives with regional decision making and sets national goals based upon local wisdom, local needs and local desires.

• (1250)

Once the oceans act is passed, the minister will be in a position to work with all Canadians in meeting the major challenges ahead as we seek to make Canada the global leader in oceans policy for the 21st century.

Through the establishment of the Atlantic Fisheries Resource Conservation Council, the minister has already proven the new willingness of the federal government to take the advice of industry, academic and government experts on fisheries issues. We all know that several heads are better than one and the new partnership approach to fisheries conservation proves it.

The even greater opportunity now is to expand that sense of partnership into the multi-faceted spheres of ocean policy, from resource management to marine safety, from trade development to environmental management, from better knowledge of ocean sciences to stronger international action on global ocean issues.

I sincerely hope that all members of Parliament will come together to allow this legislation to move forward rapidly and become law in the near future. The bill provides parliamentarians the opportunity to come together to act in the interests of all Canadians and in the interests of our oceans environment.

The bill gives Canada important new ocean jurisdictions. The bill provides for solid and sensible federal leadership on ocean issues. The bill creates the legislative framework for the development of a modern and much needed oceans management strategy. Through those measures, the bill creates the conditions in which all Canadians can share in developing a future for our oceans of which we all can be proud.

Government Orders

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Hillsborough for his speech on Bill C-98, the oceans act.

It was interesting that just a few weeks ago I had the privilege of visiting Atlantic Canada, his part of the great country we live in. I had the opportunity to visit and dialogue with many inshore fishermen. I discovered somewhat to my surprise that while our current minister of fisheries seems to enjoy a lot of popularity among Canadians who have the impression that the minister is standing up for the Canadian fishing industry, the inshore fishermen I was speaking with in Atlantic Canada were appalled by the actions of the DFO and of course the minister of fisheries who is responsible for the DFO.

These hard working, entrepreneurial people who make their living from the sea feel there is a conspiracy to put them out of business in the way the quotas are structured. They are given quotas to catch fish when the fish are not catchable and there is no quota for the species that is available. They have a quota for a species that is not even in the waters they are allowed to fish. When the other species come in the quotas are reversed. It is so bad that they cannot even pay for the fuel to take the boat out into the water to go after these fish.

These fishermen are also very concerned about the implementation of access fees which I understand would be made possible if Bill C-98 is passed. That will be the trigger which allows the DFO to impose access fees on the fishermen. It will make barely profitable enterprises unprofitable.

I ask the member for Hillsborough if he would stand up and vote for his constituents rather than voting the party line in supporting this bill. Perhaps he needs an opportunity—

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe we are into 10-minute speeches with no time for questions or comments. I presumed the member was entering into the debate.

The Deputy Speaker: That is the assumption the Chair made as well. We will assume the questions are rhetorical ones, that the member is making an intervention and any questions he asks are rhetorical.

Mr. Hermanson: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy if the member could respond to me perhaps even in his own time when we are not in the Chamber. These concerns were expressed to me by the people who make their living from fishing in Atlantic Canada.

The fisherman said the minister is not standing up for his industry, that he is throwing roadblocks in their way and none of the Liberal MPs from Atlantic Canada are standing up and speaking for them. They are very concerned and appalled. They have 31 Liberal MPs in Atlantic Canada and one Progressive Conservative MP and quite frankly they do not see much

difference between the two parties. They were asking if no one in Ottawa was going to speak up on their behalf about these access fees. They see these fees as a tax imposed on them to put them out of business.

• (1255)

I implore the member for Hillsborough and his colleagues, the other 30 Liberal MPs from Atlantic Canada, and the Progressive Conservative member for Saint John to vote against Bill C-98 unless there is a commitment from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to not impose these access fees, this horrible tax on the fishing industry. These entrepreneurial fishermen keep the rural and coastal communities of Atlantic Canada alive.

If those members refuse to listen to their constituents, if they insist on voting with their party, voting with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, voting with the Minister of the Environment on this issue, I emphasize they will not be voting for their constituents. In the future why should these hard working people vote for members of Parliament who come to the House and refuse to vote for them? These are rhetorical questions but I would appreciate answers from the Atlantic members of Parliament in the House.

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I suppose all of us as supporters of a united Canada should rejoice that the Reform Party has finally discovered Atlantic Canada. Nonetheless, it is a bit of overweening pride to assume that a very short visit to Atlantic Canada can possibly generate an awareness of the issues of the people of that region similar to the awareness the member for Hillsborough has after his many, many years of service to the people of his riding in Prince Edward Island and of Atlantic Canada.

I certainly hope members of the Reform Party will manage a return visit to Prince Edward Island. They might learn some humility and attain some understanding that it takes more than a flying visit with a political purpose to appreciate the views of Atlantic Canadians.

It is my pleasure to speak on the oceans act. Canada is a front runner in the area of oceans technology. This legislation will help ensure that Canadian companies involved in this field continue to grow.

The current work in this area is benefiting not only all Canadians but also the world. Canadian oceans related industries continue to bring new and exciting products and opportunities to Canadians and particularly those who live and work in our coastal regions.

One of the identifying factors of Canada is that we are a maritime nation. With our shores bordered by three oceans, our coastline is the longest in the world. We also have the world's largest archipelago and part of the world's longest inland waterway opening up to the sea.

Government Orders

It is important that we continue to build our understanding of our oceans, waterways and aquatic resources. Marine navigation is essential to the safe movement of goods on which our trade is so dependent. Commercial ships carry more than 350 million tonnes of cargo to and from Canadian ports each year. More shipping passes through the St. Lawrence seaway than through the Panama and Suez canals combined.

[*Translation*]

This bill deals with the concerns of the National Advisory Board on Science and Technology and other stakeholders, by allowing the development of an oceans management strategy which includes the planning and management of marine activities while also involving all the partners, including provincial governments.

In addition to promoting investment, the bill will increase the efficiency of environmental protection measures by establishing marine protected areas, by using a more global approach for the management of oceans, and by introducing the management of coastal zones.

• (1300)

[*English*]

I want to return for a moment to the importance of this bill to the growing marine industry which is so important to Canada's economy. We are already recognized internationally as having one of the world's most advanced hydrographic organizations. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans is leading the way in the development of new tools and techniques in partnership with industry.

This will continue as the development serves two purposes. The first is to improve the efficiency with which the department does its work which is in line with government program review initiatives. The second purpose, through the transfer of technology to the private sector, is to help to foster the growth of Canadian industries specializing in this field.

I will mention some of those industries. One of the most exciting new contributions, and this is within fisheries and oceans, is the development of the electronic chart display information system which allows mariners to navigate from a video screen array combining a digital chart with a radar display of shipping, navigational aids, coastline and other features. Canadian ocean industries continue to lead the way in areas of oceans technology and in many other areas.

In the area of remote sensing Canadian industry has developed the compact airborne spectrometer imaging sensor for cost effective aircraft based monitoring of capelin spawning, coastal habitat and algal blooms. This technology was developed under contract to Canadian industry based on technology from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans fluorescence line imager projects.

Three Canadian companies have been exploiting the technology. Itres Ltd. in Calgary is producing, selling and servicing it worldwide. Borstad and Associates Ltd. have developed algorithms for interpreting CASI data into quantitative coastal zone information products and provide a monitoring and information service. AGI Ariel Geomatics of British Columbia collects, processes and interprets airborne imagery for environmental uses.

All of these companies are developing collaborative arrangements with international partners to penetrate the coastal zone market niche in global environmental information services.

The Gable Group is another successful Canadian firm developing products for markets in oceanographic and freshwater monitoring and conservation and industrial applications such as moisture and heat measurement systems for irrigation, forestry and ground water pollution.

There are concerns for instance that salmon stocks are threatened by overfishing or poorly managed restocking and by the adverse effects of environmental pollution. For salmon the better management of the fish resources requires the availability of data on the origin of the fish, their migration patterns, the nutrients and pollutants they encounter during their life. An innovative new method to supply precise, reliable data for salmon migration studies has been developed by Elemental Research Inc. This company's product can measure the inorganic elemental content of fish tissue, bones and scales to the highest possible levels of sensitivity.

The need to make Canada's coastal waters safer and more accessible has been recognized by Mr. Bruce Seligman who has developed the tracked amphibious vehicle, ARKTOS. The Beta prototype has been used by Transport Canada, the Canadian Coast Guard, and more recently the Atlantic Geoscience Centre in Nova Scotia. Watercraft Offshore has successfully achieved over \$6 million worth of contracts over the past few years with China.

The list can go on. The future of these new industries is indeed bright. With the oceans act and the oceans management strategy it will be even brighter.

Countries ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea will have to map their 200 mile offshore exclusive economic zone. With Canada's demonstrated leadership in this field many of these nations will turn to Canadian companies to assist in meeting those requirements.

As the world's population grows and society becomes more industrialized, demands on the aquatic environment increase the stakes, are more costly and guesswork becomes more dangerous.

The oceans act furthers Canada's commitment to Canadian ocean industries and ensures the technology continues to flow between governments and industries as partnerships are further developed.

Government Orders

• (1305)

I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation for the benefit of all Canadians.

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and speak on this very important bill in Parliament today. I am very privileged to have the opportunity to do so.

I will very quickly cover the purposes of the bill as I see it. I will make a few comments with respect to the concern this party has for the people of the region who are most closely identified on the east coast with the ocean itself.

To begin, the bill is an excellent piece of work. It does what experts on the sea have been talking about. It should have been done a long time ago. Even before I get into the main objectives of the bill, it has to be looked at against the backdrop of the kind of country Canada is.

There is no question Canada is a maritime nation. We have three seas as our main borders. We have the longest navigable coastline in the world. We have the longest non-navigable coastline in the world.

If one adds up the water space not including the Great Lakes which themselves comprise a large percentage of the fresh water in the world, it is a pretty large piece of territory if one extends out to the 200-mile economic zone and follows the coast all along and includes the Arctic waters.

The responsibility for the management of that piece of property, sea property and the resources beneath, is tremendous. It involves close co-ordination to ensure we are getting the most effective management we can.

Canada has had many departments involved with the management of the seas. We have the Canadian forces, with the navy; the solicitor general with the marine aspects of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; the old DFO as it was before this bill was conceived. Environment Canada has been doing surveys off the coast. The coast guard has been responsible for navigation and safety and keeping the sea routes open. Other departments have had peripheral concerns and interests.

The main purpose of this bill is to establish a framework to support the new oceans management regime for Canada and to consolidate the federal responsibility for Canada's oceans. The key word here is consolidation.

The other aspect of this bill that is very important is that it recognizes in domestic law Canada's jurisdiction over its maritime zones. That has been a very long time in coming.

Without wanting to sound partisan about this, the actions that were taken by the government with respect to the extension of jurisdiction beyond the 200-mile limit out to the nose and tail of the bank, which was not ours by accident of geography, is now in effect ours. Bill C-29 was passed in the House last year very quickly with the unanimous support of all parties, passed quickly by the Senate and subsequently recognized in the United Nations as being right, valid and proper.

One other thing the bill does is develop a new approach to managing the oceans and their resources. In that regard I want to pick one example. On the east coast of Newfoundland, Memorial University has what is considered by all those in the field of oceanography and marine sciences not just in Canada, not just in North America but throughout the world truly a centre of excellence.

It has scientific laboratories. It has the venue, the Logy Bay Research Station, the sea tunnel to test various sea foils, excellence again not just in Canada but throughout the world. It is one of the few resources of that nature that exist. It contains the pilotage training simulator which I had the opportunity, with some of the members of the defence committee, to witness. Certainly the reality factor was so high that one would find it difficult not believing one was not at sea.

These are a few examples of the elements of the centre of excellence that exists at Memorial University in St. John's, Newfoundland. I am very proud to have been associated with that over the years with some of my other colleagues and would hopefully continue to do so.

• (1310)

I want to address another aspect of this which is under the purview of ocean management and is certainly very much involved. This has to do with a statement made earlier by the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster, I think half in jest but I know with an element of seriousness. Because of that I felt constrained to respond to the concerns he raised in all seriousness.

I remind the House that in 1992 the cod fishery, after a bad year in 1991 because of ice that persisted all year, essentially had to be declared a failure. The previous government implemented a program called the northern cod assistance and recovery program to last for two years from 1992 with the hope that the northern cod stock would return. Regrettably, as we all know in the House, this has not happened.

This is a matter of fact. It is generally not known that the previous government—I make this point to make another point—had made no allowance for a replacement for that

program in the event the northern cod had not recovered and said so. The minister of the day in St. John's indicated to the *Evening Telegram* that the government could not really be expected to continue to provide the kind of compensation that was involved should the NCARP program not succeed.

When we became government we found that the budget and the books did not account for any money in the program to look after the failure of that program should the northern code not return. It was through the compassion of this government and the work of many of us in Atlantic Canada, spearheaded by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and many of his colleagues in cabinet, that only new money was found in the first budget: \$1.9 billion for the Atlantic strategy program, TAGS, as it is referred to. That program is not a perfect program but there are 39,000 people who depend on TAGS in the hopes the cod fishery will return.

Mr. Hermanson: The program is a failure.

Mr. Mifflin: Mr. Speaker, I just heard the hon. member repeat himself. I am glad he did because members of his party have stood up in the House and suggested this program is no good and it should be scrapped.

Ms. Catterall: The Reform Party?

Mr. Mifflin: The Reform Party. Reform Party members have actually stood in this House and said that program should be scrapped. The only thing I have to say to the hon. member or other hon. members from that side of the House is if they believe this should be the case and they want to revisit Atlantic Canada I suggest they be really up front with Atlantic Canadians and make the point they are making here, that they do not agree with the TAGS program and that it should be scrapped.

I have another concern as an Atlantic Canadian which is related to oceans policy because it is related to the well-being of Atlantic Canadians: the Reform Party's attitude toward the regional program that we rely on so heavily, the ACOA program. Again, members of the other party—I am not sure about the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster—have been very vociferous in saying that we should scrap the ACOA program while naming some of the people that have benefited. What audacity.

I can give two examples of successes in my riding. For one example I have to quote the name and for the second example my constituent would prefer that I do not use his name but he will recognize the business of which I speak.

The White Hills in Clarendville is a world class skiing resort. Through the negotiation of \$2.9 million, mostly ACOA money, it has been able to do with the resort what would not have been possible thereby bringing many people, not just from Newfoundland but from eastern Canada, St. Pierre et Miquelon to come visit that area and to spread their money in the distribution centre of Clarendville, thereby benefiting from it.

Government Orders

Second, I have a young man in my riding who without government help established a lumber business not many years ago. Through recent assistance by ACOA of not much money, he was able to develop the new piece of equipment which allowed him to export three times what he was exporting without this ACOA grant.

I do not need any lectures from the Reform Party about what we should be doing for Atlantic Canadians. One of the things that we are doing for Atlantic Canadians includes those factors which are contained in Bill C-98, oceans management.

• (1315)

Instead of decrying members on this side and decrying the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and his colleagues for trying to use these programs beneficially through consolidation and more effective measures, they should be getting on their feet to congratulate them.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak to the bill and to the issues raised by the hon. member who just spoke. He was talking about the supposed benefits of the ACOA program, more government subsidies and so on.

I should like to tell the hon. member what I discovered in my recent trip to the Atlantic provinces and what some of the fishermen are saying. I do not claim it was an exhaustive trip, but I did find interesting some of the things they mentioned about the efforts that should be made by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to decentralize and to provide a better service to fishermen.

When I was in Antigonish they told me that a few short years ago they had two employees of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans who took the time to deliver tags for their lobster traps right to their boats. Now there are 37 employees working out of some office and the fishermen have to go to Halifax to get their tags. This is not a streamlining of services. This is not a slimmed down bureaucracy. If the minister were keen on providing a better service at a better price and more cost efficiently, there would be widespread support.

The reason there is so much cynicism about the bill as one step of many similar steps is that the bureaucracy continues to increase and service continues to go down. Fishermen on the west coast and on the east coast are having difficulty finding a DFO person on the enforcement side in the field. Yet there are many people who seem to be stuck in an office and not providing services.

User fees will be allowed under the bill. The fishermen are saying that they do not mind paying user fees for the government services they use. However the government, not just in this department but in other departments too, continues to expand the requirements placed on the backs of fishermen, farmers and business people. The government continues to expand and charge the people. In other words it becomes a user pay bureaucracy.

Government Orders

The businesses have no say in what services are provided. The government continues to throw more people and more money at a problem and then doubles the fees. It is not a user fee for a finite service. It is just: "Let us tax these poor guys, call it a user fee or a licence fee, jack them up and see if they go out of business".

If the government were sincere about helping out Atlantic Canadians and British Columbia fishermen with the Fisheries Act there are a couple of things it could do. It could provide services in the field.

I have an article from the Vancouver *Sun* about the DFO. It states that John Fraser's report on the Fraser River sockeye indicated that the DFO nearly destroyed the salmon fishery in British Columbia last year through mismanagement and a shocking lack of enforcement.

If the government wants to re-establish some credibility with west coast fishermen at all levels, whether sports, aboriginal or commercial fishermen, it would have some enforcement people in the field to make sure the rules are enforced. It has no credibility on the west coast.

On the east coast it is a similar problem. Through successive years of federal government mismanagement it has managed to pretty well destroy certain parts of that valuable fishery. The people on the east coast do not run around saying: "Thank you, Mr. Tobin, for the turbot", even though we are all glad that the pillaging of that resource is not going on any longer.

• (1320)

What they are really saying is thanks to the federal government for destroying what used to be one of the backbones of the Canadian economy and still is, through no help from the federal government, an important part of a maritimer's life.

If the government wanted to help it could get off the backs and out of the pockets of fishermen and let them get on with life. It is not only fishermen when we talk about ACOA grants. I heard a member from the maritimes make a statement the other day: "Thank goodness for regional development grants. They are the way to prosperity. We will get more regional grants".

If that were the case the maritime provinces would be the most prosperous provinces in the world. The trouble is the government has not yet caught on to the basic economic fact of what is best to promote business, to promote diversity and to promote fellows like the hon. member was mentioning who want to export around the world. We should say to that person: "Listen, I will offer you low tax rates because I am not wasting your money. I will offer you less government regulations so that you

can have a chance to put a business together easily. I will make sure that the Department of the Environment does not take three years to do a study when you want to start a mine and that there will be rapid approval processes".

Why not co-ordinate with the provincial governments so it is not overlapped and driven from Ottawa instead of being driven from the provinces where it should be? Then perhaps those people would have a chance to diversify, to get out in the world and do what they want to do? They used to be able to do it before the federal government stepped in and started kicking butt. If it would allow people in the maritime provinces to exert their free enterprise spirit, to go back to the roots that made them strong and the most vibrant part of Canada at that time, we would see a prosperous maritimes.

If we continue with expanding ACOA, giving more grants and having a bureaucracy in the DFO that will not even deliver the tags but will sit back and ask for more user fees, it is hopeless. The government seems to have lost its sense of direction.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the recorded division on the amendment stands deferred until Monday, October 2, at the time normally provided for daily adjournment.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to call it 1:46 p.m.?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: It being deemed to be 1.46 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

MINING EXPLORATION

Mr. Bernard Deshaies (Abitibi, BQ) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider revitalizing investment in exploration in Canada and in Quebec by providing for fiscal incentives, including flow-through shares.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on June 5, I had the pleasure of speaking to Motion M-292 tabled by my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming—French River, which dealt with mining incentives to help the industry replenish its ore reserves quickly enough.

Without consulting each other, my colleague and I tabled in this House similar motions on mining. This shows that there are many stakeholders urging the government and the Minister of Finance to analyze all possible scenarios and to adopt a policy to revitalize mining exploration.

• (1325)

[English]

Ms. Catterall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and apologize for interrupting my colleague who is speaking on his private member's motion. However, I wanted to clarify that the deferral of the vote is to 6 p.m. on Monday.

The Deputy Speaker: It is so noted.

[Translation]

Mr. Deshaies: Mr. Speaker, that is the message I wish to convey today through this motion, which says:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider revitalizing investment in exploration in Canada and in Quebec by providing for fiscal incentives, including flow-through shares.

We have noted for a long time how little mining exploration is done in both Quebec and Canada. Therefore, we must act quickly to revitalize mining exploration throughout this country in order to replenish ore reserves in this industry. This situation is mainly due to the fact that junior mining companies, which underpin mining exploration, cannot raise enough public funds to carry out their exploration work, while major companies, which have the money needed for exploration, spend an increasingly important part of their exploration budget in developing countries.

The advantage is that those countries already have listed minable sites, while Canada offers few new deposits ready for mining. I remind the House that the committee on natural resources held hearings on this matter last fall and made nine

Private Members' Business

recommendations that were supported by all the parties represented on this committee.

Unfortunately, the government decided to disregard all the work done by the committee and all the evidence we heard there. That is how this government operates. It has given the fifth report of the committee entitled "Lifting Canadian Mining Off the Rocks" the following response: "Keeping Canadian Mining on the Rocks".

I doubt that, by rejecting almost all of the recommendations in this report, the ministers, both of finance and of natural resources, were really aware of the true effect of their decisions on mining exploration in Canada and in Quebec.

All the stakeholders in mining exploration are disappointed that this government did not agree with any of their recommendations, that were based on their expertise and knowledge of mining. I would like to remind the government that more than a quarter of Canadian trade is based on the natural resource sector and that it is time that the government saw the mining industry as an important means of ensuring economic development in our society by achieving the national priorities, which are, according to the Liberal government, employment and growth.

Mines that will be closing in a few years as a result of the depletion of their reserves will not be replaced if new sites are not discovered. This will cause major layoffs and will have a very negative impact on the Canadian economy, especially in mining regions, where metal processing, transportation and other infrastructures will be hard hit.

An immediate response is needed if we are to reverse this trend by the year 2000, since it takes five to seven years on average between the discovery of a mine and start up of production. Failing this, the industry will gradually disappear. Renewal of the reserves is urgently needed; the mining industry is facing one of the hardest challenges it has had to deal with in many years.

As a result of the shift of mining investment to other countries, Canada's known mineral reserves have decreased. In 1992, 28 mines closed and only 8 opened. There are many reasons for this, but the trend must be reversed or the industry will be totally gone within twenty years.

Base metal reserves have been decreasing since 1980 and are unlikely to be replaced at an adequate rate in the near future. The industry has done its part. On numerous occasions it has voiced its concerns to the Government of Canada, which rather than facilitating the process of adapting to the new international competition, particularly from third world countries, has in fact added to the problems by allowing the investment climate in the mining sector to deteriorate compared to the competition.

Private Members' Business

• (1330)

The industry is working hard to ensure its survival. The economic and political context has not kept pace in order to encourage the industry to remain in Canada. Declining mining investments in our country are linked to a number of growing concerns.

To name but a few of those concerns: heavy financial burdens, compared to the countries of the south of course, particularly taxes and charges unrelated to profits; uncertainty and delays in environmental assessment and approval procedures; regulatory overlap between levels of government and between departments, creating needless difficulties; reduced access; uncertainty about tenure of mineral titles; and lastly, increased financial requirements to guarantee restoration.

For there to be any recovery in the mining industry, an incentive plan must be promoted for mining exploration in Canada, similar but better controlled than the one in place in the 1980s.

Even if base metal reserves are in decline, there is still immense geological potential in Canada, Quebec in particular. The recent opening of the Louvicourt Mine in my riding confirms the potential of the mining industry in Quebec and Abitibi and the expertise of those who discovered, developed and financed the mine and those who now operate it.

It also confirms that governments were right to create the flow-through share system, which helped to finance the initial exploration work leading to the discovery of the mine in 1989.

This particular mine, with \$300 million invested to bring it to the production stage, will provide more than 350 direct jobs for the next fifteen years at least. It is the result of a joint effort during the eighties by the federal and Quebec governments to encourage mineral exploration on sites of former mines that were no longer in production and thus deemed unlikely to have sufficient potential as a source of major new discoveries.

New technologies and adequate funding were instrumental in discovering this copper, zinc, gold and silver mine, whose mineral extraction capacity is assessed at 4,000 tonnes per day, while recent finds near the site may extend the lifespan of this mine to 25 years. Its potential classifies Louvicourt as a world class mine.

Three more major projects will start up in my region in the next two years, thanks to the same flow-through shares from the eighties, and I am referring to the Grevet, Raglan and Troilus projects. Raglan in northern Quebec is becoming the largest potential site for copper ore in Canada.

The role of mineral exploration is to find other Louvicourts or Raglans. The average lifespan of a mine is about 11 years, and since it takes between five and ten years from the discovery of a

mine to the production stage, we must start today to find the mines of the year 2000.

Many world class mines remain to be discovered in Quebec. This is clear from the examples I just mentioned. Only a small portion of Quebec's territory has been developed, and we could discover mines of this calibre, in practically any mining region in Quebec and Canada.

We have the human and technological resources to make further discoveries. For some years, however, the amount of exploration has been insufficient to renew mineral reserves because of competition from those same Third World countries and insufficient levels of public funding. The discovery of new mines is synonymous with economic development.

Louvicourt and Raglan are a clear indication that the federal government should increase tax incentives, already provided by the Quebec government, for preliminary mineral exploration in order to replace base metal reserves which are running out in this country.

The lack of mineral exploration in Canada is particularly disturbing, considering the general uncertainty as to Canada's commitment to encouraging mineral exploration and mining operations within its territory.

The uncertainty rises from the fact that regulations for access to sites are becoming increasingly restrictive, while environmental regulations or criteria are subject to duplication or diverging interpretations. In addition, obtaining an operating permit has become an increasingly lengthy process.

• (1335)

Exploration companies can no longer be sure that their exploration rights automatically include mining rights. The impression is that they have the right to engage in exploration, but until they have spent millions of dollars to identify an economically viable ore body, they do not know whether they will be able to extract ore and under what conditions.

In this context, there are three ways in which we could deal with the problem: re-establish public financing of mining exploration; improve the efficiency of exploration and make Canada more attractive to investors in the mining sector by improving fiscal, environmental and access regulations.

The flow-through share system has shown over the years that, at least in Quebec, it has made a significant contribution to the discovery of a number of mines. If we consider the 26 base metal or precious metal mines that were in production in Quebec in 1994, flow-through shares were either entirely or partly responsible for financing the discovery of 14 of these mines. Still in the case of base or precious metals, this applies to the discovery of nine out of ten mining projects now in the development or pre-production stage.

Considering these discoveries, the flow-through share system has shown it is worthwhile for governments, since it generates major economic spinoffs.

Already in September 1982, a report on the Canadian mineral industry identified five areas of urgency requiring immediate government intervention; there was urgency then, they said. They were: preventing further erosion of Canada's economic competitiveness in certain key areas of mineral production, including those of copper and nickel; halting and reversing the depletion of mineral reserves; finding new ideas and developing technologies, policies and programs to encourage greater efficiency in mining exploration; reversing the apparent trend of mining investors, including Canadian multinationals, to drop Canada in favour of countries in Latin America, Asia or the Pacific and other areas of development in the world where resources are plentiful; and, finally, generally creating a political and regulatory context better suited to maintain industry viability and stimulate investment in mining exploration.

After 13 years of work by various committees on natural resources and others and with similar conclusions for problems which do not seem to have been resolved and after two federal governments, we are at practically the same point, hence the urgency and the need to act.

If Canada remains at the forefront in the metals market, it is due to the low cost of its mining operations attributable in large measure to the high level of industry productivity.

The Canadian mineral industry therefore managed to increase its productivity significantly through the rationalization necessitated by the recession in the 1980s.

All of the sectors of the mining industry have significantly increased their productivity by adopting new technologies and mining methods, developed, for the most part, in Canada.

We must therefore support the industry's effort so as to avoid a decline in mine reserves and prepare new deposits for mining to replace those that will eventually be used up.

For many years, the Association des prospecteurs du Québec has been calling in vain for three measures that would promote mining exploration: extension of the expenditure period to 12 months in the year following the year in which the equity was raised and harmonization by Ottawa; a federal measure whereby only the capital gain over and above the net purchase cost would be taxable, something the PDAC is also calling for—Quebec already has a similar measure—; and greater deductibility of exploration expenses federally—the rate is currently 100 per cent federally and 175 per cent in Quebec.

Carrying part of work funded in one year over to the next would not mean any additional expense to the public purse.

Private Members' Business

To administer this measure, the Association des prospecteurs du Québec proposes a trust mechanism under a mandate conferred by the governments on private sector organizations, which would ensure technical and financial expenditures were justified. The users would pay the costs of the trust.

• (1340)

I have just given a long list of measures which would assist the mining industry and which would meet the demands of various groups. Not all are easy to implement in these times of severe government cutbacks.

However, a large number of them would not cost the public anything and could be very profitable in the medium run. The government must learn to distinguish between measures which involve expenditures and measures which yield dividends for the public purse.

It is essential to restore a climate conducive to mining investment in Canada and in Quebec. According to Natural Resources Canada, data dating back to June 1994 indicate that Canada's investment in exploration barely reaches 17 per cent of world spending in that field, while it was 23 per cent in 1991. We have good grounds to believe that within five years, if nothing is done to create a favourable climate for mining investment in Canada, this figure could drop to 10 per cent.

Such data clearly suggest that Canada must do something fast to reverse this trend. The various levels of government will have to work together to improve fiscal and environmental regulations, as well as regulations governing access to land for the mining exploration industry.

The mining industry can still contribute to the economic development of a country, as many South American countries which rely on the expertise and the financing of Canada to develop their economies have discovered. They know how to attract mining and exploration companies.

The present outflow of exploration funds and the selling of our expertise to foreign countries will lead, in Canada in the years to come, to a reduction of employment in the mining industry and in associated industries like transportation, and therefore to a reduction of the share of the mining sector in the Canadian GNP.

I hope that the measures I just proposed, as well as those proposed by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources will be considered and implemented as soon as possible. In Canada and Quebec, we have the mining potential, the technical know-how and the money to allow our mining industry to increase its economic contribution, but the government has to be willing to do its part.

Mr. George S. Rideout (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the House concerning this motion that the

Private Members' Business

government should consider revitalizing investment in mining exploration in Canada by providing fiscal incentives.

[English]

Let me begin by thanking the hon. member for Abitibi for bringing this matter before the House. The Government of Canada acknowledges that it is important for all Canadians to recognize that mining will continue to be a key sector of the Canadian economy for generations to come.

[Translation]

On behalf of the Minister of Natural Resources, I am pleased to have this opportunity to be able to tell the House about the measures that the government is presently taking to maintain or increase the economic and social benefits Canadians derive from the mineral and mining exploration sectors.

[English]

Mining directly contributes \$20 billion to the national economy every year and creates more than 300,000 jobs for some 115 communities throughout Canada. It has significant benefits in almost every other sector of our economy. How many Canadians know, for example, that toothpaste has five minerals in it or that sunscreen contains zinc? How many Canadians think of the mining industry when they add salt to their food or when they switch on their computers or start their cars?

Simply put, without mining and minerals many of the things we take for granted today would not exist. The World Bank recently released a new report ranking all countries on the basis of total wealth. That report ranked Canada as the second wealthiest nation in the world when taking into account our vast natural resources.

Mineral exploration is fundamental to a healthy mining sector. We are witnessing a significant improvement in the fortunes of the Canadian mining industry, thanks in part to recent increases in spending on mineral exploration. Total exploration expenditures for 1994 were \$630 million. This total represents an increase of \$150 million, or 32 per cent compared to exploration expenditures in 1993. Moreover, the favourable trend is continuing, and spending could approach \$675 million in the current year.

• (1345)

The amount of flow through share financing to support mineral exploration in Canada has been on the rise since 1991, when it totalled \$40 million. This indicates the increasingly positive prospects for the mining industry in Canada. Flow through shares financing totalled \$80 million in 1994 and is projected to be between \$80 million and \$90 million this year.

There are other facts that demonstrate a turnaround for the industry. This year it is expected that 14 new mines will be opened and that 11 mines will be reopened, representing a net

gain of some 700 new jobs. This year could be one of the best years for mining since 1981 in terms of mine openings. Preliminary data indicates the outlook for 1996 may be even brighter. In addition, figures concerning Canada's base metal reserves have been increasing recently. The Voisey Bay nickel discovery in Labrador has been cited as one of the world's richest. There has been tremendous interest and investment in diamond exploration activities. These are just a few of the highlights of healthy recent activity by the industry that is stimulating a number of benefits and jobs in particular.

Let me now turn to the role of the federal government in the mining and minerals sector. The Government of Canada made some very difficult choices in the budget, which were made for the benefit of the country in the long term and did not include any new tax incentives for any sector of the Canadian economy, including mining.

Although we cannot afford any new incentive programs, Canada is still one of the most generous countries in the world when it comes to encouraging mining exploration activities. At the federal level all exploration and preproduction development expenses are fully deductible. In recognition of the special needs and risks of resource development, the flow through share financing instrument allows those deductions to be transferred to individual investors.

Provincial governments, as the resource owners, also have an important role to play in encouraging mineral exploration. Over the past few years a number of them have taken steps to promote exploration activities by introducing new tax incentives. Since the provinces have primary responsibility for determining the pace of activity within their jurisdictions, these steps are highly appropriate, in my view.

We believe the mining industry has a strong future in Canada, but we are also aware the industry faces challenges. During the last federal election the Liberal Party was the only political party to release a detailed plan outlining its commitment to the mining industry. That commitment still stands.

Working closely with the provinces, we will continue to support and encourage the mining sector in Quebec and in every other province and territory across Canada. One of the best ways to do this is to reduce the long term structural impediment to mineral investment. Many of these impediments were identified by the Whitehorse mining initiative, an unprecedented multi-stakeholder initiative that led to a common vision for Canada's mining industry through shared principles and goals. The federal government was a full participant in this 18-month exercise.

To help develop an action plan to address the Whitehorse Mining Initiative issues that fell within federal jurisdiction, the Minister of Natural Resources has established an advisory committee composed of representatives from the mining industry, labour, aboriginal and environmental groups. One of the committee's first tasks will be to provide commentary and

advice on the sustainable development and minerals metals issues paper that was released for discussion in September in Vancouver.

The Government of Canada has already taken several steps to address the most fundamental industry concerns. For example, in the 1994 budget we introduced a deduction for mine reclamation trust fund contributions. In "Building a More Innovative Economy", our government-wide plan for economic growth and job creation, we identified six major sectors of the economy that will benefit from substantive long term improvements to the federal regulatory regime. One of the six sectors is the Canadian mining industry.

Mining sector areas under active consideration include changes to the administration of the Fisheries Act, land use and related decision making, the definition of waste, regulatory regimes north of 60, regulatory impact analysis, and toxic management. As well, important improvements on the issues of overlap and duplication may be achieved through the harmonization initiative of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment.

• (1350)

We believe that the less costly and more efficient regulatory regime that we are trying to achieve will lead to an improved investment climate that is respectful of sustainable development principles. I emphasize our commitment to environmental protection will not be compromised.

The Government of Canada is already making an effective contribution to improve the conditions that are required to ensure that exploration activity will continue to rise in this country. The harmonization of environmental assessment regimes between federal and provincial orders of government and regulatory reform measures through the "Building a More Innovative Economy" initiatives are real and meaningful efforts to reduce overlap and duplication. The goal is to provide stable and predictable conditions that will attract more investment for mineral exploration and for economic activity throughout Canada. The result is that this activity will stimulate new opportunities in Canada and help to put more Canadians back to work.

The Government of Canada is confident that the prospects for mining in Canada will continue to improve and that mining will realize the full potential of Canada's rich geology in a manner that is consistent with the principles of sustainable development. As a result Canadians will be able to enjoy the many benefits that come from a strong mining industry for many generations to come.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to follow the parliamentary secretary. Obviously there is no time for a major intervention.

Private Members' Business

I find it interesting that one of the other initiatives of the federal government in response to how to keep mining off the rocks was that the standing committee made about 20 recommendations last year that an all-party committee agreed would help to spur on the mining industry within Canada, and the government chose to ignore every single one. They were good words, but I do not think there is a lot of proof in the pudding.

We are here to address the motion of the hon. member for Abitibi:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should consider revitalizing investment in exploration in Canada and in Quebec by providing for fiscal incentives, including flow through shares.

In my capacity as the party critic for natural resources, it is a privilege to speak to this issue.

Flow through shares are one way to subsidize industry. They cost the taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars a few years ago, with only a very few positive results.

We in the Reform Party have called for a reduction in government subsidies to business. We feel that if it is in the market's interest to explore for more oil, gas, diamonds, coal, or whatever it is, the market will marshal the funds necessary to go ahead and do the exploration.

What is the role of the federal government in this regard? Does it have a role? I believe it does. It remains for the federal government to provide a regulatory regime for industry that clears the way for industry to go ahead with sustainable development.

I will clarify what I mean by sustainable development. Development means we want to develop our natural resources. It does not mean preservation; it means sustainable development. Development is a key word. Canadians depend on natural resources for a huge proportion of our jobs, our income, and our standard of living. Sustainable means we want to continue to develop them for decades to come, and in order to do that we have to deal very carefully with our environment. This requires a balance between the two.

A Price Waterhouse study released yesterday dealing with British Columbia's forest practices code illustrates how this balance is fairing in Canada. Enforcing the new code will cost the economy 46,000 jobs in British Columbia. This shows that Canada is losing its balance when it comes to sustainability versus development.

In our concern for sustainability, I believe we are bordering on hysteria and catering to preservationists instead of people concerned with sustainable development. We are stifling development in our country. This is not the intention of the concept of sustainable development.

Private Members' Business

I met yesterday with representatives of the mining association and listened to the problems they are encountering in their industry. I will give the House one example. They told me that mining companies are warned before any exploration takes place that federal environmental regulators will take a minimum of three years to approve their application for a mine. Instead of getting one permit for one mine, a company must go to every federal and provincial department, official, and bureaucrat in North America to get separate permits to develop what should be a straightforward process. This all takes a minimum of three years. In other countries the same process takes half that time.

● (1355)

Is it any wonder that the mining companies I am familiar with, especially in the British Columbia area, have put so many of their resources into Chile and other countries where they have friendlier and more receptive governments?

The old way of doing business was to assist companies by subsidizing them. Subsidies insulated companies from the market. In the case of flow through shares, in some cases they caused exploration to take place where that was costly, unnecessary and unproductive. This is what the Department of Finance said in its report on the subject in October 1994.

The new way of doing business is to encourage development in an environmentally sustainable way. That requires balance between our concern for the environment on the one hand and our desire and necessity to explore and develop our resources for the benefit of all Canadians.

If sectors of the industry are suffering in Canada, it is not the fault of the federal government for not subsidizing it. The fault lies in a regulatory regime, at least partially, that needs streamlining and co-ordination between different federal and provincial jurisdictions.

The second thing we need, and I do not want to elaborate on this too much, is a tax regime in Canada that is competitive with other nations. We also need, and this is very important, to resolve our disagreements over land use and tenure. We need to resolve that with our aboriginal people so we can move forward and establish stable environmental standards, land use standards and a tax regime that is predictable so that mining companies feel comfortable and confident in investing in our Canadian future.

How many times have we heard industry say that if you just get off my back as far as taxes go, get out of my hair as far as regulations and unnecessary duplication go, I will create jobs and opportunities in this country that will make your head spin. We hear that time and again. They do not need or want a subsidy.

I am surprised and I might almost say astonished that this particular motion would come from the member for Abitibi. Let me paraphrase what he says. He says he wants the federal government to pour money into subsidies for industry in Canada and in Quebec. I am surprised, because the member for Abitibi is a member of the Bloc Québécois, which as we all know is a political party with only one purpose, and that is to destroy Canada as we know it by taking Quebec out of Confederation. It is even more astonishing since natural resources, by our own Constitution, is and should be in the purview of the provincial government. Not only that, but in the middle of his own campaign to destroy the federal government, the member stands up in the House and asks that the federal government subsidize more industry in Quebec.

I hope the member understands that people from my riding are frustrated by this kind of behaviour. This is a good illustration of Quebec's separatist movement, which lives in a world of illusion, a fairy tale where one wants to enjoy the best of both worlds.

The separatists have always been of two minds on the subject of independence. It reminds me of someone who wants to have his own place, his own car, his own life, but he wants his parents to pay for it.

With a motion like the member has put forward, I wonder if the member is really a sovereignist at heart at all. If he really believed in independence he would be asking the federal government to get out of Quebec, not subsidize the industry there. Perhaps the member secretly depends on the family and he does not really want out of it; he just wants his own apartment.

I believe that most Quebecers take a more mature view of life and of our country. They recognize that the Canadian house is big enough for the entire Canadian family to live together in happiness and prosperity.

The Reform Party agrees with the member for Abitibi in calling for change. Change is necessary; we all recognize that. However, we are calling for a new Canada, not a separate nation of Quebec. We are calling for a new Canada, a Canada built on equality but a Canada with a smaller federal government role, not a larger one, where all regions can be satisfied with a less oppressive federal fiscal framework.

I reiterate to the House and my constituents that I am anxious that Quebec remain an equal partner within Canada.

Last spring I went down to Montreal. I caught one of the last games played in the old Montreal Forum. As we were wandering around in the old part of Montreal before the game and we were talking to people, they were very friendly. A couple of times people came up to me on the corner—I guess I obviously was looking for something at the time—and offered to help us out and give us directions and so on. I was very impressed. I thought that was a typically Canadian thing to do. If you see somebody in

trouble you want to help out. In my travels and in talking to many people I have found that Canadians are basically the same everywhere.

• (1400)

The more I talk to francophones the more I realize they have the same goals and aspirations as people elsewhere in Canada. They want good jobs with good incomes, safe streets, a fair taxation system. They want less government bureaucracy in their lives. They want much the same things as people everywhere else. We share common values and interests. The language we speak is really of secondary importance to those major things.

Language is a code. We can speak English or French. We can use Morse code or a computer language. We can do what we like in that area. It is just a method of communication. What is important is what we are communicating, the content of our communication, the core values we have regardless of the language we use.

I believe that as Canadians we want to continue to communicate with one another. Quebecers have given their time and energy to building homes, industries, towns and cities that are among the best on the entire planet. During the world wars and in our peacekeeping duties they have spilled their own blood to carry Canadian values around the world. They see that Canada is the best place in the world in which to live. I am confident they are going to vote no on October 30.

In closing, we do not support any motions that call for more subsidies. That is the old market distorting way of doing business. We would welcome a motion from the Bloc calling for a better balance between sustainability and development in Canada. That is supportable everywhere. Most of all, regardless of where we are in Canada, we invite Quebecers, including Bloc members, to join hands with Canadians, whether we are English Canadians, Japanese, Italian or of whatever descent to build a new and united Canada together.

[Translation]

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Reform member had a lot to say about the Bloc, but I just want to make a quick comment. He said that Quebecers are polite and that is true. We are extremely nice and polite and we know that.

However, I do not agree with the member when he says that language is a secondary issue. Language is a reflection of one's culture on the North American continent, and it is certainly not a secondary issue for Quebecers.

I cannot help but wonder: If language is a secondary issue for the member, that means he attaches little importance to us; consequently, why does he want us to remain part of Canada? The only true reason I can find is of an economic nature. This is why we are important to western and atlantic provinces, and why

they want us to remain part of Canada. I just figured out why they do not want us to become sovereign.

There is no doubt in my mind that natural resources are, for a future country like Quebec but also Canada, a very important economic tool.

A country that has no natural resources or that does not pay proper attention to their development will, sooner or later, experience serious problems in the context of global competition.

Of course, its economy will be seriously affected, but one must remember that a country's natural resources are an asset for the whole community, not only for some individuals or large corporations.

Natural resources in both Quebec and in Canada belong to their respective communities. If they are developed for the well-being of the people, they are central to development.

Not only do they create jobs, but they also greatly contribute to economic growth.

• (1405)

When our raw materials are transformed here into finished products, they create a very important collective wealth. One must never forget that a job created in the natural resource sector has a multiplying effect on the whole economy, as long as we are not only raw material suppliers, as we have been too often in forestry. We ship wood from the Matapédia area to Montreal and Toronto, then finished wood products are shipped back to us.

In the mining sector, the discovery of minable deposits, or exploration, is at the very beginning of this potential chain. But for that chain to be started, we should, as my colleague for Abitibi suggested, consider revitalizing investment in exploration in Canada, notably by providing for fiscal incentives, including flow-through shares. Quebec is a good example.

To generate every possible benefit, natural resources development planning must be consistent and, surely, ongoing. It would be wrong to think that we can leave this to the private sector alone, as some trends of thought would have it. It is necessary for governments, through their tax system, and flow-through shares among other incentives, to foster investment in exploration. In Canada, over the past few decades, we have seen a clear decline in the exploration and the processing of our natural resources, particularly in mining. We are now making a fresh start. All the better.

Several issues are at the root of the problems facing Quebec and all of Canada in this major sector of our economy. First and not the least is the constant fluctuation of the global markets, which is indeed a very sensitive issue. Sudden fluctuations of the world economy have greatly affected the development of our natural resources. When the prices of natural resources go up and down like in a roller coaster, massive investment in that industry does not seem very attractive.

Private Members' Business

The other problem has to do, of course, with the general economic slowdown. When the demand is decreasing, exploration and transformation also slow down. Another important element is the inefficiency of exploration incentives. The current tax system is not in sync with the real objectives. We must change it, for example by providing flow-through shares.

Most of the stakeholders in the mining industry we have met during the hearings of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources agree that the current measures are not very efficient. Also, they do not meet their goal, which is to promote exploration and discovery of new deposits.

Some stakeholders think that the current measures only reward the big corporations, who can unfortunately deduct part of their operating costs from their income tax. The inefficiency of current tax measures is only increased by all the red tape due to the federal government infringing upon an exclusively provincial area of jurisdiction, as enshrined in the constitution.

Because of the lack of program co-ordination in this field as in many others, developers as well as producers waste a lot of time and energy. Having to go constantly from one level of government to the other to get authorizations, to ensure compliance with existing policies or to adjust to the different tax standards of each government, to try to understand and, especially, to make people understand is far from productive for businesses. This waste of time is reflected in substantial losses.

In the Bloc Québécois, we wish that once and for all the federal government would fully recognize the jurisdiction of Quebec and the other provinces over natural resources. We want Ottawa to give the provinces control over natural resources and to truly encourage investment in exploration through tax incentives such as the flow-through shares, for example, in co-operation with the provinces.

• (1410)

I do not understand the federal government's attitude. Why is it trying so hard to take over resource management from Quebec and the other provinces? Why is it always sticking its nose in areas where it has no business? Why is it not working with the provinces instead of competing with them, and, moreover, using our money, our tax dollars to do so?

Why is it not adjusting the federal tax system in co-operation with the provinces to make it more responsive to the real needs of the industry? This is what we want to know. Is it because, as certain federalist big guns have said, those of us from Quebec and the provinces are incapable of doing the work or simply of delivering?

On the contrary, we, Quebecers, are perfectly capable of managing our own natural resources. Our social and political institutions have a long democratic tradition. Our people are well educated, and we can count on a multitude of workers capable of doing all the jobs in natural resource exploration and processing.

We have very abundant natural resources. Over the years, Quebec has acquired the ability to act as it sees fit in organizing development, and its tax system strongly supports its industry.

With the help of adjusted fiscal programs and so-called flow-through shares, Quebec has been able to further diversify its economy in areas such as culture, research and processing.

Quebec has changed over the last thirty years, and we can no longer tolerate that our natural resources be practically given away, as was unfortunately the case in the past.

Through our tax system, we have encouraged Quebecers to invest in their own province. The experience of the development of Northern Quebec has left indelible marks. Hopefully, we will never again see foreign industries shut down towns and villages, and abandon entire regions. As Quebecers, our success in the area of natural resources certainly no longer depends on foreign investors or on federalism.

On the contrary, our success is the result of our imagination, our initiative, our actions, our creativity, our decisions, our efforts and the desire of Quebecers to play an active role in their own economy.

The tax measures introduced by successive Quebec governments have played a very important role, and all of Canada readily recognizes it.

Moreover, these tax measures and our own successes have helped to reduce our dependency toward foreign investors. While in the rest of Canada, the federal government begged foreign investors to develop natural resources, we, in Quebec, took control of our destiny. At present, the French-speaking Quebecers control more than half of the industrial and commercial corporations in Quebec. This is remarkable. This is almost twice as much as 30 years ago. In Canada, we see the opposite happening.

During these 30 years, a growing number of Canadian owned companies have fallen into foreign investors hands. Any country that lets foreigners extract its natural resources is no longer a master in its own house.

Finally, I know very well that all these requests I just made will not amount to much. Even if it would have us believe otherwise the present government is very centralizing.

Private Members' Business

We of the Bloc Québécois want our neighbour, Canada, to remain very strong, especially in the mining area, since it will be one of our economic partners after October 30.

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleagues, since no other member wants to speak and since the motion has not been declared a

votable item, the hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[*English*]

The House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m. I hope everyone has a good weekend.

(The House adjourned at 2.14 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, September 29, 1995

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Oceans Act

Bill C-98. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading and of the amendment	15029
Mr. Culbert	15029
Mr. Pomerleau	15030
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	15033
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	15034
Mr. Chan	15035
Mr. Strahl	15037

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Ellen Foundation

Mr. Easter	15037
------------------	-------

Division of National Debt

Mr. Godin	15037
-----------------	-------

Major Bruce Henwood

Mr. Ringma	15038
------------------	-------

Day Care

Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	15038
----------------------------	-------

War Memorials

Mr. Flis	15038
----------------	-------

Aboriginal Affairs

Mrs. Kraft Sloan	15038
------------------------	-------

Quebec Territory

Mr. Deshaies	15038
--------------------	-------

Agriculture

Mr. Hermanson	15039
---------------------	-------

Information Highway

Mr. Pagtakhan	15039
---------------------	-------

Community of Russell

Mrs. Cowling	15039
--------------------	-------

Division of National Debt

Mr. DeVillers	15039
---------------------	-------

Referendum Campaign

Mr. Paré	15039
----------------	-------

Alliance Quebec

Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	15040
---------------------------------	-------

Division of the Federal Debt

Mr. Bertrand	15040
--------------------	-------

Division of the Federal Debt

Mr. McWhinney	15040
---------------------	-------

World Summit for Children

Mr. Harb	15040
----------------	-------

The Grumman Goose

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	15041
--	-------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Quebec Referendum

Mr. Bouchard	15041
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15041
Mr. Bouchard	15041
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15041
Mr. Bouchard	15041
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15042
Mr. Gauthier	15042
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15042
Mr. Gauthier	15042
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15042

The Economy

Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	15042
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	15043
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	15043
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	15043
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	15043
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	15043

Government Subsidies

Mr. Dubé	15043
Mr. Bevilacqua	15043
Mr. Dubé	15044
Mr. Bevilacqua	15044

Yugoslavia

Mr. Ringma	15044
Mr. Mifflin	15044
Mr. Ringma	15044
Mr. Mifflin	15044

Immigration

Mrs. Debien	15045
Ms. Clancy	15045
Mrs. Debien	15045
Ms. Clancy	15045

Census

Ms. Meredith	15045
Mr. Manley	15045
Ms. Meredith	15045
Mr. Manley	15045

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	15045
Mr. Dupuy	15046
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	15046
Mr. Dupuy	15046

Aquaculture Industry

Mr. Culbert	15046
Ms. Marleau	15046

Somalia Inquiry

Mr. Frazer	15046
Mr. Mifflin	15046
Mr. Frazer	15046
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15047

Canada Council

Mrs. Dalphond—Gural	15047
---------------------------	-------

Mr. Dupuy	15047
Mrs. Dalphond–Guiral	15047
Mr. Dupuy	15047
Medicare	
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	15047
Ms. Marleau	15047
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	15047
Ms. Marleau	15047
International Criminal Court	
Mr. Allmand	15047
Mr. Rock	15047
Bell Canada	
Mr. Laurin	15048
Mrs. Robillard	15048
Porcupine Caribou Herd	
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	15048
Ms. Copps	15048
Public Service of Canada	
Mr. Bélanger	15048
Mr. Eggleton	15048
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	15048
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Transport	
Mr. Young	15049
The Environment	
Ms. Copps	15049
Mr. Pomerleau	15050
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	15051
Interparliamentary Delegations	
Mr. Proud	15051
Committees of the House	
Code of Conduct	
Mr. Milliken	15051

Committees of the House	
Code of Conduct	
Motion for concurrence in first report	15052
Mr. Milliken	15052
(Motion agreed to.)	15052
Petitions	
Income Tax Act	
Mr. Szabo	15052
The Environment	
Mr. Harb	15052
Assisted Suicide	
Mrs. Ur	15052
Agriculture	
Mr. Crawford	15052
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Milliken	15052

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Oceans Act	
Bill C–98. Consideration resumed of motion for second reading and amendment	15053
Mr. Strahl	15053
Mrs. Cowling	15054
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	15055
Mr. Proud	15056
Mr. Hermanson	15058
Ms. Catterall	15058
Mr. Mifflin	15060
Mr. Strahl	15061
Division on amendment deferred	15062

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Mining Exploration	
Motion	15063
Mr. Deshaies	15063
Mr. Rideout	15065
Mr. Strahl	15067
Mr. Canuel	15069



*En cas de non – livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*
Groupe Communication Canada — Édition
45 boulevard Sacré – Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Canada Communication Group — Publishing
45 Sacré – Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes par l'Imprimeur de la Reine pour le Canada.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons by the Queen's Printer for Canada.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.

**On peut obtenir la version anglaise de cette publication en écrivant au Groupe Communication Canada — Édition, Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

**Additional copies may be obtained from the Canada Communication Group — Publishing, Public Works and Government Services Canada,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.**