



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133 • NUMBER 012 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, March 13, 1996

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

Wednesday, March 13, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

The Speaker: As is our custom, we will now sing O Canada which will be led by the hon. member for Pierrefonds—Dollard.

[*Editor's Note: Whereupon members sang the national anthem.*]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

CANADA-UNITED STATES TWINNING PROGRAM

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to familiarize the House with my idea to twin Canadian ridings with United States congressional districts.

Twinning Canadian ridings with United States congressional districts would encourage the exchange of ideas and build channels of communication between Canadian and U.S. legislators. The twinning program would provide opportunities for politicians on both sides to gain a better understanding of the problems facing both nations.

One critical aspect of the twinning program is the initial twinning process. I hope to elicit the support of my fellow members of Parliament in determining the possible twinings. I would greatly appreciate their assistance with this process.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BANKS

Mr. Gilles Bernier (Beauce, Ind.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian banks are reporting enormous profits. Great. Shareholders are happy. Banks pay taxes and so do their shareholders. The government has also imposed a 12.5 per cent surtax on the banks. So far, so good.

What I, however, find indecent, prohibitive, shocking, even outrageous, are the interest rates charged by the banks on consumers' credit card balances as well as their service charges on banking transactions.

The government's role is to protect users from this kind of shameless exploitation. Bankers should be called to order. This calls for some serious reflection on the part of these powerful bankers and the government.

* * *

[*English*]

HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH FUND

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to challenge the government on its decision to unconditionally spend \$65 million on a health services research fund.

I have heard from Canadians from coast to coast who are incensed to learn of the existing Health Canada research funding priorities or lack thereof. For instance in 1994-95 the federal government spent some \$43.4 million on the AIDS strategy, yet in the same year it spent a mere \$4 million for breast cancer.

All illness traumatizes individuals and families and all death is tragic. However, a total of 10,700 HIV cases with 7,400 deaths since 1980 does nothing to answer to the feeling of abandonment in 1995 alone of the almost 18,000 families affected by breast cancer or the 5,400 who buried their loved ones on account of this epidemic disease.

Clearly this government has demonstrated no supportable criteria for the allocation of precious health care and research resources. How can we trust it with a new arm's length research sinkhole of precious tax dollars?

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are starting to understand the failures of the completely unaccountable free market economic system.

Statistics Canada released the results of a study yesterday showing that most of the jobs being created in Canada are low wage often temporary service sector jobs which are demoralizing the

S. O. 31

people who must rely on them for their family incomes. This comes at a time when the corporate and government sectors are also downsizing and laying off reasonably well paid long term employees despite their recording of large corporate profits.

The work world is changing dramatically and it is obvious the federal government is pushing the negative aspects of that trend. New Democrats believe that corporations must be accountable. That is why we support the implementation of a new Canadian code of corporate citizenship.

We call on the government to stop apologizing for their friends in the banks and instead ask them to take some of the responsibility for the long term healthy future of the Canadian economy.

* * *

[Translation]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to salute my riding's local investment association for employment development, which is doing a remarkable job in co-operation with the Lotbinière economic development corporation and the regional county municipality of Lotbinière.

The Lotbinière investment association is very profitable and helpful; by approving 11 applications for a total amount of \$495,000—in venture capital, I might add—it has helped maintain 132 jobs and create 73 new ones. In total, 205 jobs were directly affected in my riding of Lotbinière.

To the investment association and the regional county municipality of Lotbinière, I say: "Well done!"

* * *

[English]

STAN DARLING

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of a former long serving member of this House. Mr. Stan Darling who served for over 20 years as the member of Parliament in my riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka is not only an accomplished politician, he is now an author as well.

Despite our political differences, I consider Stan a true statesman and a good friend. He is a generous man and that generosity extends to his most recent project with all the profits from the writing of his memoirs being donated to charity.

I congratulate Stan Darling and wish him well as he continues to tell his political tales. Stan Darling, who is visiting with us today in Ottawa, has distinguished himself as a hardworking servant of the people. I salute you Stan.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would remind all of you that I will be giving a reception for our former colleague in my chambers this afternoon at 5 p.m.

* * *

NATIONAL FARM SAFETY WEEK

Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is the last day of National Farm Safety Week.

Farming can be a hazardous occupation. The farm is not only a home but an industrial work site. It has been estimated that 200 people die every year in farm related accidents. Children are especially at risk, with reports indicating that approximately 20 per cent of farm fatalities are youth under the age of 14.

● (1405)

There is no other occupation in Canada where children live on an industrial work site. This makes farm safety a very important issue and something every farm family must work to improve. Farm safety is an important issue that warrants more attention.

I applaud the efforts of the Canadian Coalition for Agricultural Safety and Rural Health, which includes organizations such as Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada and the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, to educate the public and to address the serious problems of accidental death and injuries suffered by farmers and their families.

I encourage our farming sector to make a determined effort to eradicate dangerous environments on their lands. Let us all work together to eliminate farm tragedies in 1996 and into the future.

* * *

NATIONAL FARM SAFETY WEEK

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Farm Safety Week is being observed Canada wide from March 7 to 13. The 1996 theme is child safety.

The Farm Safety Association has announced that farm related fatalities were down by 21 per cent in 1995. Still, 19 people were killed on Ontario farms during the course of farm work. Of the 19 individuals killed, two were children under the age of 15.

A safety project last year promoted safety among rural children and their families. Parents were reminded that agriculture is the only industry where the home is also an industrial work site, thus placing farm children at an increased risk of injury. I have always lived on a farm and as the member representing the largely agricultural riding of Lambton—Middlesex I know how vitally important farm safety is.

My congratulations to the Farm Safety Association and the 100 agricultural commodity groups and others who have become partners in this very successful project.

S. O. 31

CURLING

Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Junior Women's World Curling Championships are being held this week in Red Deer, Alberta. I am pleased to say that the team representing Canada curls out of the Grande Prairie Curling Club which is in my riding. The Peace River country has many avid curlers and many teams have competed in national finals.

The Heather Godberson rink joins a long list of accomplished curlers from this region. The team is curling well and at last report is tied for first place. I would like to congratulate the skip, Heather Godberson; third, Carmen Whyte; second, Kristie Moore; lead, Terelyn Bloor; and spare, Rona McGregor on their performance so far.

Curling has played an important role in Canada's culture and heritage. Hundreds of thousands of Canadians enjoy this roaring game.

I wish the members of the Grande Prairie curling team the best of luck in their quest to be the next world champions.

* * *

[Translation]

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as part of the organization process of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, the hon. member for Windsor—St. Clair was elected as chairperson while the hon. member for Burlington and the hon. member for Saint-Hubert were elected as vice-chairpersons. I think that this is the first time in our history that three ladies have been appointed to the executive of a House of Commons committee.

Aside from their undeniable talents and skills, what made this selection by the justice committee possible is the fact that these women ran in nomination conventions to begin with, that they had their supporters behind them and that they won the trust of the electorate.

Consequently, their election to the executive of the justice committee was the result of successive decisions made by the people and recognizes the fact that men and women make fundamentally equal and complementary contributions to modern society. May this recognition intensify.

* * *

[English]

FIRST BAPTIST GIRLS CHOIR

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to welcome the First Baptist Girls

Choir from Truro, Nova Scotia to this honourable House. This young choir is an ecumenical group comprised of secondary school girls.

Under the able directorship of Jeff Joudrey, this choir has performed internationally both in Europe and in the United States winning awards of very high acclaim.

During the March break the choir is touring Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick. I am very pleased that they can enjoy a visit to Parliament Hill today.

Through their music and message of song, these young Canadians are excellent ambassadors for this great country.

I offer my congratulations to the First Baptist Girls Choir of Truro. I invite all members of the House to meet these girls at a reception in the Commonwealth room immediately following question period.

* * *

● (1410)

DUNBLANE SCHOOL TRAGEDY

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I offer the sympathy and condolences of the government and the people of Canada to the families and friends of the 16 school children and their teacher who were killed in Dunblane, Scotland today. The sudden death of so many children and their teacher strikes the sensibility of all Canadians.

We trust those wounded in this attack will recover completely from their physical wounds. We pray that the psychological scars of the wounded and the children at Dunblane School will be healed.

We share the shock and horror of the people of Dunblane and the whole country at this cruel and wanton act.

Earlier today, Canadian High Commissioner Royce Frith sent the following message on behalf of Canada:

May I express on my own behalf and on behalf of my compatriots, our most profound shock at the horrible events in Dunblane this morning.

Our hearts and warm sympathies go out to the families of those killed and our thoughts and prayers to those injured and their families.

No words are adequate but we hope they and our continuing sympathies will be of some comfort to them during this very time.

* * *

MISSILE TESTS

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, missile tests by the People's Republic of China in the straits of Taiwan fall athwart recognized international air corridors used by Canadian Airlines, Air Canada and commercial airlines of other states. These air corridors are established under the ultimate

S. O. 31

authority of the United Nations specialized agency, the International Civil Aviation Organization.

We should bring to the urgent attention of the governing council of ICAO this interference with the freedom of the air and the danger to the lives of innocent civilian passengers. We should also ask for appropriate sanctions or control measures to be taken within the Chicago Convention of 1944.

* * *

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM

Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Amqui, more than 4,500 people demonstrated against the new employment insurance. Back home, we call it destitution insurance.

In light of the contemptuous and insulting remarks made by the Minister of Human Resources Development regarding union leaders in particular, the people of my riding have every reason to be concerned. Such remarks make us fear for the future.

These demonstrators are not seeking minor reforms. They are rightfully calling for the withdrawal of this bill, no more, no less. A bill which—may I remind you—is unfair and regressive and which creates unemployment and poverty.

You can rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that all Bloc members support the unemployed who are only asking for their fair share.

* * *

[English]

REFORM PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today is the anniversary of a most significant event in Canadian history. It was on this date in 1989 that the citizens of Beaver River decided there was an alternative to the politics of cynical pragmatism, of winning at all costs, of special interests and backroom deals choking out the national interest. They voted for someone to speak for them, not to them; for a platform of fiscal responsibility and deficit reduction; for democratic reforms to make members of Parliament accountable to their constituents; for fairness and common sense in government.

Yes, seven years ago today the residents of Beaver River used the opportunity of a byelection to send a clear message to Ottawa. They elected the first Reformer to the House of Commons and thereby set off an avalanche of democratic and fiscal reform which cannot be stopped.

In a few days the voters in six ridings can make their mark by sending the same common sense message to Ottawa. The message is the same now as seven—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Timmins—Chapleau.

* * *

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. Peter Thalheimer (Timmins—Chapleau, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the mining industry is very important to Canada's economy, particularly to northern Ontario. Allow me a minute to give an example.

Falconbridge Limited recently announced it will upgrade its smelter in Sudbury over the next two years. It may not sound like much but consider this: this project will create 200 jobs during construction and millions of dollars will be pumped into the northern economy.

The smelter is being upgraded to process ore being shipped from the Raglan project. Falconbridge is investing more than \$400 million in the Raglan mine in northern Quebec which should last at least 25 years.

• (1415)

I ask members to consider the jobs, the social benefits and the economic contributions just one mine can make to Canada. I encourage the government and all members to support the mining industry in Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC'S ENGLISH SPEAKING COMMUNITY

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the PQ premier invited prominent people representing Quebec's English speaking community to an important meeting that took place in Montreal on Monday evening.

The event was really meant to be an opportunity for the new PQ leader to rebuild bridges with Quebec's English speaking community, following the unfortunate comments made by his predecessor on the evening of October 30.

We salute Mr. Bouchard's initiative, which shows a willingness to get closer to an important community in Quebec and to co-operate with it. However, like the majority of the participants in that meeting, we deplore the fact that the PQ leader stubbornly wants to pursue, even against the will of the people, his objective of separating Quebec from the rest of Canada.

If he sincerely wants to get Quebec's economy back on track and improve public finances, the PQ leader must set aside the main obstacle to his province's economic well-being, namely his plan for separation.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[Translation]***UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE REFORM**

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House the Minister of Human Resources Development continued full steam ahead with his attack against not only those demonstrating against his planned cuts to unemployment insurance, but the labour leaders as well, who are also protesting these unacceptable measures the government wishes to implement.

Does the Minister of Human Resources Development still believe today that the 4,500 people in Amqui who demonstrated against his planned unemployment insurance cuts are professional agitators?

The Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Human Resources Development has nothing more to say here in this House than he has to say to Canada's unemployed.

The minister wants people to have confidence in him, because it appears a consultation process is going to be starting up on the planned unemployment insurance reform. What can the public expect from a consultation which starts off with confrontations between the minister and the key witnesses who will be called before the commission?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is important to treat such a problematic matter seriously. I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that, in the consultations to be held with the parliamentary committee, we will be consulting many more people, taking care to listen, to evaluate what they have to say.

There will be a greater number of people consulted on bill C-12 than there were involved in selecting the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister is talking about something he knows nothing about, since obviously he will never be selected leader of his party. Instead of being concerned about the Leader of the Opposition, he ought to be concerned about the unemployed, for whom he is responsible.

The minister is announcing major amendments to his bill. It would appear that his mind is already made up, yet he is talking about consultations. Will he finally admit that his intention to cut benefits to all Canadian unemployed persons is indeed already finalized and his decisions have already been secretly included in the Minister of Finance's calculations?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would be to the Leader of the Opposition's advantage to allow the critic, who handles these issues so ably, to continue to work toward the improvements we wish to see made to Bill C-12. That hon. member knows what she is talking about, at least.

What is going on here today? The Leader of the Opposition is telling us that our minds are already made up.

• (1420)

Since Parliament reconvened, I have been explaining in this House that the parliamentary process requires the committee to examine the bill in question, and I am confident that members of all parties will have valuable suggestions to make. We have not decided on one solution in preference to another, except that we do wish all changes made to Bill C-12 as tabled to be equitable and in line with the commitments made by the Minister of Finance in last year's budget.

Mr. Loubier: My foot.

Mr. Young: And as for this "baveux", this member of the Bloc Quebecois—

Some hon. members: Oh, Oh.

The Speaker: My dear colleagues, we know today is Wednesday. I would ask all of you to choose your words very carefully. The hon. member for Mercier has the floor.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, allow me to express my regret that this minister, whose responsibilities include co-operation, working with other parties, clearly went off the rails yesterday and again today, and this time with a member of Parliament.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Lalonde: The Minister of Human Resources Development has up to now shown no intention of withdrawing his bill on unemployment insurance. Instead of reassuring Canadians and Quebecers, who are worried about their situation, the minister is poisoning an already explosive debate.

If the minister refuses to withdraw his bill, is he prepared, as of today, to reassure Canadians and Quebecers by informing them of the changes he proposes to make to his bill?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think all members who have looked at the issue realize the extent of the concerns raised by a whole lot of people pretty much throughout the country. I think it would be irresponsible of me to impose more work on the committee, which, only a few days ago, got the job of looking over the bill and expressing its opinion. I remind you that all political parties are represented on the committee.

Oral Questions

I think it would be inappropriate for me to say: "We are going to propose this and that amendment on top of Bill C-12", before I even hear what the parliamentary delegation on the committee has to say. In the coming days, when we have heard the witnesses who are to appear before the committee, I hope that we will hear the member's suggestions for amending the bill. She is right, we do not intend to withdraw the bill, but we do intend to amend it to meet the needs of people with legitimate concerns.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, to the many demonstrators, the minister says: "We will reform". We ask him to specify the reforms, and he says: "I am waiting to see the committee". He cannot mock people.

Is the minister prepared today or in committee tomorrow to state exactly what amendments he plans to make to his bill?

• (1425)

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a whole series of people are supposed to appear before the committee. Dozens, if not hundreds of individuals and groups have asked to come and testify before the parliamentary committee.

I hope, with time, the committee will invite me too to come and do it a bit of a favour by explaining the implications of certain proposals by organizations or members of Parliament.

I do not think we should just leave the impression that it is going to take two, three or four months before we get to solutions, because I am sure the committee, given that its work has already begun, will submit suggestions for the government's consideration, and we will come up with final proposals. I hope this will happen within the next few weeks.

* * *

[English]

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, after making inflated promises of jobs, jobs, jobs in the last election, the Liberal government has finally realized that it is the private sector that is going to create the majority of those jobs.

The unemployed need more than words. The only practical way to unleash the job creating power of the private sector on the scale that is required is through genuine tax relief. Yesterday the Minister of Finance ruled out all hope of that happening.

What is the hope for long term private sector job creation when the government has ruled out tax relief until the next millennium?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should look at the most recent statistics. They indicate that in the last three months over 140,000 jobs have been created. Those are in the private sector almost entirely and almost entirely full time jobs.

The hon. member would do well to look at the numbers before he asks his question.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): The numbers that we are looking at, Mr. Speaker, are 1.4 million unemployed and 2.5 million under employed. That is the statistic he ought to look at.

Perhaps it is just as well that the minister did not answer my question about tax relief because who would believe anything the government said on that subject. Why would Canadians believe that the Liberals had any intention of leaving more money in the hands of taxpayers when they deliberately broke their promise to scrap, abolish and kill the GST?

The government has lost its believability on the subject of tax reform and that diminishes the stimulative effect that promised tax reform could have.

What is the hope for tax relief that will stimulate consumer and business confidence when the government has broken its one and only major promise on tax reform?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would have been disappointed if I had not been asked about the GST today. The hon. member is trying to make question period the most boring 45 minutes in the House.

Let me deal with the question of the GST and the supposed questions that he raises. I would like to suggest to the hon. member that our commitment is clearly to harmonize. I realize harmony is not something that the Reform Party has.

I suggest that he read his own party's addendum to the finance committee report on the GST, in which the Reform Party said: "We commend the government on its attempt to harmonize the tax with the provinces. As the Reform Party concurs with the majority of those who said that a substantial simplification would result from a wide ranging broadening of the tax base, we support the lowest possible rate on the broadest possible base until major tax reform takes place".

That was the Reform Party's position.

• (1430)

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if there is boredom in question period it is because of the quality of the answers, not the quality of the questions.

The government promises hope. Where is the hope for consumers and families when the finance minister has ruled out any

Oral Questions

prospect of tax relief until the next millennium? In the last seven years Canadians have seen the disposable incomes of families go down but the revenues of the federal government go up by over \$20 billion.

What hope is there for income stability? What hope is there for tax relief? What hope is there for long term job creation as long as government tax revenues increase while the disposable incomes of Canadians decrease?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the policies of this Liberal government are the best hope for Canadians. We have set and met the targets on the deficit. We have gotten the deficit down and it is still falling to the point where the books will eventually be balanced. The policies of the Liberal government are the best hope that Canadians have for job creation and improvement in their lives.

* * *

[Translation]

DISABILITY TAX CREDIT

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Revenue.

A number of organizations defending the rights of the disabled have for months been receiving so many complaints regarding Revenue Canada that they have recently decided to sound the alarm. Revenue Canada seems to have an increasingly narrow definition of what constitutes a disability, thus managing to limit access to the disability tax credit.

Can the minister confirm for us that the directives issued by her government regarding the disability tax credit have resulted in a tightening of the eligibility criteria?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I draw to the attention of the House the very good work that the advocates on behalf of disabled Canadians did in responding to the prebudget work of the finance committee. Because of this work, the Minister of Finance included in this year's budget a paragraph that stated the government would look at the support systems and programs to ensure they responded to the modern needs of disabled Canadians.

Specifically in response to the disability tax credit, not only has this member drawn it to my attention but many of my caucus members have as well. I have asked my department to do four specific things. First, to ensure that Canadians have the understand-

ing and education they need to understand this credit. Second, to ensure that we review it in a very effective way.

Some hon. members: Order, order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I think you will have another kick at the can.

[Translation]

Mr. Maurice Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the minister admits that more restrictive directives have been issued that are in effect at odds with the report by the Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, a report tabled in this House and signed by all Liberal members, I would like to remind the minister that in this report she is asked to reconsider this restrictive interpretation for the years up to and including 1995.

Will the minister abandon this restrictive interpretation?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the definition of persons with disabilities has been expanded for the sake of this credit. We know there are those who have been audited. We have asked every tax centre across the country to look at individual cases and to treat them with fairness and understanding should difficulties of hardship arise in individual cases.

• (1435)

We are not without compassion but we have to ensure that the tax base is fair and is full of integrity.

* * *

OLD AGE SECURITY

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on October 18, 1993 the Prime Minister stated: "The Liberal Party is committed to maintaining old age security".

Last week in the budget the finance minister killed OAS. The Prime Minister made a campaign promise to seniors in 1993 that he knew he would break by attacking their pensions as he has.

Why did the Prime Minister falsely raise the hopes of seniors that he would protect them when he was shamelessly planning to kill OAS as quickly as possible?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would agree that prior to the budget and prior to statements by the Prime Minister, a lot of senior citizens in the country were extremely concerned because a number of comments and studies indicated that the entire program was in great difficulty.

Oral Questions

The Prime Minister's undertaking was to ensure that no one who was presently benefiting from OAS-GIS would be affected by the changes. He made that commitment in this place and elsewhere.

I am sure the hon. member will agree that when the Minister of Finance brought in his budget, not only did he honour the commitment made by the Prime Minister, but he extended that commitment by making sure that no one who was 60 on January 1 of this year was going to be affected by any changes.

I am sure that most senior citizens appreciate the hon. member joining them and applauding the fact that the government has now predictability and sustainability in what was formerly the OAS-GIS which is now the combined seniors benefit.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let us look a little more closely at this issue. The Liberal government does not appear to care about the retirement security of seniors despite the response of the hon. member.

Not only did it kill OAS but it also attacked seniors by dropping the age limit for RRSPs from 71 to 69. Finance officials have confirmed that this attack on our seniors' pensions will generate billions of dollars in tax revenue for the Liberals.

This Liberal government is playing petty politics with the retirement security of our seniors. Our seniors fought in wars to make our country great.

Why will the finance minister not keep his money grubbing, neck throttling, tax grabbing hands off our RRSPs?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the hon. member feels very strongly about this.

She has to come to grips with the real choices that face Canadians every day and also face the government and that is to make a choice between trying to maintain programs and systems in place to assist those who are most vulnerable in our society and recognize that people who are somewhat better off often recognize their obligations of having to make significant contributions.

The true test of the changes that were announced by the Minister of Finance in his budget comes when you look at the reaction of senior citizens around the country. No one could possibly contemplate continuing a system where there was uncertainty, where people actually could not prepare to plan for their futures.

The results of testing show the reaction from senior citizens' groups around the country. People do have confidence that when they retire there will be a program in place. Those who are already retired and those who are within five years of being 65 years of age also have certainty.

[Translation]

COLLECTION OF UNPAID TAXES

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. In his November 1994 report, the Auditor General of Canada deplored Revenue Canada's inefficiency in collecting unpaid taxes. As of May 31, 1995, more than a year and a half after this report was released, there were still \$6.4 billion in unpaid taxes, a reduction of less than 5 per cent compared to the year before.

How can the minister justify the fact that 400,000 high income taxpayers still owe the government more than \$6 billion in unpaid taxes?

• (1440)

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Department of National Revenue has a very good record when it comes to collecting receivables.

We as a department have worked extremely hard, as I mentioned yesterday, on the underground economy. We are focusing on Canadians who are taxpayers. We need to have those moneys in our coffers.

We have a good record and we will continue with that record.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the minister intends to do, in concrete—I repeat concrete—terms, to collect these unpaid taxes, to ensure that the most disadvantaged in our society will not pay once again for the government's inaction?

[English]

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had read our budget or listened to the Minister of Finance he would know that in a very concrete way we have addressed this issue. Fifty million dollars will be coming into the Department of National Revenue to help us audit in a more extensive way those sectors of the economy at risk to the underground economy.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the budget offered absolutely no hope for the 1.4 million unemployed Canadians, not to mention the 2.5 million under employed and all the rest of the people who are so concerned about losing their jobs.

Oral Questions

The government campaigned on the promise that it would create jobs, jobs, jobs. Why has it not improved on its disgraceful record of job creation? Sixty-five thousand jobs over the last year for 1.4 million unemployed Canadians is disgraceful. Why has it not met its promises?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should look at the statistics again.

Since the government came to power over 500,000 new jobs have been created. They are permanent jobs and they are in the private sector.

There was a problem last year. The world economy did slow and there was less job creation than we wanted. However, as I mentioned earlier to the leader of the Reform Party, in the last three months we have seen a strong growth in job creation, and the budget will ensure that continues.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, those words mean nothing to people concerned about their future. People are very concerned about the lack of job growth and the slowness of the economy.

The government ran on the promise that it would create jobs. They do not exist. Will the minister admit the real cause of unemployment is that we do not have lower taxes and therefore we do not have the type of job creation we need to give people some hope that we will get out of this malaise?

The government ran on the promise of jobs, jobs, jobs. All the government has given people is despair, despair, despair. When will it meet its promise of creating jobs?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that the Reform Party is suggesting tax cuts. That would only raise the deficit. In the last two years all I have heard from the Reform Party is that the deficit should be reduced. Now it is suggesting tax cuts which would raise the deficit.

We have instituted a policy of rolling two-years targets and the second part of that policy is meeting those targets. We have been successful in doing so. We have three budgets down and we will continue to meet those targets. That is the best way to create jobs.

* * *

[Translation]

SECURITIES

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. The federal government recently announced its intention to establish a Canadian securities commission. Meanwhile, provincial securities commissions are currently putting in place a co-ordinating system, known as electronic document analysis and retrieval, or SEDAR, to ensure a

true integration of financial markets. In that context, the Canadian commission will very clearly be another useless and costly example of overlap.

Given that the provinces' co-ordination work is already well under way, will the minister finally recognize that this initiative is totally unnecessary and that the federal government is more interested in asserting its authority in an area that comes under provincial jurisdiction than in promoting financial market effectiveness?

• (1445)

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, I personally had discussions with a number of provincial officials who asked for the establishment of a unified securities commission. The reason for this is simple: businessmen who need to raise funds across the country do not want to have to deal with 10 different securities commissions. They want to be able to get the funds they need under a set of harmonized rules for the whole country, since it is cheaper that way.

This is why it was proposed to create a Canadian securities commission. If a province does not want to join up with the federal securities commission, it is absolutely free to do so. This is only a proposal to create a partnership to serve Canadians better.

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first, I want to point out to the minister that while there are businessmen there are also businesswomen.

Second, I asked a question to the minister concerning SEDAR. Obviously, the minister is not aware of the existence of that system, which is a co-ordination instrument being set up by the various provincial securities commissions. This comes as no surprise, considering that effectiveness and harmonization are not synonymous with federalism and centralization.

Since the provinces have clearly taken the initiative to meet a real need, will the minister stop once and for all trying to take control of everything and accusing the provinces of being ineffective?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, nobody is accusing anyone of being ineffective as regards the securities sector. However, there are businesspeople who clearly asked the federal government and their provincial government, in order to promote job creation and more profitable investments, to create a securities commission with a single set of rules for the whole country.

Once again, the idea is not to impose anything, but to offer Canadians the best possible service. Bloc members who put Quebec's interests first should know when it is in their best interests to have national standards that help Quebecers within Canada to have better investments and to create jobs. Now is not

Oral Questions

the time to have an ideology that prevents businesspeople from creating jobs in Quebec.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

Due to recent changes in the Canada-U.S. tax treaty over 81,000 Canadians who receive U.S. social security have witnessed one-quarter of their benefits disappear at the hands of the IRS. Many of these are low income seniors. Americans who receive similar payments from Canada are allowed to seek a refund, but this is denied Canadians.

What is the Minister of Finance doing to redress this inequity in tax treatments of low income seniors?

Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is of interest to a large number of Canadians. It is an issue that has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Finance.

The background is that we updated our treaty with the U.S. specifically to get rid of double taxation and also to let us recover OAS going to high income seniors just as we do in Canada.

We have these taxation provisions in place with other countries such as Germany, France and Austria. The large number of Canadians receiving U.S. benefits makes this a very special case. This is a concern to us and we have raised the issue with Canadian and U.S. officials.

• (1450)

After this communication the Minister of Finance will be speaking this week to his counterpart in the U.S., Mr. Rubin. I anticipate that either I or the minister will keep the House informed of the progress on this important issue.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a growing number of prairie grain farmers want the Canadian Wheat Board to be made more accountable and transparent. This means the wheat board must be made to open its books.

It is amazing that the Canadian Wheat Board remains exempt from the scrutiny of the auditor general and so is closed to Canadian farmers and the public.

When will the minister of agriculture open the books of the Canadian Wheat Board and make it financially accountable to farmers by having the auditor general do an audit of the board?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman knows, the Canadian Wheat Board is already subject to an annual audit, conducted by a very well known national accounting firm in Canada, according to all national and international accounting standards. On the issue of an annual audit, it is already accomplished.

In terms of the general argument about opening the books, there is a process under way right now in western Canada under the jurisdiction of the western grain marketing panel that is looking at a variety of complaints about our marketing system. A number of arguments are being made before that panel with respect to transparency and accountability. I hope we will receive some very useful advice from the panel on how to improve accountability and transparency through the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board.

I remind the hon. member the Canadian Wheat Board operates in an intensely competitive international environment. I hope he would apply the same standards to international grain companies like Cargill, Continental and others that he would presume to apply to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the minister mentions the audit. Deloitte & Touche does the audit. Deloitte & Touche has done an independent review of the Canadian Wheat Board. I managed to get hold of a copy.

It states there are deficiencies in the operations, management structure and accountability to grain farmers of the Canadian Wheat Board. It said its annual operational plans generally do not exist and budgeting or forecasting of expenses does not exist. These are a few of the problems mentioned in the report.

If the minister is so open and wants to co-operate in the process, why has he kept the report a secret from the public? Can the minister tell concerned grain farmers what the wheat board has done to address the serious deficiencies stated in the Deloitte & Touche study?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the kinds of concerns referred to by the hon. gentleman in his question are among the very reasons the western grain marketing panel is conducting work at present across western Canada. As we speak, the panel is conducting a series of public hearings in Winnipeg and it will go on to hold hearings in Edmonton and in Regina. The process is entirely open, entirely transparent.

If the hon. gentleman has more than just allegations and accusations, if he has specific, constructive suggestions on how to improve the marketing of western Canadian grain, I invite him to put those ideas before the western grain marketing panel so that they can be aired and reviewed in the proper forum.

Oral Questions

[Translation]

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the solicitor general. When CSIS was created, RCMP officers who were integrated into CSIS retained their rights, including the bilingualism bonus. However, after their integration, the then director general of CSIS, acting as a separate employer, abolished this bonus.

Is the government willing to restore, now and on a retroactive basis, the bilingualism bonus for RCMP officers transferred to CSIS?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will take my hon. colleague's interesting question under advisement and get back to him as quickly as possible.

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in making these inquiries, could the solicitor general also take into consideration the fact that the current director general of CSIS is willing to restore the bilingualism bonus, as long as the government and Treasury Board provide him with sufficient funds to do so?

• (1455)

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, I will make inquiries on this interesting matter and get back to my hon. colleague as quickly as possible.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week we heard an incredible admission from the justice minister. He said there could be instances in which some first degree murderers deserve an opportunity of parole after serving just 15 years of a life term.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice please give us an example of a murderer who deserves an opportunity of parole after serving just 15 years of a life sentence? Should Constable Todd Baylis' murderer get a hearing? Should Laurie Boyd's killer get a hearing? Should the killers of Brenda Fitzgerald, Darren Rosenfeldt, Leslie Mahaffy and Christine French get a hearing? Would any of these murderers qualify in the opinion of those in the justice department?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I understand my hon. friend's concerns but I remind him and the House that the parole board is an independent semi-judicial body

that operates at arm's length from ministers and MPs. I do not see how my hon. friend could reasonably expect us in the House to give that type of information.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the solicitor general should talk to the justice minister and suggest that he not make these kinds of comments in the House if he is not prepared to explain them. What is the purpose of making them if he is not prepared to explain them to the House, to the people of Canada and to the families of victims of these first degree murderers?

The member for York South—Weston reintroduced a private member's bill yesterday which would eliminate section 745 from the Criminal Code. His former bill, Bill C-226, was buried for over a year in committee.

Will the parliamentary secretary to the justice minister assure the House there will be no interference with the agenda of the justice committee and allow this bill to become law before August 12 of this year when child serial killer Clifford Olson becomes eligible for parole?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member that it has been an important innovation in parliamentary reform by the government that all private members' business is treated on a free vote basis. Also, the committees are masters of their own agendas.

I am glad the hon. member asked his question because it gives me the opportunity to remind the House that the bill of the hon. member for York South—Weston has been restored to the Order Paper and sent back to the committee where it was before prorogation. This is because of the initiative taken by this government, again for the first time in Parliamentary history, to restore private members' business after prorogation in exactly the same way as has been done in the past only for government business.

I also remind the House that the Reform Party totally opposed the government's motion to allow the restoration of private members' bills like that of the hon. member for York South—Weston. If it had its way the bill of the hon. member for York South—Weston would have been dead and buried forever but we, the Liberals, prevented that.

* * *

HEALTH

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

• (1500)

Science and technology is making giant strides in the area of human reproductive technologies, leaving the public interest and legislators well behind. Will the minister tell the House if and when

Point of Order

he intends to reply to the recommendations announced in November 1993 by the Royal Commission on Reproductive Technologies?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks a very substantive and important question.

The royal commission filed its report with the Government of Canada. Over the last number of weeks we have been doing a fair number of bilateral consultations with various groups.

It would be my intent, based upon the suggestions which have been made by hon. members opposite as well as my colleague to the right, that we would want to proceed with legislation. We would like to table that legislation hopefully before the House recesses in June.

The legislation we intend to table will be comprehensive. I will be looking for guidance and advice from members of Parliament from all political parties in terms of how we can effectuate the best piece of legislation for the country as a whole.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Health.

Today the Canadian Health Coalition released a legal opinion prepared by Dr. Bryan Schwartz concerning the impact of NAFTA on Canada's medicare system.

In view of the serious differences between the U.S. and Canada over this issue and in view of the March 31 deadline which is quickly approaching, will the minister agree to meet urgently with his provincial counterparts and health policy activists? Most important, will he issue a clear interpretation that no part of Canada's health care system will be opened up to U.S. for-profit health corporations?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is well aware there is a lot of legal interpretation circulating with regard to this issue.

I want to assure him and the House there are no provisions of the NAFTA agreement which will impact in terms of Canada's medicare system. I want to assure the House that the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister for International Trade and I are working co-operatively with one another to assure every Canadian there will not be an attack by Americans or Mexicans as it relates to the Canada health care system.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Colleagues, I would like to draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Irish Language, Mr. Dinny McGinley, and the accompanying delegation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. During question period, the Minister of Human Resources used the expression "baveux" to describe the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot. We know one of them at least, one of them is the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the expression is not parliamentary. The word "arrogant" is considered unparliamentary. The use of such words threatens the atmosphere in this House. With all due respect, I contend that, in future, you should intervene immediately and ask the member in question to withdraw the words to avoid poisoning the situation.

If the expression were considered parliamentary, we would have to conclude that it should be used in this House and that each side of the House could use terms that are an affront to the intelligence of remarks made here and tarnish people's image of parliamentarians, even those who behave properly, unlike the Minister of Human Resources Development, who has not, unfortunately, behaved properly for far too long.

• (1505)

The Speaker: My dear colleagues, it is true the word "baveux" was used in question period. In my opinion, as the Speaker, it was not applied to a specific member.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: This is why I intervened. The word, I believe, is unacceptable in circumstances such as these.

I would ask the hon. members on both sides of the House to stop using such words, because, in my opinion, they are too strong for the House of Commons. This is why I intervened. I hope a word like this will not again be used in the House.

This is not a question of privilege, but perhaps a point of order. However, since the minister was named, and he is here, perhaps he could clarify the situation.

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is true these words were spoken in the House and I willingly admit that I used the expression. However, I would also point out that I heard others use it today, this afternoon, even. I agree entirely with the description of the situation made by the House leader of the official opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to agree with you that these words are not appropriate in this House, particularly when they might be claimed to have been applied to more than one person. That would be disastrous.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Routine Proceedings

The Speaker: I think the word “baveux” will never again be used in the House, and I will leave the situation as it stands. It is over. Please do not use this word again.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I would like things to be clear. Did the minister withdraw his words? Let him say so clearly, and the whole matter will be clarified. Could he say so while you are here?

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I agree totally with the whip of the official opposition in the House and with the Speaker of the House that the word “baveux” is unacceptable and must not be used in this House.

The Speaker: So, he withdrew it. That is the end of it.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government’s response to seven petitions presented during the first session.

* * *

• (1510)

PRIVATE MEMBERS’ BILLS

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in conformity with arrangements already made in the House and referred to earlier by the solicitor general, I would like to reintroduce a private members’ bill on the subject of the Endangered and Threatened Species Act, File No. 352119.

The Speaker: My colleague, I am informed that your request should be on notice and it is not receivable today. I would invite the hon. member to put it on the Notice Paper.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, with reference to Beauchesne’s, as I understand it a question of privilege takes precedence in the House over other matters on the Order Paper. We did allow question period to proceed because there was an understanding that it would proceed. However, in terms of proceeding with the other orders such as the ones we are dealing with now, it would be out of order in that the question of privilege

does have precedence. I would appreciate your ruling on that, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: The hon. member is correct in what his belief is. Questions of privilege do take precedence. The reason I am going through the routine business of the day now is that not only is it a question of privilege, but it is the first item on the orders of the day.

It is for that reason I have decided to proceed in this manner. The House will be seized with the matter not only as a point of privilege but also as the first order of the day. That is why I decided to do this first.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

GASOLINE TAX

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions from people in my riding and the adjacent area, concerning the excise tax on gasoline.

[*English*]

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present pursuant to Standing Order 36.

In the first petition the petitioners would like to 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 in our society.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon 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, and the aged.

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from Sarnia, Ontario.

The petitioners would like to bring to the attention of the House that consumption of alcoholic beverages may cause health problems or impair one’s ability and specifically, that fetal alcohol syndrome and other alcohol related birth defects are 100 per cent preventable by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

The petitioners therefore pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation to require health warning labels to be placed on the containers of all alcoholic beverages.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions today. The first is signed by residents of Ottawa and Toronto.

Privilege

It notes that acts of discrimination against lesbian, gay and bisexual Canadians are an everyday reality in all regions of Canada. This kind of discrimination is unacceptable in a country known for its commitment to human rights, equality and dignity for all citizens.

Lesbian, gay and bisexual citizens pay taxes, make contributions to employee benefit plans and are entitled to the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens. Therefore, the petitioners call upon Parliament to act quickly to amend the Canadian Human Rights Act to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and to adopt all necessary measures to recognize the full equality of same sex relationships in federal law.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition draws to the attention of the House the fact that the current Criminal Code denies people who are suffering from terminal or irreversible and debilitating illness the right to choose freely and voluntarily to end their lives with the assistance of a physician.

• (1515)

Therefore, petitioners from across British Columbia call on Parliament to amend the Criminal Code to ensure the right of all Canadians to die with dignity by allowing people with terminal or irreversible and debilitating illnesses the right to the assistance of a physician in ending their lives at a time of their choice, subject to strict safeguards to prevent abuse, and to ensure that the decision is free, informed, competent and voluntary.

ANIMAL RIGHTS

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am here to present some thousand names on the issue of puppy mills. Under the present sentencing system only two years' prohibition from owning an animal is given to those who are convicted of operating a puppy mill.

The petitioners are asking the House of Commons to include in the Criminal Code a sentencing provision prohibiting those who operate puppy mills from owning or having custody and control of an animal for a period of no less than 10 years.

GASOLINE TAXES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition sent in by constituents from Mistatim, Porcupine Plain, Hudson Bay and Chelan. It notes that Canadians are paying about 52 per cent of the cost of a litre of gasoline at the pumps in the form of taxes. Over the past 10 years excise taxes on gasoline have risen 566 per cent. They urge that Parliament not increase federal excise taxes on gasoline in the future.

VIETNAM

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present this petition on behalf of a number of citizens in metro Toronto.

The petitioners urge the Government of Vietnam to immediately and unconditionally release all persons who are detained for peacefully expressing religious or political views. They urge the Government of Vietnam to adhere to the standards set out in the United Nations standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners to ensure that ill-treatment or torture of prisoners is abolished, and that adequate, and immediate medical treatment is provided to all detainees; and to press the Vietnam government to recognize the universal freedoms of speech, religion, assembly, association and free press.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege of presenting to the House two petitions from concerned citizens in my riding of Cambridge.

The first petition requests that the Government of Canada find alternate means of stable funding for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, other than the implementation of a communication distribution tax.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition, signed by over 250 people, requests that the government amend the Criminal Code to protect the rights of all unborn children.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Speaker: Shall the questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

COMMUNIQUÉ FROM THE MEMBER FOR CHARLESBOURG

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the matter that has been raised in this motion is very serious and you have ruled that it is sufficiently serious and it should be taken up with priority over the other business of the House.

I believe this is an indication to the House by its Speaker that this matter warrants a full investigation by the committee of the House that normally considers such matters, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, which I have the honour to chair.

Privilege

● (1520)

I want to assure hon. members that if this matter is referred to the committee it will be taken very seriously. It will be given a high priority and it will be dealt with in an orderly and equitable manner.

The House has on occasion dealt with matters of contempt in a summary fashion, for instance, when the offence in question was self-evident and without doubt, as in the case of a few years ago when the incident occurred in full view of the entire House. The usual practice, however, has been to ask a committee of the House, without prejudice, to look into the matter, to report its findings to the House and, if necessary, to recommend a course of action.

This motion does not follow the usual course. The essence of the motion is to ask the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs to investigate the matter in question. This can be accomplished only if the terms of reference that the House gives to the committee are framed in a fair and equitable manner.

As I indicated in my brief remarks yesterday, the motion of reference now before the House does not seem to meet those criteria. In effect the motion sets out a series of conclusions and then asks the committee to investigate the actions in question. Any committee proceedings pursuant to such an order of reference would be clearly prejudiced. A fair and equitable order of reference would not dictate the conclusions of an investigation of a committee, it would merely set out the issue that the House wishes the committee to investigate.

To draw an analogy from the justice system, an individual is not convicted first and given a trial later. Every individual is entitled to a full and fair trial before any conclusions are reached.

If the motion restricted itself to that there would be no problem. There would be no prejudice implied. Unfortunately, the motion contains a great many prejudicial phrases which makes it impossible for the committee to conduct fair hearings. Without any investigation of the events surrounding the issue or of the law concerning either sedition or contempt, the motion seeks to declare individuals guilty of serious offences.

The motion does not charge these individuals with offences. It declares them guilty without the benefit of deliberation. This, as all hon. members know, is contrary to every principle of justice within the Canadian system. Every citizen is entitled to a fair trial in which the alleged offence is clearly defined and in which the allegations are proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

The motion, as it is worded, makes a number of assertions that may or may not be correct. It asks the House of Commons to accept those assertions as fact without the benefit of investigation. The motion declares that the alleged facts constitute serious breaches of law. It asks the House of Commons to come to conclusions on these laws without having the opportunity to consider the nature of these laws and the jurisprudence surrounding them.

● (1525)

I would suggest the proper course would be for the matter to be referred to committee for examination without prejudice. The committee could then proceed to a thorough examination of the law and the jurisprudence surrounding sedition and contempt and perhaps, more important, adduce the accurate and complete evidence concerning the actual events in question. It could then come to conclusions and report these to the House, along with any appropriate actions.

It is at that time, and only at that time, that the House should then be asked to make a definitive statement on the actions in question. As I said, it is contrary to every principle of justice that is basic to the system in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, your ruling is a strong indication to the House that it ought to order an investigation of the matter. I believe that the House is prepared to concur in your opinion. We do not, however, believe that we can risk any committee of the House being converted to some sort of kangaroo court. Any and all committee proceedings on such matters ought to be fair and equitable.

In order to accomplish this, I move:

That the motion be amended by deleting before the word "that" and deleting all the words after the word "that" and by substituting for those words, the following:

—the matter of the communiqué of the member for Charlesbourg released on October 26, 1995, with reference to members of the Canadian Armed Forces be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

I am shocked at the amendment today. It appears that the government side is trying to completely gut the spirit of the motion I brought forward yesterday.

The Speaker: Would the hon. member please be very specific on what is the point of order. I would like him to proceed to it forthwith.

Mr. Hart: Mr. Speaker, it appears that the government's amendment guts, completely destroys and negates the motion I brought forward yesterday. We went through the procedure yesterday. I laid a charge and this totally takes away from the process that the Speaker ruled on yesterday in the House of Commons.

I would think that this was out of order.

The Speaker: I have the amendment in front of me now. In my opinion, this amendment is procedurally in order and I am going to allow it.

Privilege

• (1530)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the Reform Party is extremely serious. I intend to prove how serious this action is, especially as, in consideration of some minor changes, it has gained the support of government members, of Liberal members.

To make sure that everybody knows what we are talking about, I believe we should read again part of the main motion before us.

That in the opinion of this House, this action by the Honourable Member for Charlesbourg, and the then Leader of the Official Opposition should be viewed as seditious and offensive to this House and constitutes a contempt of Parliament; and consequently, the House refer the matter to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs for examination.

To understand fully what is at stake, I took the trouble to check how two of the most commonly used dictionaries defined the word "sedition". According to Webster's it is "the stirring up of discontent, resistance, or rebellion against the government in power."

This concept of sedition refers also to sections of the Criminal Code because it is something extremely serious. Sections 59 to 62 of the Criminal Code give a more precise definition of what sedition is, and I quote: "Every one shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who teaches or advocates, or publishes or circulates any writing that advocates, the use, without the authority of law, of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada."

It remains to be seen whether the charge laid by the Reform Party can be taken into consideration by this House in view of the fact that not only it is obviously grossly overstated, but also it does not refer to the action taken by my colleague, the member for Charlesbourg.

As proof, we only need to go back to the communiqué which is the object of the Reform Party's wrath. The fourth line of that text reads as follows, and I quote:

—MP for Charlesbourg, Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob, put forward his position today concerning the national defence policy of a sovereign Québec.

There is no deception whatsoever in that press release issued by the MP for Charlesbourg. It states the position of the Bloc Québécois, a political party which is fully recognized, was democratically elected to this House with the support of 50 per cent of the Quebec population, and has some ideas on the eventual organization of the department of defence and of the defence system if sovereignty as it proposes it is ever accepted.

• (1535)

In publishing that press release, the MP for Charlesbourg never had any seditious, as the term says, intent of any kind. He did not

try to propose the use of force against established order, with a view to overthrowing the government.

Someone deciding to commit a seditious action, to foment rebellion, would not do so openly and publicly and would not send a press release to all the journalists in the press gallery to explain what a sovereign Quebec would do.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, this would be like signing his own death warrant.

"Ladies and gentlemen of the press and of the television, I hereby announce that our party intends to start a rebellion in Canada". It makes no sense. This is a public action taken by a member of Parliament who, within the context of his duties, explains the structure of the department of defence in a sovereign Quebec.

Now everybody, all the members in this House, all the journalists on Parliament Hill, everyone except maybe the reform party members who have not yet understood it, everybody knows that the main reason why Bloc Québécois members were elected to this House, their main political goal, is for Quebec to become a real country as soon as possible.

Some people could say: "Yes, but if we read a little further on in the communiqué, the member for Charlesbourg wrote that Quebec will need all the Quebecers who are currently in the military; he added that Quebec will be part of NATO, that we share concerns for democracy and for the respect of civil and human rights". What offence did the member for Charlesbourg commit? He announced that we intended to respect our international responsibilities in the defence area, and that in Quebec we respect human rights. Is he guilty of sedition because he said that we would respect human rights?

"The day after a yes win," he says, "Quebec should immediately create a Department of Defence, the embryo of a major state, and offer Quebecers serving in the Canadian Forces the chance to integrate into the Quebec Forces "while keeping their rank, seniority—", etc.

It is also public knowledge—and the communiqué must be interpreted in that light—that Quebec's plan to achieve sovereignty will become a reality—it was announced throughout the referendum campaign—after a yes win and a one-year period of negotiations during which we will offer the rest of Canada a partnership in an appropriate, responsible and honest way. And it is only at the end of this process that Quebec's sovereignty will be proclaimed and that Quebec will put in place its defence system, its army and the whole structure of a real country. I repeat, after.

Is it reasonable to think that the hon. member for Charlesbourg is guilty of high treason for announcing to all newspapers in Canada that, after a yes vote in the referendum and a year of negotiations, Quebec will give itself a defence policy? Is it treason to tell those

citizens who were asked to support our goal what the future will be like in our new country? That, Mr. Speaker, is sheer nonsense.

The reality behind this motion is that, for Reform members in this House, being a sovereignist is a crime. According to Reform members, 50 per cent of Quebecers should be charged with treason, since, as sovereignists, they want their own country.

• (1540)

Mr. Speaker, I must point out that the reality behind this motion is that, for over two years, the Reform Party has wanted to form the official opposition but has been unable to earn this position. That is its problem.

Reform members will have an opportunity, during the coming by-elections, to become the official opposition if they wish. They should behave like democrats. It is only by running in the ridings in question and defeating the Bloc and Liberal candidates that they can be taken seriously and have any hope of becoming the official opposition. Not before.

Mr. Speaker, your ruling, which I deeply respect, calls for the House to consider and vote on this motion. We in the official opposition had felt and hoped that Liberal members, acting a little more sensibly, logically and responsibly than third party members, would fight this motion which does not make any sense and is totally unfounded, which goes way beyond what the hon. member for Charlesbourg has done and even infringes on the official opposition's right of free speech.

Instead, they disguise the main proposal. It is hypocritical to try to disguise a proposal like this one on the pretext that talking about sedition is not quite politically correct, that it does not look good in the Quebec ridings where those people have representatives. They know very well what the people of Quebec would think of their colleagues in every riding, because no one in Quebec, not even non sovereignists, will ever tolerate that sovereignists be called traitors and accused of sedition for making our goal known, a goal in which we believe.

They know very well that they would be judged harshly in their ridings. That is why they resorted to a totally, and I would say obviously, artificial artifice. An unspeakable artifice. That is the word I was looking for. They tried to do some window dressing by saying: "Let us refer the matter to the House committee. It will examine the matter involving the member for Charlesbourg. We will look at the press release like good children. We will assess the situation. We will determine whether or not the member for Charlesbourg is a traitor for speaking of sovereignty". That is what we are hearing from the across the floor.

Mr. Loubier: Shame. You should be ashamed.

Mr. Gauthier: Did you think for a moment that we would let the parliamentary system deteriorate to the point where a colleague of

Privilege

ours can be named in a parliamentary release without any restriction, without any sort of protection? Did you think that we would let our colleague stand trial without being afforded the protection normally afforded to anyone who has dealings with the law? Do you think that we will let a puppet court decide the case of the hon. member for Charlesbourg, who is guilty of having made our political vision known? Never.

I shall remind you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members opposite that further thought needs to be given to this. To vote for the new motion we have before us, which makes a few changes to the motion put forward by the Reform Party, is to enter into a dangerous partnership with the third party. Politically, the Liberal Party of Canada will never recover from such act of infamy. In Quebec, the people, including federalist Quebecers, will never forget what federal Liberal members will have done. It is plain unthinkable that we would go along with this kind of game.

The hon. member for Charlesbourg did his job as a member of Parliament. The official opposition is doing its job in this Parliament. We are looking after the interests of Quebec.

• (1545)

We are publicizing our sovereignty plan, as we have been asked to do by the other side of the House. The Prime Minister regularly says to us: "Tell the public about your plan". Yes, we are telling Quebecers about it. No, we have not finished publicizing it because our presence here is designed to do precisely that. This plan that is so dear to us and that we will soon, furthermore, succeed in bringing about is our reason for existing.

There is not one member of the official opposition in this House that would stand for it, if one of our colleagues were dragged before a committee, without rules, with no protection whatsoever, handed over to the Reformers, who would like nothing better than to occupy our seats, handed over to the members of the Liberal Party who could blindly take positions that are absolutely unacceptable in the democratic system in which we operate.

Referring to committee the case of the member for Charlesbourg and the press release in question would be to brand him guilty, in advance, of sedition, without actually using that term, because it would not fly in Quebec. It would allow the member for Charlesbourg to fall victim to the ire of certain people who cannot accept that a political plan such as ours is allowed to be expressed freely in this country and in this Parliament.

It would be as if 50 per cent of Quebecers were dragged before this committee without rules to defend themselves simply because they have committed the crime of being sovereignists. Sixty per cent of francophones in Quebec are represented by the member for Charlesbourg, they think like he does and they want him to explain to the members opposite that our political project makes sense.

Privilege

Never will we accept that our colleague, the member for Charlesbourg, be attacked by fellow parliamentarians before a puppet committee, a puppet tribunal, simply because he took the time to honestly explain our political project with the parliamentary means at his disposal. Never will we accept that 50 per cent of Quebecers be dragged before this committee without rules. Never will we accept that a fundamental right that parliamentarians in this country have always enjoyed, namely the right to express themselves and present their ideas even if the government does not agree, be taken away from us.

To vote for this motion as amended by the government is unacceptable because it is a direct infringement upon our right to represent our constituents and to present our option with all the implications it would have if Quebecers decided to have their own country. We will never be able to vote for this motion because after that, in this House, Liberals and Reformers alike will ask sovereignists "O.K., who is next?". We do not accept that, and Quebec does not accept it.

The Speaker: My colleagues, since the time allotted to the Leader of the Opposition is unlimited, it is not followed by a question and comment period. Resuming debate. The government whip has the floor.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a few minutes to indicate to the House that some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition are—to say the least—far removed from the facts before the House.

Of course, we just heard him vent his feelings and his distress and say some things which are far removed from the truth—and I am being polite here. He argued, for instance—

Mr. Plamondon: Side with the Reform Party!

Mr. Boudria: Maybe if the member opposite were to listen, he would finally learn something after all these years.

• (1550)

It is the Speaker of the House, and not the hon. member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, nor the government whip, nor the parliamentary secretary, who has ruled that this is a *prima facie* case of privilege. The issue was certainly not raised by the government. As it turned out, it was raised by someone else, but the fact remains that the House of Commons, through the Speaker, has decided that this was a *prima facie* case of privilege.

So, this is where we are at, right now. It is up to all the members of Parliament to ensure that the committee can do its job. And we are not talking here about a puppet committee, or a committee

without rules, as the Leader of the Opposition put it. The leader of the opposition said that we have no rules to guide us. There are the Standing Orders of the House, Beauchesne, Bourinot, Erskine May, I could go on and on.

Mr. Plamondon: Not forgetting the red book.

Mr. Boudria: There are library shelves chock full of books on procedure to guide our deliberations in the House and in committees.

The leader of the opposition's splitting himself in two in the House to claim it is otherwise does not make it so. The inaccuracy still remains. The members across the way are talking of voting nay. There has not been a vote in this House as of this moment.

We are faced with a situation in which the Speaker has deemed there was a *prima facie* question of privilege. This was followed by a Speaker's decision to entertain a motion.

Mr. Bernier (Gaspé): Vote nay.

Mr. Boudria: The motion before this House is unacceptable as it is improperly put.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Vote nay.

Mr. Plamondon: You vote nay.

Mr. Boudria: The hon. members across the way may continue with their catcalls, but the facts remain the same. If the motion is improperly drafted, it is the duty of this House to do things properly.

Mr. Plamondon: Vote against it, do not amend it.

Mr. Boudria: What we have done in this House is to propose, following on the ruling issued in this House by its Speaker, that it is totally in order for a committee to consider the matter. My colleague, seconded by myself, has therefore moved that the matter of the hon. member for Charlesbourg be referred to the parliamentary committee.

If the Reform members think—

The Speaker: Order, please. My dear colleagues, this is one of the most serious debates we have had here in this House. We shall all have the chance to speak here in the House. We are Canadians, we are democratic, and you will all have an opportunity to speak.

[English]

I ask you to have the courtesy to hear out all members of Parliament. This is a very important issue for all of us. As your Speaker I ask you to respect one another in this debate and listen to what is being said. Then you will make up your minds as parliamentarians.

Privilege

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take a few minutes to conclude. We all have a duty to ensure that this Parliament works well. There are no puppet committees. The decision of the House to strike the Committee on Procedure and House Affairs was a unanimous one.

This committee, which deals with procedure, privileges and elections, was established by unanimous consent of the House. Every member of this House knows that it is the role of this committee to deal with such issues. It is wrong to now claim that this is a puppet committee with no rules. It is absolutely wrong. To make such a claim is also to insult this House. That is what it is. This is not a puppet committee, and it will do its job. Too bad for those who chose to make gratuitous accusations in their motion.

• (1555)

We, on this side of the House, and certainly myself as a long time parliamentarian, only want the committee to do its job, as it has done on several occasions. Contrary to the claim made, this is not unprecedented. I remember the Mackasey case. I remember other cases that were referred to the same committee and a decision was made. I even remember parliamentarians who chose to put their case before the committee, in order to prove their innocence. How can anyone say that this is a puppet committee? These are false allegations. Members opposite know that. It is wrong for them to now criticize in that fashion the existence of House committees and, in doing so, that of our parliamentary institution, and they know that.

Why did those across the floor who chose to make such gratuitous accusations not draft the motion in proper form? Surely, they must know how to do it. And if they do not, there are enough lawyers and procedural experts in this place to help them, and they surely could have consulted them. The same rule applies to them. All we have to do is refer the case to the committee, without making accusations, where it will be heard in an honest and legitimate manner.

[*English*]

That is all we have to do. All the people across the way and those making those kinds of gratuitous affirmations are no better. All we have to do as Parliamentarians is do our jobs honestly in the House and in the parliamentary committee. Then the issue will be clear and hopefully the House will be stronger when it comes out of this. However, it will not happen unless we all want to do the right thing.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a calm voice to this discussion. I would like to add it to those voices of hon. members who have been urging the motion of privilege put by the member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt be accepted as it is, not as amended, and that the matter contained in the original motion be referred to the standing committee.

It has been well established that the member for Charlesbourg, a member of the defence committee of the House, released a communiqué on letterhead of the office of the leader of the official opposition of the House on October 26, 1995 before the referendum in Quebec. It invited Quebec francophone members of the Canadian Armed Forces to join the Quebec military in the event of a yes vote in support of separation from Canada.

The original motion calls for recognition that in the opinion of the House this action should be viewed as seditious, offensive and in contempt of Parliament. I will argue in favour of retaining the original wording. The government wants to water it down.

The issue is not whether the action by the member was foolish and ill considered; obviously it was foolish and ill considered. If the commission of foolish and ill considered actions from time to time were to constitute contempt of Parliament very few of us would escape its censure.

The issue is not whether the action by the member was offensive to the public, although it undoubtedly is offensive to many members of the public judging from the letters we have received, including letters from my constituents. The issue is not even whether the action of the member was seditious or traitorous in the sense of sections 53, 59 or 62 of the Criminal Code, a subject on which at least one Ontario court has partially ruled.

Rather, the issue is whether in the opinion of the House, a court in its own right with respect to its own privileges, the action of the member should be viewed as seditious and offensive.

I remind the government House leader these words were carefully chosen. They have not been carefully read but they were carefully chosen in the first place.

• (1600)

As early as June 1994 I urged the Prime Minister publicly and privately to spell out the terms and conditions which in the opinion of the federal government ought to govern any attempt at secession. I asked him to spell out the terms and conditions which ought to govern any public order issues, such as those envisioned by part II of the Criminal Code and the Emergencies Act. My fear was that in the absence of such guidelines it would be left to the sovereignists, those advocating the break-up of Canada, to define what constituted acceptable and unacceptable behaviour in those circumstances. That is exactly what happened.

The principal reason for allowing this motion to proceed in its original form is not simply to determine whether a particular member should be disciplined for actions offensive to this House and to many Canadians. It is to permit this House to consider through an examination by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. It is for the future guidance of all members in terms of what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable conduct with respect to urging members of the Canadian Armed Forces to pursue

Privilege

a particular course of action in the event of an attempted secession by a province or a part thereof.

Part II of our Criminal Code tends to define sedition using an old wartime definition of sedition. It defines it narrowly as advocating governmental change within Canada by the use of force or violence. The Leader of the Opposition misses the entire point of our motion by harping on that particular definition.

Proceeding with this motion will require the standing committee to determine what should and should not be viewed as seditious in the present opinion of this House in the context of a secession attempt, something that the Criminal Code never envisioned, nor did the court cases dealing with sedition in the past consider. For example, it may well be that in the opinion of this House, under present circumstances, advocating a change of government in Canada by any unlawful means should be considered some form of sedition and that the Criminal Code should be changed to reflect that opinion. That could very well be one of the conclusions of the standing committee.

The government by amending the motion seeks to avoid coming to grips with the real issues raised by a secession attempt and the participation of members of this House in that attempt. It seeks again to avoid the realities of secession. That is precisely what it did prior to the referendum and it was a profound mistake. It was a strategic mistake. It allowed separatists to define what was acceptable and unacceptable in the event of a yes vote. It created a vacuum into which members like the member for Charlesbourg wandered and were allowed to do whatever they pleased. That same type of conduct will occur in the future if that vacuum is allowed to remain.

Many Liberal backbenchers, to their credit, saw that mistake more clearly than the advisers in the Prime Minister's office. Now by supporting this motion they have a chance to correct it. The House has a chance to correct it at least in relation to one small dimension of the separation issue.

Supporting this motion in its original form would make a major contribution to clarifying for all members what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable conduct with respect to attempting to influence the armed forces in the unusual constitutional circumstances in which this country finds itself. Supporting the motion in its original form contributes to the rule of law by defining the rule of law in an area where it is unclear or does not exist at all and contributes to peace, order and good government, two purposes for which this House exists.

• (1605)

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a clarification from the hon. member as to whether or not he appreciates the importance of having this matter

referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. I would like to get his view on the prejudicial aspects of the preamble to the hon. member's motion.

We are really talking about the fundamental issues of Canadian justice. Certainly as members of Parliament, which is from where all our country's laws should come, we should be setting the first example on justice. It strikes me that when we have a motion that colours the rights of any member of the House prior to its going to committee, we would be putting in jeopardy the deliberations of the committee. It was for that reason the amendment was offered.

I would like to get a specific reply to my question on whether or not there is a prejudice occurring.

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, if this matter is to be investigated, the charge has to be made in some way, shape or form so that the committee knows what it is investigating, what it is endeavouring to determine, what is true and what is not true. That is the reason for that thrust.

A second thing should be said in response to the member's intervention. His committee is not acting just like a court. This Parliament not only interprets laws and can interpret laws in committee, it also makes laws. In fact that is its primary function and that is why the motion is worded the way it is.

If someone does what is alleged and it is established that they did it or whatever the case is established, should that be viewed as seditious? That is not a question a court can answer but it is a question which Parliament and a committee can answer. If it should be viewed as seditious, then this body has the capacity to change the law and the definition of sedition. That is why the words "should be viewed" are included in the motion. To strike them changes the whole nature of what we are endeavouring to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed when I hear the member of the Reform Party talk of sedition and of such a serious matter, as you said Mr. Speaker, with practically no grounds. I think that the leader of the Reform Party is a smart man and knows how to read communiqués. I think he understands the news. I wonder why he is putting so much time and energie into bringing this matter up in the House today.

I think that, if one follows the news, one realizes—maybe this is something people do not know—that this matter has already been considered by a justice of the peace. A lawyer from Montreal was, like the Reform Party, of the opinion that the member for Charlesbourg had committed a crime of lese majesty and decided to lay a complaint. A justice of the peace, a law professional, a person who knows the law, who knows the Criminal Code, who knows what he is talking about, has studied the communiqué, has considered the facts at issue, and has rejected the complaint made by the Montreal

lawyer. Furthermore, the same thing occurred in Ontario, and the complaint was again rejected.

The member must be aware of that. Canadian legal experts, not only from Montreal or Quebec, but also from Toronto, in Ontario, determined that there was nothing wrong there. The communiqué was even been described as a job offer.

• (1610)

Today, some people feel the need to waste the time of the House, to make members of Parliament waste their time on something as ridiculous as this. There is no sedition. That is clear. I challenge the member to find in the communiqué issued by the member for Charlesbourg a call to violence or to threat to public order. Where can he find, in the communiqué, an invitation or an incitement to engage in some prohibited action? Where? Nowhere.

I challenge the member to find exactly where such things are to be found in the communiqué. He will draw the same conclusion as the justices of the peace and the legal experts: it is a job offer. The member for Charlesbourg said that after a yes vote, those who are in the army will be allowed to join the forces, or the Quebec army, since Quebec will have an army, as any other self-respecting country.

It is not a call to sedition or revolt to welcome people with open arms while telling them: "French and English speaking Quebecers, join us". Nowhere in the communiqué can such a distinction between French and English speaking people be found. The Reform Party members are the ones who are making that distinction. They are the ones acting in this way.

Where, in the communiqué, is there a distinction between French and English speaking people?

Mr. Landry: Nowhere.

Mr. Bellehumeur: These are other questions for which the Reform Party member, who is, moreover, the leader of the third party, will not be able to provide an answer.

[English]

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the member's intervention. It gives us a chance to explain exactly what is going on here. If the member had listened to my remarks he would have heard what I said. I will repeat it slowly.

Privilege

The issue here is not whether the action of the member was seditious or traitorous in the sense of sections 53, 59 or 62 of the Criminal Code, the sections cited in the two court cases the member refers to, both of which I have read and a subject on which two courts have partially ruled. That is not the question. We are not answering the question as to whether the member urged sedition in the sense of the Criminal Code with respect to the use of force or violence to overthrow the government.

The actual motion is whether in the opinion of this House the action of the member "should be viewed" as seditious and offensive. If the committee were to determine that it should be viewed as seditious that would require us to change the definition of sedition. That is where Parliament is different from a court. A court could come to the conclusion that this type of activity should be regarded as some sort of sedition but the court could do nothing about it. This Parliament can. That is why the words "should be viewed" are essential to the motion and should be left there rather than struck.

Members of the Bloc will not believe this but it is important to get it on the record. Getting these guidelines clear as to what is acceptable and unacceptable is as much for their protection and for the protection of their province as it is for anyone else. I am afraid that if these things are not answered then that is when accidents will happen. People will do ad hoc things that will be destructive to the interests of Quebec and Canada, things we have not even envisioned. We all have a vested interest, whether or not we agree in exactly what is acceptable or unacceptable in this circumstance, in spelling it out in law if that is at all possible.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened to what the leader of the third party had to say. He has just confirmed that the judgment we are about to pass on the member for Charlesbourg is a question of political opportunism. It boils down to this: Was what the member said in this House or outside acceptable to the leader of the third party or did it offend him?

Does this means that from now on, whenever we ask an embarrassing question of the Prime Minister, a question that might be considered politically embarrassing by Canadians at large, or embarrassing for the government or whatever, the leader of the third party will rise and say: "Hand this guy over to a House committee". This is tantamount to throwing a lamb to the wolves.

• (1615)

And yet, this is what he is asking you to do. This is what is happening. We can no longer ask legitimate questions, questions our constituents are asking, and rightly so. This is all about political opportunism. We are told: "If we do not like what you are

Privilege

saying, we are going to parade you in front of this wolf committee; you are the lamb and you are going to be torn apart”.

[English]

Mr. Manning: Mr. Speaker, I would answer that intervention with another question. The Bloc member cannot answer it today, but it will help the House.

Let us say that Quebec got its sovereignty. If someone advocated a change in the sovereign government of Quebec by unlawful means should that be prevented or prohibited in Quebec law? If your answer to that is yes, then you should be supporting the motion rather than opposing it.

The Speaker: This ends the question and answer period for this speaker. Once again, I ask all members to please address the Chair. Do not address one another. Address the Chair.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have all been following the remarks of colleagues very closely on this important issue. As much as we would like to conclude debate and have the matter dealt with, I would hope that most of us would want to see the matter go to committee, rather than taking up the time of the House.

Certain things have to be said and certain things have to be clarified and I would like to focus on two or three of them now.

The process which I support is one that would cause the motion to be amended, as has been moved, and referred to a committee. The importance of amending the motion before it is referred to a committee lies in two or three reasons.

The first reason is that all of us in the House, I am sure, wish to accord to each other over the period of our service here the utmost in procedural fairness and respect.

The manner in which this motion was originally framed, although perhaps it was not intended, alleges that the action of the hon. member who was cited was seditious. His action may or may not constitute sedition. It may or may not constitute something else in the Criminal Code. It may or may not constitute something else again, simply involving the appropriate activities of a member of the House of Commons. Clearly there are some questions on which we are not clear and the precedents do not teach us well.

The motion should be reframed and the matter should be sent to a committee in a manner which will not prejudge precisely what the error was, if any, that occurred by the action which was taken by the hon. member.

Every one of us has an interest in ensuring procedural fairness. Today I have heard suggestions from the leader of the official opposition about this being a kangaroo court. I could be critical of that. In saying that he does a disservice to himself, to his colleagues and to all of us in the House by prejudging that something which

we will put in place, something which we will do, will constitute a kangaroo court. I know that all members of the House will not let that happen.

• (1620)

I want to see the motion amended. I have concerns about the way the matter is being framed here in the House with constant references to sedition. There is no need to frame this as sedition.

The Leader of the Opposition and other speakers have attempted to define what sedition is. In each case they failed to take note of the very clear words in the Criminal Code that define sedition as more than just the presumptive words referring to use of force or violence.

I will read them. Just in case anyone wants to refer to it, it is section 59 and it states: “Without limiting the generality of the expression, seditious intention, everyone shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who does (a), (b) and (c). But the definition clearly says “without limiting the generality of the meaning of the expression, seditious intention”. Where do we find out what seditious intention is? It is more than just the presumptive words.

The last case that dealt with this was *Boucher v the King* in the 1950s. The court was divided but it spoke. In my reading of that case, sedition does not just involve words or encouragement of the use of force in promoting public disorder. There are other elements to it. We should not refer this to the procedure and House affairs committee without acknowledging the fact that we are not just talking narrow words of sedition that have been described here. Sedition is more than that.

Even beyond that, the action by this member should not be seen as potential sedition. There is another section in the Criminal Code that has nothing to do with sedition. Section 62 makes no reference to sedition, but it does say: “everyone who willfully publishes, edits, issues, circulates or distributes a writing that advises, counsels or urges insubordination or disloyalty by a member of a force”—meaning the armed forces—“is guilty of an indictable offence”. It says nothing about sedition.

The original motion in the House clearly referred to sedition. In my view that is too narrow. We must look at other aspects of the action by the member. It is possible he may not have been wilful. We do not know. The committee will probably look at that. However, we must determine whether he did what has been alleged here because we all have a concern about this.

I take another step and urge the acceptance of the amendment to the motion. We are not directly concerned here as a public prosecutor would be about whether there might have been sedition or that there might have been a counselling to disloyalty of a member of the armed forces. We are looking at whether a member of the House misused his office, resources, his taxpayer provided

resources, all the privileges he has in the House, for an act that would bring contempt on the House.

The original motion does not reflect that aspect. That is another reason why the motion should be amended.

I also heard the word treason mentioned. The word treason should not have come up. I think we have free speech here within the limits of the Criminal Code. Treason has not come up. It is a non-issue. No one has alleged, as the leader of the official opposition has alleged, that there was some type of treason. There is no connection between what has happened here and the political viewpoint of a person in the province of Quebec who may or may not wish to see his or her government take certain actions in the future. This is not an issue that involves sovereignty or separatism or secession.

• (1625)

We are dealing with the actions of a member of Parliament in using his resources to do something that may have been a breach of our law or a breach of the rules of the House. I have every expectation that we can fairly accommodate that in the procedures we have in this House. In my short career here I have seen three or four procedures involving the bar and motions for contempt.

We have difficulty from time to time when some of us—we are political animals—politicize these incidents. I would encourage members on both sides to please try in this case to avoid politicizing it to the degree to which we are all capable, especially because the *raison d'être* of the Bloc Québécois is arguably related to the actions of that member. I would not want us to be blind to the fact that we all could politicize this past the point where we have the ability to act fairly: fairly in relation to the member, fairly in relation to ourselves and the precedent we may or may not set for dealing with these kinds of actions in the future.

I want to see the motion amended. I want to see the matter dealt with. I have confidence in the abilities of members on both sides of the House who will sit on the procedure and House affairs committee to dispose of this matter fairly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did not take the floor for a few weeks. I am participating in today's debate with a lot of sadness. I have been in this House for 12 years, and during those 12 years I have seen debates where the differences of opinion between the parties were enormous, and I have seen very fiery debates.

I remember for example the great debate on the death penalty, where positions were deeply entrenched. However, members were always respectful of the rights of their colleagues, whether they

Privilege

were for or against the death penalty, for or against abortion, for or against an institutional reform, they were always respectful of each other. Today's debate in this House is a shame for Canadian democracy. What we are doing in this House is impugning motives. Worse, what we are putting on trial is the right to write, speak or express an opinion on a subject in this country still called Canada. This is the real debate launched by the Reform Party, and the Liberal Party is a party to this shameful behaviour.

Today, we are witnessing the sovietization of debates in Canada. That is what it means. We are creating a censure board, here, in this country that calls itself democratic. That is what we are doing today. We are impugning the motives of a political party on the basis of one communiqué from one of its members. I, too, want to be implicated, because in my own riding I dared talk to Canadian athletes who were going to the Olympic Games and told them: "I cannot wait for you to serve Quebec in the Olympic Games, when Quebec becomes a country".

I talked to the postmaster and told him: "I cannot wait until, as a postmaster, you serve Quebec". I spoke with health research officers in my riding. I told them: "I look forward to having you as health research officers for Quebec after Quebec has become sovereign". I spoke with Canada customs officials. I told them: "I look forward to having you as employees of Quebec customs".

• (1630)

Does this mean that I am guilty as well? Am I guilty? What kind of trial are we inflicting upon a Bloc member for saying something as simple as: "Dear brothers and sisters who are serving in the army, you will be welcome in a sovereign Quebec; we will need our own armed forces in Quebec to participate, alongside the Canadian Armed Forces, in peacekeeping missions with U.S and European forces. We would be together and we would only be too pleased to have you serve under the Quebec flag instead of under the Canadian flag, since you would no longer be Canadians, but full-fledged Quebecers". Where is the sedition in that? What sedition? Never in the 12 years I have been serving in this Parliament have I witnessed a case being made against someone based solely on assumptions like this; never have I seen people try to censure in this way what is said or what political views the members of this House may have. This is unacceptable.

I am one disappointed onlooker and I would like to tell my hon. friends the following. You belong to a great party. I disagree with the ideas put forth by the Liberal Party, but the Liberal Party always boasted about being the party of major reforms. Just think about the reforms in the field of health.

An hon. member: Do not forget the War Measures Act.

Privilege

Mr. Plamondon: There have been a few disappointments, like the War Measures Act, but on the whole, the Liberal Party has put forth major reforms. And today, the Liberals would be party to instituting this kind of censorship. This goes against their traditions. And one of your leaders, the Hon. Lester B. Pearson, a human rights advocate, who won the Nobel Peace Prize for his nobility of soul, his vision and his respect for human rights, must be spinning in his grave today. He must not be able to believe that his own party could be party to such a motion.

The Speaker: The hon. member has used up half the allotted time. We will now have a chance to hear what the other hon. member has to say.

[*English*]

Mr. Lee: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his comments. He focused quite appropriately on our privileges as members of Parliament. I cannot do anything but support him in that because his privileges as a member are mine. We all share and have a very great interest in those privileges.

I want to point out that although the facts of this case have been presented to persons and authorities outside this House, it is my understanding that a public prosecutor in the province of Quebec declined to proceed in relation to these facts.

Mr. Duceppe: In Ontario also.

Mr. Lee: Also in Ontario, as my friend reminds me quite appropriately.

However, none of us have been made privy to the legal opinions on which those decisions were based. It may well be that the major reason no one would proceed was precisely because the member involved had privileges as a member of Parliament and those privileges, which my friend has just made reference to, protect us all in our speech and in our activities in this House of Commons.

It may be that the committee which will deal with this will rate our privileges so high that it will accord to the member enough freedom so that he could do again what he did then. That might or might not happen. However, I just wanted to concur that the privileges, which we all have here and which we all share, are very important to us all.

Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River is right about the privileges of Parliament. That is precisely what we are about here. We can potentially talk about sedition in the armed forces. We are not talking about that. We can talk potentially about sedition among members of the public. We are not talking about that. We are talking about what happens in this Chamber. Is there a possibility of sedition in the case in front of us?

• (1635)

I ask the hon. member: How is the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs going to be able to examine this question of privilege and procedure in this Parliament with the modified amended motion brought forth by the Liberals? All it states is that the matter of the communiqué, released October 1995 by the hon. member for Charlesbourg, with reference to members of the Canadian Armed Forces, be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. Referred for what? Let us be precise here. Give the committee a chance to address the issue by putting some meat in it.

Mr. Lee: Mr. Speaker, this is a good question. The hon. member opposite will take note that the Speaker has already found that the issue, as framed by the hon. member who originally rose, is *prima facie* a matter of privilege and therefore the matter has already been framed.

Second, the body of debate that accompanies this motion in its eventual passage or non-passage as the case may be will be part of the record that goes to the committee. There will be no doubt in the minds of committee members what the Speaker has ruled, what the member originally moved and what members of this House have put forward in relation to these facts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with an important matter and we have heard all sorts of things for about an hour. I am a little surprised by what we heard. I think we must go back to the definition of sedition, because it is what the Reform Party is talking about in its motion.

As you can see, Reform members have somewhat altered the meaning of sedition. We must go back to section 59, which provides that “every one shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who teaches or advocates, or publishes or circulates any writing that advocates, the use, without the authority of law, of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada”.

Well, the communiqué makes no mention of this. It is very clear. I thought I would be arguing with Reform members on the basis that the communiqué does not refer to this or contravene section 62, which relates to any member of the military who is guilty of disloyalty, insubordination, mutiny or refusal, or section 59, which concerns anyone who publishes or circulates any writing that advocates the use of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental change.

I thought our debate would revolve around this and I was somewhat surprised at first, because this matter was raised by a Montreal lawyer, Mr. Tyler, in the Quebec courts, and in an Ontario court, before it was dismissed. One judge even called the communiqué a job offer. In other words, this is as far as he could go in

Privilege

ridiculing the claims of this lawyer, a supporter of the partition of Quebec, we must remember.

The ministers of Defence and of Justice have told us, either in the House or in press releases, that they would be consulting their legal advisers in order to see whether there are grounds for laying charges. According to Diane Francis of the *Financial Post*, one of the Reform's gurus, the legal advisors of both ministers, Defence and Justice, have indicated that there was nothing to be done.

There was therefore no basis for accusations of sedition. What is surprising this afternoon is that there are admissions that there is no sedition, but they want another definition of sedition: crimes of opinion. The leader of the Reform Party, a person of some consequence, is speaking now of crimes of opinion, saying that in Canada there could be criminals of opinion. That is new, totally new. CSIS may have been investigating the Reform Party, but I have a feeling that next year it will be Amnesty International.

• (1640)

It is not very democratic to talk in terms of a crime of opinion. This is a new definition of what sedition is. In a way, it does not surprise me that a few Reform members would think of leaving that party, finding it to be too far to the right and seeing that, thank God, the majority of Canadians, no matter whether Quebec remains a part of the federation or not, would never follow that party in its undemocratic attitudes.

What is going a bit far, as was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, is speaking of sedition and ending up giving out a fax number. This is like storming the Bastille. One thing is clear: there will surely not be any exercise in camouflaged terrorism led by the defence minister to storm the Bloc headquarters. We indicate where we stand.

It is completely ridiculous to speak of sedition. Mr. Tyler has been told so. There have been three previous cases of sedition.

The first case, I think, was that of Louis Riel. It goes back a long way, and I find it very disturbing that one could refer to Louis Riel, because it was recognized later on that it was a mistake. Even though this Parliament refused to apologize, some even consider him a Father of Confederation. But he had been found guilty, which is not the case with the hon. member for Charlesbourg, far from it. A few years later, it was realized that Louis Riel was not guilty.

The second case is the case of Fred Rose, in 1946. This was when the Cold War was at its worst. It may be more accurate to talk of an open conflict, since McCarthyism was about to take hold of the United States. He was convicted, and there was a certain foundation in fact for his conviction. But today, his guilt is being questioned.

It is very dangerous to exploit the concept of guilt in matters of opinion the way the Reform Party is trying to do.

I will deal later on with the Liberals or at least with the Liberal member who raised that same point. I am not talking about the mover of the motion, but about the member who spoke after him. The name of his riding escapes me. I am happy to see my colleague across the way is relieved.

The third case is that of Mr. McGreevy, in the 1880s. That member was actually guilty, and he resigned before the committee hearings took place. That case and that of the hon. member for Charlesbourg have absolutely nothing in common. I repeat, absolutely nothing.

A Reform member, the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands made a statement the day after the press release or a few days later. That was the first reaction of the Reform Party to the press release. Here is what he said:

[English]

“I do not think this can be considered inciting mutiny. We have to accept that in the Canadian forces right now are some people who are in favour of separation”.

[Translation]

What have we here? A member of the Reform Party who seems to understand something about the situation.

Mr. Lebel: We do not see that very often.

Mr. Duceppe: Some say that we do not see that very often, and I tend to agree with them.

An hon. member: Yet, he seconded the motion.

Mr. Duceppe: However, I want to talk about our colleagues opposite, because they were not of that opinion at the very beginning. They raised some issues similar to what the Reform is saying today. I would like to remind the House that in the days following this press release, in early November, the federal Liberals were talking about their plan B, in which they seemed to promote the partition of Quebec. They were also questioning the percentage needed for a Yes vote to carry and asking to review the question the government of Quebec would eventually come up with.

So, the defence minister said:

[English]

“I am shocked by the communiqué—”

[Translation]

He may well be shocked, but then he seems to be shocked most of the time.

Privilege

• (1645)

[*English*]

—“and I am seeking an opinion on the propriety of this release”.

[*Translation*]

This is what he did, but he did not get any answer, as we saw later.

I refer to the chief government whip, who said:

[*English*]

“This is dangerously close to inciting mutiny in the forces”.

[*Translation*]

I think the Liberals were the first to raise this issue. They contributed, I would say, to the feeling of paranoia created in the media in English Canada. A bit like Diane Francis, whom the Reform members seem to find inspiring nowadays. However, the Reform members woke up and realized the Liberals were about to overtake them on the right. When you can pass the Reformers on the right, you are way out to the right.

Today, the Liberals are proposing an amendment. I think they are trying in a roundabout way to do something they do not have the fortitude to do outright. One cannot talk about sedition without being held up to ridicule, since the legal advisers of certain ministers are saying there is no sedition. It is not possible any more to say to Quebec—They can say something to Canada and something else to Quebec, but there are limits to what can be said because the English term “sedition” and the French term “séditation” are very close. They should not speak of sedition to Quebec, especially since their legal advisers are of a different opinion, not to mention that there will soon be by-elections and the Leader of the Opposition in Quebec, federalist Daniel Johnson, is telling them to go easy and revert from plan B to plan A.

Now they know they cannot play that game as they did at the very beginning, on November 4, when the Reform Party was still asleep.

So today they try to withdraw anything that would make the member for Charlesbourg look guilty before being judged, but they still refer this matter to the Committee on Procedure rather than defeating it here and concluding this whole debate in order to go on to more pressing matters. They cannot do it because there are, in the Liberal caucus, members who are still talking of plan B. Besides, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Dion—who can be named, since he is not a member of Parliament—always speaks of plan B.

The other side backs all the horses. They do in a roundabout what they do not dare to do outright. But I notice that there is a

member who goes a little further by raising an issue of conscience when he asks: “Can the letterhead of the House be used to promote political opinions?”

If there are Liberal members who do not use the letterhead of the House to promote their political opinions, I think we should question the way public funds are used. It is meant to be used that way. If they spend the money for other purposes, then it is questionable, very questionable.

This means that we are still talking about a crime of opinion. Some could say: “Long live Canada and long live the Canadian armed forces, and there is the risk that soldiers from Quebec will no longer be allowed to serve in the Canadian army if Quebec becomes sovereign”, which would be correct. On the other hand, we could not say: “This is what will happen if Quebec becomes a sovereign country”. That is a crime of opinion. That is a double standard, and it is dangerous, but definitely not for the Bloc Québécois. I must say that we are thick-skinned. We are used to fighting in the House, and the fight is not over. Some day, we will win. I am telling you that this is much more dangerous for democracy in Canada. It is dangerous because this country does not deserve to fall under the boot of some dictatorship, because that is what this will lead to ultimately. When you start condemning people because of what they think, where does that lead you? That is where such regimes lead. Everybody knows that.

Canada sends military personnel to other countries to make sure such regimes disappear from the surface of the earth. I believe there is a Criminal Code, a Civil Code. There are the workings of the internal economy committee. Some would like to circumvent these procedures and start judging people according to what they think and not according to the rights which should be the same for everybody. If we change our way of doing things, the people do not have the same rights anymore. I believe this must have precedence over any political allegiance.

• (1650)

In conclusion, I want to make a few other remarks. In its motion, the Reform Party talks about francophones. But I looked at the text, and it does not say francophones, it says Quebecers. For us, Quebecers are not only francophones. There are anglophones in Quebec, aboriginal people, people who come from other countries and integrate into Quebec society. They never talked about Quebecers.

When people make ethnic divisions like you do, we know where that leads. Crimes of opinion, ethnic divisions, these are words that I have seldom heard in this House. And coming from the Liberals, I have to say that it surprises me. I know that, in the past, the Liberals have passed good legislation. There were great measures; we just have to think of Lester B. Pearson. But there was also the War Measures Act. That was a bit less democratic. There is a little

dark side to our red friends, but it is an exception in the way the Liberal Party operates. Plan B is a dangerous departure from liberalism in the noble sense of the word.

As for the Reformers, it does not surprise me that much since I remember a debate we had for two or three hours on the reinstatement of corporal punishment for children. I did not think I would see that in the 1990s. I know that one Reform member is going to Singapore to see if you can get results by flogging children or by striking the soles of their feet with a bamboo rod. When a member wonders about and puts time, money and research into investigating the merits of whacking people on the feet, there is definitely something out of whack.

There have been some strange things from the beginning, but it has still been quite some time, since the Bloc's very first days here, since there has been anything like this. Members will recall the \$500 billion lawsuit when we first arrived. To be precise, some saw the Bloc's arrival as the end of Canada's debt. They probably thought we had \$500 billion. Ignorance is bliss.

On a more serious note, I think that what we are talking about here is democracy, the right of sovereignists to express themselves, just as in Quebec there is a concern about the right of federalists to express themselves in the Parliament of Quebec. I suppose we would not dare ask them to check the papers they send to their voters or their press releases on the pretext that we do not agree with their content. This has not been done here either, and I expect and hope it will not be done.

Most importantly, I hope that the voice of reason will prevail in English Canada. I must tell you frankly that I do not count on the Reform Party for that. That is definitely out of the question. I believe that in the Liberal Party there are people for whom democracy must prevail over petty party politics and I hope they will put aside plan B and will, at the end of the day, vote against this motion. I hope they will dissociate themselves from what could pave the way to McCarthyism. You know what that led to in the United States.

Canada kept away from that. Some were tempted to go that route in Canada and Quebec, and this is not a racial issue. We had people who thought along those lines. Duplessis was not very far from that sort of thinking. But we have progressed. I hope you will not back track. I believe it is important. Someone just mentioned the amendment, but that amendment will not change anything. It is a compromise solution within the Liberal Party.

An hon member: It is a masquerade.

Mr. Duceppe: In English Canada, they say: "As you saw, we supported the Reform Party on that issue". In Quebec, they say: "As you saw, we stood up to the Reform Party". This is the way the Liberals act. Canadian diversity at its best; oh, sure. We have seen this in the past: two languages, two messages.

Privilege

In conclusion, I must tell you that what counts for us is not the future of the Bloc but the future of Quebec. What counts for us is sovereignty. This is why the Bloc does not have much future in the long term. The future of democracy is much more important for us.

• (1655)

At issue here is whether democracy is going to be questioned for political ends when, in political and parliamentary terms, the position of official opposition is out of reach, when playing one's role in committees is parliamentarily impossible and when winning a by-election is politically impossible. Every possible means is being used to talk about every speech, except the heart of the matter, at the moment.

For a party that wanted to discuss public finances—the opportunity is there—, for a party that wanted to talk of unemployment insurance—although their idea of unemployment insurance is worse than the Liberals', believe it or not—not a word is heard. This party has the opportunity in the days following the budget to debate both it and the throne speech. What does it do? The debate is no longer about sedition, as the leader of the Reform Party said, but about a crime of opinion. This is what is before us.

I hope, less for the Bloc than for Canadian democracy, that the entire House, except of course the Reform members, but the other parties will give thought to this and rise and vote against it. We will continue to debate federalism and sovereignty, but we will comply with the standards and remain true to democracy, without hearing the sound of boots in the distance.

[*English*]

The Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Lambton—Middlesex, softwood lumber industry.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was loath to rise and comment on this matter but a number of things require some clarification.

As you frequently remind us, Mr. Speaker, this is a Chamber in which passionate debate and passionate partisanship exist. I would be the last to deny that I relish both passionate debate and passionate partisanship. I want to say something that needs to be said. Every member of Parliament in the Chamber is here because he or she believes very deeply and passionately in the form of public service he or she has chosen.

There are certain things that perhaps get lost in debates of this nature. With regard to what I presume are the intentions of the member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, I do not disagree with those. I have difficulty, however, with the wording of the motion. I agree wholeheartedly with my colleague, the member for Scarborough—Rouge River, and with other members, including the chief government whip. The difficulty is while this place is the

Privilege

highest court in the land, it is not a court of law in the context of the courts in all of our ridings.

It would ill behave us as members of Parliament to usurp the actions of those courts even as in this particular case prosecutors have refused for whatever reasons to make a charge. It would be unparliamentary of us to use the words that we on the government side feel should be deleted. However, we will let that pass.

I do every much want to see the question of privilege go to the committee for its proper disposition. With regard to all members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition who have spoken on this matter, I am very proud that these matters can be debated in the Chamber.

• (1700)

Mr. Epp: Why do you not say something serious?

Ms. Clancy: Perhaps the hon. member would let me finish. This is very serious. I have already said that I believe very much in partisanship. God knows I can out-heckle him any day of the week but that is not the point. The point is, let us get on with this. Let us get the motion in its proper framework to the proper committee so that it can be disposed of.

I would like to finish my comments with respect to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition by saying that all of us on this side of the House are proud that issues such as this one and issues that relate to the unity of Canada, the sovereignty of Canada and our Constitution are being debated here and in committee under democratic rules and procedures, not in the street with bombs.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, we all agree that this should not be settled in the streets with bombs. Everybody agrees. But how can one be proud to say that national unity and Canadian sovereignty cannot be debated, the two examples the member gave? This is not what it is about. What we are talking about is a press release providing information.

How can one be proud to want to censor a member of Parliament, or even to take punitive measures against him? How can one be proud of prosecuting someone for his beliefs? This is what it is all about.

This might sound good in their ridings, but it is not good for democracy. This is nothing to be proud about. This kind of action brings shame to Canada.

[English]

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on several occasions the hon. member used the phrase "avoir un avis", to have an opinion. I wonder what sort of silly sophistry this is. Nobody is talking about the right or

the ability to have opinions in this House or anywhere else. We are talking about actions.

If someone writes a letter encouraging members of the Canadian Armed Forces to abandon their oath of allegiance, that is not having an opinion, that is an action. If someone delivers that letter to military bases, that is not having an opinion, that is an action. We are talking about deeds in this place, bad deeds.

I would like to raise a second point because the hon. member for Calgary Northeast is not here and he was slandered by the member. He did not make a trip to Singapore specifically and precisely to study the question of whipping. And he did not, in the true Bloc-Liberal tradition, take a taxpayer paid junket to Singapore. He paid his own way. I think the hon. member knows that. I think he owes the hon. member for Calgary Northeast an apology.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, ridicule never killed anyone, we all know that. We are being told: "You may have an opinion, but you may not express it, you cannot voice it". This is what the member just said. What a beautiful country.

It makes for quite a dialogue. It is as if I said: "I have an opinion. What is it? I am not saying". Then someone else said: "Can we talk?" Then, I replied: "Yes, I have ideas, opinions, we can talk". And the other said: "Oh no, we cannot talk about that".

What an impressive, what a remarkable dialogue. It is all fine and well for you to come to Quebec a few days before referendum, to jump on junket trips to Quebec. We know all about junkets. One hundred dollars from Vancouver to Montreal, but not work in the opposite direction. Tell me about junkets.

It is totally ludicrous to have an opinion and not be able to voice it. This is what freedom of opinion means, it seems. Without such freedom, what kind of country will this be? We have the right to have opinions, but not to voice them. Oh, really.

• (1705)

Secondly, concerning the Reform member who made a trip to Singapore, I stand by what I said, I will not apologize. He paid his own way, no problem. I would point out that, when there is a trip for a parliamentary association, some Reformers do go on the trip, but not too often, I must admit.

Paranoia can exist in politics. Reform members want to have very few contacts with their colleagues abroad. This kind of isolationism is an integral part of their political doctrine, but not of ours. We are not uncomfortable about being members of Canadian delegations and sharing Quebec's point of view in a very courteous manner with our Liberal friends.

Privilege

As far as Reformers are concerned, when they have opinions, they cannot set them out in their political doctrine, so why would they need to meet others? I can understand that.

[English]

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. During his presentation the member for Laurier—Sainte-Marie said that the member for Calgary Northeast had been to Singapore at the taxpayers' expense. He has not even been to Singapore. I would like to make that clear.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, I did not say that he made the trip at taxpayers' expense. One colleague says he did not go, and the other tells me he that he did but paid his own way.

[English]

Mr. John Bryden (Hamilton—Wentworth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this debate with a sense of great concern because I feel, as you do, that the issue is very important. Future generations will be looking at this debate. I want to take this opportunity to put on the record what I think is the very core of the debate.

The member for Scarborough—Rouge River mentioned that the reference to sedition in the original motion may be in error. There is another category in *Martin's Annual Criminal Code* which may be appropriate. Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence I would like to read that passage in its entirety into the record and when people refer to this debate they will see it before them.

This is from section 63 of *Martin's Annual Criminal Code*, concerning offences in relation to military forces. Military forces refers to the Canadian forces:

- (1) Every one who wilfully
 - (a) interferes with, impairs or influences the loyalty or discipline of a member of a force,
 - (b) publishes, edits, issues, circulates or distributes a writing that advises, counsels or urges insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny or refusal of duty by a member of a force, or
 - (c) advises, counsels, urges or in any manner causes insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny or refusal of duty by a member of a force,
- is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for a period of five years.

I am not a lawyer, I admit that. This is the section in *Martin's Annual Criminal Code* that seems to be more relevant than this arcane debate we are having about the definition of sedition. It would appear to me from the communiqué I read that this section of *Martin's Annual Criminal Code* is the most important portion.

The member for Berthier—Montcalm spoke earlier and made the observation that there is nothing in the communiqué that should cause us concern or alarm in the context of sedition. Also, I

should say in passing that there was nothing in the communiqué that specified francophones as opposed to anglophones. There was a suggestion that the communiqué may have been directed at some people because of their French language ability.

• (1710)

I point out that the *Martin's Annual Criminal Code* passage I cited involves all the Canadian forces; it does not make distinction by language. It does not make any distinction in that way at all. If a person is in contravention of that passage, it regardless of the linguistic origin of the member of the Canadian forces talked about.

In that context I would like to read into the record a couple of passages from the communiqué which my Bloc colleagues seemed to have overlooked in the course of the debate. I will read them in French. One relevant passage is on the second page of the communiqué:

[Translation]

“The day after a yes win,” he says, “Quebec should immediately create a Department of Defence, an embryo of a major state—”

—that ought to read “of a military staff”—

—and offer all Quebecers serving in the Canadian Forces the chance to integrate into the Quebec Forces “while keeping their rank, seniority, pay and retirement funds as a means to ensure a better transition—”

[English]

The other relevant passage is at the very end of the communiqué. It is a quote from the hon. member for Charlesbourg:

[Translation]

“All this expertise will not disappear with Quebec's accession to sovereignty and personally, I think that soldiers of Quebec will respect the people's decision and will transfer their loyalty to the new country whose security they will ensure”, Mr. Jacob concluded.

We must take note of the last words:

—whose security they will ensure—

[English]

We have to go to the beginning of the paragraph:

[Translation]

The day after a yes win—

[English]

I am not a lawyer, I am just an ordinary Canadian and an ordinary MP. It is not my position and not my responsibility to interpret the law. I can say however that as an ordinary person I did find the words in that press release, which I read for the first time today, very troubling in the context of the passage I quoted from *Martin's Annual Criminal Code*. Very troubling indeed.

Privilege

I am not prepared to support the Reform Party motion as presented because that motion has two flaws. It has the flaw the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River mentioned that it stresses sedition. We have reason to believe that it might not be sedition.

On the other hand it also prejudices the situation with the hon. member for Charlesbourg. As a member of Parliament and an ordinary Canadian I am not willing to prejudice anyone and I do not think it is proper to do that. I support the amendment which would send the motion to a committee of the House for a deliberation on the issue, whether something was done improperly here or not.

I was very disturbed that the Leader of the Official Opposition disagreed with the motion on the grounds that there would be some danger the committee would not judge the situation in the motion that would come to it without any kind of prejudice or prior conclusion. He seemed to think that members of Parliament would not be able to judge and analyse a situation dispassionately in the very sense of justice and fair play that we in this Parliament should all believe in.

That is one of the things that disturbed me because the Bloc Quebecois, with the greatest respect, have always argued absolutely that the debate with respect to sovereignty or separatism or call it what you will has to be conducted in a democratic fashion. It has to respect all levels of our parliamentary institutions.

• (1715)

I have been disturbed to hear several members suggest that by referring this issue to a parliamentary committee, having changed the original motion so that there is no prejudice in it—we just want to examine the issue—that the Bloc Quebecois finds that this is not something it can support. Having heard its members so many times say that we should conduct ourselves in a parliamentary fashion and that this is a democracy, this is something that they should get behind in every way.

I support the motion. It does a great service it has for you, my fellow colleagues in the Bloc Quebecois—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is permitted to face the members, but he can at least address his remarks as if he were speaking to the Chair.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I do not like to say I am on the wrong side of the House but it is very difficult to speak to hon. members while they are behind me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remark.

The Bloc Quebecois misses a wonderful opportunity here because if the words used by the member of Charlesbourg which caused me so much concern and caused Canadians concern were debated by the committee, we are not looking to attribute blame or

to assign une mauvaise entente. We are looking to define the parameters of our debates in and outside this House on the question of sovereignty.

I believe that in all probability the member for Charlesbourg acted foolishly, acted impetuously but did not act wilfully. However he has acted in a way that we should all be concerned about. It is a way that some may consider dangerous, a way that some may consider inciting high emotions and certainly in a way which when we compare the *Martin's Criminal Code* passage I cited and the actual words from the communiqué we have every reason to be concerned.

I urge the Bloc Quebecois to support the motion to send this to committee so that we can all get an impartial assessment of whether or not the member for Charlesbourg went too far. It does not matter whether or not there is criminality. I am sure that no member of any committee would ever suggest such a thing. It would define the debate. It is in the interest of democracy, the very democracy that the members of the Bloc Quebecois are so fond of citing and indicating that they have great respect for.

In conclusion, I think it very much is a matter of the current situation with sovereignty and a question of democracy.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there is something profoundly unhealthy in today's exercise.

As I listen to government members, I realize that they have all made up their mind. The member who just spoke has already made up his mind. This is unhealthy. Maybe the hon. member for Charlesbourg should not have done that; personally, I would not have done it. An hon. member said earlier that this is not a real court. However, the consequences are worse than in the case of a real court, since a legitimately elected member of this House may be prevented from sitting in this place.

After listening to all those who spoke here on behalf of the government and the Reform Party—and I have no doubt that they are unanimous in this case—how can you expect the committee to disregard their comments and make an enlightened, impartial, fair and honest decision? This is hogwash.

I have a question for the member who just spoke. Last week, in the riding next to mine, in Saint-Hyacinthe, about 100 people held a protest against the UI reform. My friend and colleague, the member for Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, and myself, went to that demonstration.

Do the Liberal Party and the hon. member who just spoke view our action as seditious, since we told these people to not get taken in, to assert themselves, that they had a right to protest and not be pleased with that reform? This is seditious stuff.

Privilege

• (1720)

Are we also going to accuse the 30 or so policemen who were there of complicity, since they did not step in and beat the heck out of us? They, too, are guilty of something. I would appreciate an answer.

[*English*]

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the member's question is not at all relevant. We are talking about members of the Canadian forces who took an loyalty oath to the crown. We are not talking about a labour situation. I am very disappointed with the member.

I suspect no member in the Bloc Quebecois can answer my question about democracy. Why do they not want this to go to a committee of their fellow MPs who would simply assess whether or not the member for Charlesbourg went a little too far? That is all we are looking for.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to correct to record. All communiqués released by the Office of the Leader of the Opposition for the records are always in both official languages. So this communiqué was written in both French and English. That is my first comment.

Second, I wish to set the record straight before putting a question to the hon. member. The communiqué in question was released on October 26, a few days before the referendum. The polls were then saying that the yes side would win, which aroused some fears in certain sectors, including perhaps people working for the Canadian Forces. There were some fears.

As you can imagine, one hears all sorts of things on military bases. "If you vote yes, you will lose your job" may have been said here and there on some military bases. The defence critic, the hon. member for Charlesbourg, therefore released a communiqué designed to reassure people. Does the hon. member believe that, in the event of a yes vote in the referendum, Canada would have been able to afford to keep all those soldiers? That is my question to him.

[*English*]

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I will go back to the communiqué, but I will make a little abridgement to it. The relevant passage that we are talking about and which is at the centre of the problem is:

[*Translation*]

The day after a yes vote—I think that members of the military from Quebec will respect the people's decision and shift their loyalty to the new country for whose security they will be responsible.

[*English*]

It states that the day after the yes vote, members of the military forces, regardless of whether they speak English or French, which is the racist comment raised by the Bloc Quebecois members, are

being asked to take action to separate their loyalty to Canada. That is a bad thing to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would have a question for my hon. colleague, who is no doubt a democrat. I know him personally. I would like to react to a statement made by the hon. member just a moment ago, and by the Speaker before him, to the effect that this House is living through its most important moments.

There is a fundamental reason for the Speaker to tell us that; it is because we are dealing with the very foundation of democracy here. We are, of course, elected members of this House, and the only thing that legitimizes our discussing this matter here today is the fact that we were elected.

We are elected members, and the majority of us were elected on a very clear platform of jobs, jobs, jobs, elimination of the GST, renewal of federalism or of the system under which we live, while our platform, a remarkably clear platform, was to look after the interests of Quebec and promote the sovereignty of Quebec.

You will recall that we were elected in an election in which Bloc candidates ran against Liberal and Conservative candidates. The people of Quebec voted to send 54 members to Ottawa to promote this option. I am a 100 per cent behind my hon. colleague for Richelieu, who described events that took place in his riding as well.

• (1725)

I would like to ask a question to the hon. member who spoke before me. He claimed to understand what is going on here, and he is still willing to refer the issue to a committee and have my colleague from Charlesbourg be judged by that committee.

Does the hon. member understand what that means? Does he understand that a committee will pass judgement on an elected member because he stood for what he was elected on? By doing that, Quebec as a whole would be sent to be judged by a committee.

[*English*]

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, the committee is not going to make a decision with respect to this, it is going to assess the words. It is not a member who is being sent to committee, it is the words that are going to be evaluated.

I would ask Bloc Quebecois members if they believe in the parliamentary system. If they believe in democracy then they should support this motion so we can get it into committee and evaluate the situation without prejudice and in the manner that is appropriate for MPs.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member why his government has not dealt with this issue in over four months. Canadians have been asking for

Privilege

some action to be taken against the member for Charlesbourg for four months. Reform has been pushing for action for four months. Why has his government refused to deal with this issue until now, when the Reform Party has forced the issue?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, this is the crux of the problem. We are not seeking action against any particular member of Parliament. We are seeking clarification of words that were said that caused great concern both in the nation and within Parliament. It is the words we have to examine. This is not a kangaroo court, this is Parliament that is operating here.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we have been reminded that this is a place of passionate debate and partisanship. My comments today are going to be very partisan. I wish to make it very clear for the readers of *Hansard* that I am going to attempt to do this in a totally dispassionate way. I think it is important that I do it in a dispassionate way because this is a very passionate issue.

I would like to refocus this debate in the direction that my colleague from Vegreville was just pointing. We are presently debating the Liberal amendment to the Reform motion. The Liberal's first excuse for gutting our motion is that voting for the motion decides before examination that the member is guilty.

These are the facts. Voting for the motion means what the motion says, that the House view the action as seditious and a contempt, and it should be examined by a committee. Just like any other court you are charged before the trial. Without that charge we would not be debating the motion. It would not have been given privilege.

The Speaker said "the House today is being faced with one of the more serious matters we have been faced with in this 35th Parliament. I believe that the charges are so grave against one of our own members that the House should deal with this accusation forthwith".

I also quote Beauchesne's citation 50 which says:

In any case where the propriety of a Member's actions is brought into question, a specific charge must be made.

That is very clear. The wording we have in the initial motion is the correct wording. It was thought out wording. It was wording that as put forward by the leader of the Reform Party in a very clear call to action by this House of Commons. I charge that the Liberals are attempting to gut our motion.

They have an old excuse. The old excuse for inaction is that sedition is something for the courts to decide. That was the very weak-kneed answer to my colleague from Vegreville. They say let somebody else do it, they do not want to rock the boat. Here are the facts. If the courts want to deal with a charge, they do what courts do. Parliament does whatever it wants in the context of a contempt of Parliament. Citation 28 of Beauchesne's sixth edition states:

Parliament is a court with respect to its own privileges and dignity and the privileges of its Members.

• (1730)

Citation 49:

It is not necessary for the courts to come to a decision before the House acts. In 1891 charges were laid in the House against Thomas McGreevy relating to scandals in the Public Works Department. The Committee on Privileges and Elections examined the evidence and concluded that the charges were amply proven.

I parenthesize and point out that the House judged Mr. McGreevy to be guilty of a contempt of the House as well as certain of the charges and ordered his expulsion.

Other references to support the right of Parliament to charge a member with whatever it wants to charge a member with are in Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada*, page 100—

NOTICE OF CLOSURE MOTION

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

I wish to give notice that with respect to the consideration of the motion before the House, at the next sitting I shall move, pursuant to Standing Order 57, that the debate be not further adjourned.

COMMUNIQUÉ FROM THE MEMBER FOR CHARLESBOURG

The House resumed consideration of the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Abbot: Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely outrageous. I said at the start of my discussion that I was—

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, could you explain to the House what the minister has moved? We did not hear him.

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleague, the minister just gave notice that he will move closure under Standing Order 57. Such a motion is in order and it is in proper form.

[*English*]

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, I say with the greatest sorrow that when I came to the House of Commons I really thought I was coming to a House of democracy. I did not think I was coming to a House in which the Liberals, absolutely sick with power, would bring closure on a motion like this. They are absolutely disgraceful; totally disgraceful.

It does not come as any surprise to me that when the Reform Party wanted to sing the Canadian anthem in the House of Commons these people, these Liberals, these individuals, chose to

block the ability of even being able to sing the Canadian national anthem in the House of Commons.

It therefore comes as absolutely no surprise that they would bring closure to this debate. I find it absolutely disgusting and appalling.

We have been through the process of an election and many people after that election said: "It does not make any sense that we have a debate in which we have five leaders sitting in front of the television cameras debating and one leader is out to take Quebec out of Canada". They told me: "That does not make any sense, but I suppose that is the Canadian way".

We went through the whole process and when we got to the House of commons, notwithstanding that we are a national party with members of Parliament in five provinces, those people on that side of the House sided with the Bloc Quebecois and said it would be Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. What a joke. It is a joke.

I find it absolutely unspeakably stupid that the Liberals would invoke closure on this motion.

• (1735)

I suggest there is a reason. They knew that when the next Reform speaker got up, namely me, I would end up pointing the finger at the people who are responsible for not setting the Canadian agenda. They do not have any idea of how to put together Canadian unity. They think that by giving an "800-call-for-flags" telephone number people will wave flags and we will have Canadian unity.

It is unimaginable when we have gone through a situation in which the people of Canada have bent over backwards to the point at which they have asked who will draw a line in the sand.

If the Liberals will not do it, Reformers will. We are drawing a line in the sand right now. This seditious activity of the member of the Bloc Quebecois cannot stand. This is the line in the sand. We go no further.

The people of Canada deserve leadership. What are they getting? They are getting waffling. What about the members on the other side?

The people of Canada need to know that every time there is an election in committee these members are lined up and follow along like good little ducks behind the party whip and vote in favour of the Bloc Quebecois for the vice-chair position.

Canadians need to know, notwithstanding the motion by my colleague from Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, that the members of the Liberal Party voted in favour of a Bloc Quebecois vice-chair for the defence committee. It is absolutely shameful and disgusting. I cannot believe that a so-called national party would be in bed with these people who are out to destroy our country.

Privilege

I spoke to the Minister of National Defence. I asked him what he will do about this issue. The minister said: "There is no problem. We will refer it to the judge advocate general". What happened? Nothing. No activity. Nothing was done by the Liberals. It was taken to court. I am told that under the definitions of the court, although we do not have the official rulings yet, it is not applicable.

Who will draw a line in the sand? The Reform Party will draw a line in the sand against the people who want to break up Canada, even if the Liberal government will not do it.

It has been suggested by the Bloc, and surely it must be a joke, that this is a simple matter of talking about employment; in other words, the people in the armed forces are in it for the money. The people in the armed forces are wonderful, dedicated, loyal Canadians who are prepared to put their lives on the line for their country.

How serious can Bloc members be when they suggest people in the armed forces are concerned only about their employment and their next paycheque? I can think of a lot of ways which are easier to make money than putting my head above a turret and getting it shot off. It is absolutely crazy.

The official opposition defence critic who, along with the then leader of the opposition, Bouchard, came into the Chamber went into the Speaker's chamber and pledged an oath of allegiance to the Queen. Those two people, with the collusion of the members of the Bloc caucus, said: "Why do we not suggest that people give up on the Canadian army and come over to the Quebec army?"

People in the army are not civil servants in the sense of a civil servant. People in the army are the people who protect us in Canada. They are the ultimate end. They are the ultimate line. They are the ultimate protection for what we call civilization in Canada. We cannot toy with the army. That is exactly what Bloc members are doing.

The people of Canada want to know there is someone, some party, some power somewhere prepared to draw a line in the sand. The Reform Party will do it in the absence of leadership from the Liberals.

• (1740)

With that in mind, notwithstanding the efforts of these people who are duplicitous in their joining of forces with the Bloc Quebecois by trying to gut our bill, by bringing in closure so their deeds will not be seen, I move:

That the amendment be amended by adding before the word "communiqué" and after the word "the" the words "seditious nature of the".

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is acceptable in terms of procedure.

*Privilege**[Translation]*

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the cat is finally out of the bag. The real problem is that we are sovereignists. That is the problem. Since we are sovereignists, the Reform members see us as enemies. That is the real problem. The worst is that we are democratic sovereignists, and this is very serious.

It is serious, because it leads them to very inconsistent arguments they should be ashamed of. They keep saying that the situation is terrible, seditious, and that no punishment would be too harsh for the hon. member for Charlesbourg in view of what he did. If our colleague had sent a press release asking Quebec soldiers everywhere in Canada to remain with the Canadian Armed Forces in the event of a Yes vote, what would they have said?

This is inconsistent. Are you aware that a lot of Quebec soldiers are sovereignists? One member of the Reform Party acknowledged it in a press release. Quebec soldiers are first class citizens. Pursuant to the partnership agreement we would sign with Canadian citizens who will choose to be reasonable, Quebec soldiers would have the right, in the event of a Yes vote, to transfer their loyalty. The hon. member is not here anymore, but the press release did not say that Quebec soldiers have to transfer their loyalty right now. It did specify that, in the event the Yes wins in a democratic process, these soldiers will be asked to join a Quebec army to defend together a partnership, as we put it, and to take part in operations pursuant to the agreements dealing with NATO, NORAD, etc.

• (1745)

So, I want to ask my colleague if he thinks it is worth making such a fuss over a quite normal and democratic position. I also want to know if he thinks Canadians will put their trust in such incoherent and unreasonable people, in people who complain because we asked soldiers from the province of Quebec to join a Quebec army in the event the Yes wins. I have nothing more to add, Mr. Speaker.

[English]

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, there are people in Canada who see those who would take Quebec out of Canada as being the enemies of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that I am one of them and I am speaking for those people.

It is incoherent in my judgment to speak of Quebec soldiers when in fact we only have Canadian soldiers who have pledged allegiance to Canada.

The point of my speech was not directed at these people because the separatists are clearly defined. They are proud to be separatists. They are proud to be attempting to break up Canada. They are proud to be trying to take Quebec out of Canada.

I was looking at the Liberal members, who with their duplicity have entered into a pact with the devil. They have turned around and not taken any action to do anything about this. They have never drawn any lines in the sand. They have completely mangled and mismanaged the referendum and then have turned around and blamed everybody from the CBC down through all other areas.

I suggest, although not by intent, I do not question the loyalty of one single solitary member of the Liberal Party, but by their actions, they are in bed with the separatists.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: I will return to the official opposition, but first the hon. member for Mississauga South has the floor.

[English]

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask for the member's comment on something that was said by the prior speaker about the issue of timing.

The letter regarding the day after was issued just prior to the referendum. Yet the question in the referendum referred to an offer to be made to the federal government if there was a vote. This means that the timing to negotiate and consider an offer clearly allowed more than enough time to consider the necessity to discuss matters with the military.

This is a total contradiction in terms of the time line. It is why this matter should be discussed in committee, so that the details and the facts can get out.

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, that is good. I found a Liberal member I can agree with. He is absolutely right.

The timing of this and the duplicity of the separatists during the referendum was absolutely monumental. On one side of the coin, we had a letter going out to the Canadian Armed Forces. On the other side of the coin, we had the deputy premier of Quebec sending out letters to the embassies around Ottawa. On the third side of the coin, if there is such a thing, we now have the text of a speech given by the former premier of Quebec which clearly states: "Today you have made a decision. We are out of here. We are gone. We are toast. We are history". The duplicity was absolutely profound.

With the greatest respect, in spite of the fact that I do agree with the point made by the Liberal member, I also point out that if the Liberals had handled this thing correctly and had put proper rules in place before ever going into this referendum, we would not have ended up with the very, very tight vote we had in the first place. More people in Quebec would have understood the real issue. There would have been a greater opportunity of exposing the duplicity that was happening behind the scenes.

Privilege

• (1750)

Again, I say with sadness to my friend on the Liberal side, I am sorry it is his party that is the Government of Canada, it is his party that is in charge of this issue and it is his party that is blowing the drill.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, before making my comment, I would like to bring to the attention of the Chair that what the Liberals have just done to gag us, is intolerable, considering that the Speaker told us right at the beginning of the debate to be quiet, to listen calmly, that everyone would have the right to speak, that everyone could speak on the matter. Today, what does the government do? On the same day, it wants to gag us on a most vital matter. If it is that important, it must be discussed.

Second, in response to the last speaker, who says there is at least one Liberal he agrees with. So far, dialogue has meant, for the Liberals as well as for the Reformers, a sort of Siamese twin dialogue between two bodies that share one head. They agree on everything, and do you know why, because they are making political capital at the expense of Quebecers, one member in particular; they are judging the entire sovereignist movement. They have never been able to stand the fact that we have been here since October defending the interests of Quebecers. They have never been able to stand our coming here to defend the sovereignist movement, to defend what we Quebecers have wanted for a long time. That is where the problem lies.

Now, to get to my question.

Mr. McTeague: The question.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Hold on, I am getting to it.

Mr. McTeague: What is the question?

Mr. Bellehumeur: I must say what I have to say, despite your gag. Gagging us is what you are doing with your motions.

Now, getting to my question. I invite the hon. member to quote one place in hon. member for Charlesbourg's communiqué where there is a call for violence, for public disorder, where there is any encouragement, recommendation, advising of members of the Armed Forces to carry out any prohibited activity. Let him respond to this question.

[English]

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, this is really a kind of star spangled night. Not only can I agree with the Liberal member, I can agree with the member from the Bloc, in fact he is correct which my colleagues tell me he is, that the Speaker has said that we were going to have the opportunity to have freedom of speech in this House of Commons for a change, unlike what the Liberals usually

do to us and have actually gone back on their word. So it is really no surprise to be able to have that agreement.

I will quote from the communiqué. The Quebec military will "respect the people's decision and will transfer their loyalty to the new country whose security they will ensure". I repeat, transfer their loyalty. Those are the words from the communiqué. Loyalty is defined as allegiance, faithfulness, devotion, fidelity, attachment and patriotism. On the other hand, sedition is defined as revolt, rebellion, revolution, insurrection, mutiny, unrest, riot, uprising, defiance and disobedience. I suggest that on the words of defiance and disobedience we have a case made for mutiny and sedition.

Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as important as this debate is, I find it deteriorating to some extent. We are deviating totally from the motion. We in this House seem to be already prejudging an act that one of our colleagues made.

The member for Kootenay East has asked several times why this government has not acted before. As I only have a few seconds, I would like to ask the member for Kootenay East a question his colleague from Vegreville tried asking. I refer to page 29, citation 115 of Beauchesne. Since this question and debate has emanated from a question of privilege, citation 115 clearly states: "A question of privilege must be brought to the attention of the House at the first possible opportunity. Even a gap of a few days may invalidate the claim for precedence in the House".

As much respect as I have for the Chair for having ruled on that, why is—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Kootenay East.

• (1755)

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Speaker, the answer lies in the hon. member's question. The Speaker of the House said that this is such a serious issue that the delay is a moot point. That is a ruling of the Speaker and as such it becomes a precedent in this House. I suggest the member be careful that he not question the rulings of the Chair.

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in intervening in this debate I must record that I at times felt I was attending one of Verdi's latter day operas, high opera. Marked sometimes with opera bouffe I find to some extent the levity that was introduced in the matter concerning the potential loss of privileges of a member of Parliament rather disquieting. I take it that it relates to the intensity and the passion of the debate.

I will focus on the roles and missions of Parliament today, which I believe is the issue we should be debating. This includes what the House is competent to do and what it is not competent to do.

Privilege

The alleged remarks of the hon. member were not made in Parliament, nor were they made by legal definition within the rayon of Parliament which by extension has been known to include government departments and the like. They would probably not be covered by an argument of parliamentary privilege. To express my own opinion, they would not be covered by parliamentary privilege if the member was prosecuted in the ordinary courts.

One of the issues here concerns whether this is a matter for the ordinary courts. In the case of a member of Parliament it would be the civil courts. In the case of members of the armed forces, with whom it is alleged there was some species of collusion, it would be the military courts. I will return to that in a moment.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding based perhaps on a too rigid and unimaginative reading of old precedents concerning the role of Parliament today. The phrase high court of Parliament has been used but without an understanding of its historical origins or the need to interpret it in the light of contemporary developments in Parliament and in other institutions that borrowed from the same British parliamentary model we borrowed from.

There was an extensive review of Parliament's criminal powers at the time of the impeachment issue in the United States, the so-called Watergate scandal. I was consulted in a pre-parliamentary capacity by the Senate Committee on Campaign Activities, the Watergate committee. I gave opinions which were published at the time. The great advantage of the Watergate scandal for our purposes is the opportunity for discussion of the inherited criminal powers of Parliament which the United States received as part of its general reception of British law.

The basic point revolves around this issue of the impeachment power which was written into the United States' constitution. There is no doubt that in medieval times these were opportunities for political fishing expeditions. There was no real pretence of a criminal offence or anything else involved. It was a judgment exercised by Parliament on the king's ministers in which the subjective evaluation of their motives in exercising their powers was at the core of the decision.

I mention this simply to say that the vestigial powers of Parliament as the high court of Parliament are essentially limited today by the evolution of the precedents and also by Parliament's own deliberate legislative act of passing legislation it is limited to the cluster of offences grouped around impeachment. There is a reason for this. It is the tyranny of the majority that caused successive Parliaments deliberately to limit by law the power to expel members of Parliament.

There is legislation. It sets it out. It sets out the necessity for convictions before the ordinary civil courts for specified offences,

but limited offences, what in contemporary terms we could still call the felonies as they were understood under the common law.

• (1800)

The correct procedure for a legislative body today would see the power of expulsion being limited to acting on a conviction made by the regular civil courts for a specified offence meeting the test of a felony as it existed under the old common law. This has been done simply to discipline the otherwise unregulated use of a majority's power to expel people it did not like. We saw examples of this in continental Europe between the two wars in the last days of the Weimar Republic when it was used disgracefully.

Impeachment as such is not available in the case of a member not being a government minister. Even if we go back to that, it is limited to officers of the crown. I was asked by a senator the other day, I presume not frivolously, whether it still availed. The answer is yes but it is limited to government ministers. In the British Parliament it has not been used since 1840 but is still there.

As to other matters, they are matters for the ordinary courts, but Parliament can act and properly will act if so inclined on the decisions of the civil courts. If a verdict of guilty were to be returned in such a process, Parliament could be seized and exercise its powers, including the powers to expel.

The problem that one sees in the present case is simply that one understands the matters were taken up with crown counsel. It would surprise me if they have not been because I received letters from constituents asking me if there was a prima facie case. I simply said consult or refer to crown counsel. They were referred to crown counsel and apparently crown counsel have decided not to pursue the matter.

If that is so, and it is beyond correction by senior crown counsel, then it seems to me Parliament cannot retry the matter. It is not simply a matter of the limits of competence of members of Parliament to decide difficult issues of the law of evidence and the like. It is a matter that the executive power has been used and exercised to the full, and that is the end of the matter.

I support the reference of this issue to the committee on procedure and House affairs mainly because I believe it will avoid further debates of this sort, which sometimes seem to be without any clear direction. A restatement by the committee of Parliament's power to discipline its own members stated clearly and concisely would be a help to this House.

I hope the committee will not assume it is its function to act as a court of law. I do not think it would do the job very effectively. If there are still remedies before the civil courts then it would be possible for opposition members to utilize those remedies and take the steps themselves. As far as Parliament is concerned, it is my

own opinion that we should obtain legal opinion at defining the constitutional role of Parliament today.

My personal opinion, as expressed in the past, is that Parliament's criminal law powers are limited to impeachment, narrowly construed. In the case of the attempted Nixon impeachment I came to the conclusion that judgment on political acts was no longer part of the impeachment power. These things became moot with the decision of the president to resign and the matter never proceeded.

There are advantages in going to the committee on procedure and House affairs. It may be that the committee, in spite of the opinions I have expressed, will decide that Parliament should resume criminal law powers, in effect control of members that have lapsed effectively with the transfer of erstwhile powers of Parliament to the ordinary courts.

• (1805)

In that case, I would be prepared to read the report and discuss it on its merits. But under the present circumstances I think it has been beyond Parliament's competence to discuss the merits of the alleged act. I think it is not a proper use of our functions. I therefore would welcome constitutional advice, a ruling from the committee on procedure and House affairs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to our honourable colleague, who gave us an interesting and very different viewpoint. I think, in the present matter, we have to ask ourselves what rights members have. A member should be entitled to speak and to act. Time is also a consideration.

I think what is happening is that the rest of Canada did not understand what was going on in Quebec at the time: the members of the Bloc Quebecois elected to this House are getting ready for the big day. The big day is the day Quebec becomes sovereign, fully sovereign. We are getting ready. We are involved in committees of the House of Commons of Canada. We are learning about defence, a federal jurisdiction at the moment. We are learning.

I remember, when I was on the joint committee on national defence, going to Edmonton when we were touring Canada to hear witnesses. I asked three eminent professors, experts in the field of defence, Canadian anglophones: "Do you think a sovereign Quebec should have its own army?" Two of the three agreed that Quebec should have its own army. The other said it depended. According to him, there could be agreements between Canada and Quebec and perhaps there could be a shared army.

I would like to ask my eminent colleague whether he thought that the member for Charlesbourg said things in his communiqué that were contrary to what one ought to expect?

Privilege

Mr. McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I will limit my answer to Parliament's jurisdiction. I said that the statements made in the member's communiqué had been made outside of the House, and therefore were not covered by parliamentary privilege. He can be prosecuted in civil court.

I only said that it had nothing to do with Parliament. In other words, we are limited to the old impeachment process, which is interpreted in a very restrictive manner nowadays.

The merits of his conversation, of his discourse, have nothing to do with this House today. He is subject to civil court. It is up to him to invoke his parliamentary privilege. I for one believe that his parliamentary privilege does not apply when he is outside of the House or of the parliamentary precinct. This is why I said that this debate, by emphasizing what he said, is going beyond the mandate and powers of Parliament.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am listening very carefully to the debate and I appreciate very much the hon. member's intervention this afternoon.

On the question of whether or not it is in the purview of Parliament to deal with this, I would point out that the communiqué was written on the letterhead of the official opposition. That makes it very much an issue that this Parliament should deal with.

The Speaker of the House ruled yesterday that it, in fact, does. I would like to point out a couple of citations that may help the member. I would like to say first that Parliament does whatever it wants in the context of contempt of Parliament.

• (1810)

Citation 28 of Beauchesne's sixth edition states:

Parliament is a court with respect to its own privileges and dignity and the privileges of its Members.

Citation 49 states:

It is not necessary for the courts to come to a decision before the House acts. In 1891 charges were laid in the House against Thomas McGreevy relating to scandals in the Public Works Department. The Committee on Privileges and Elections examined the evidence and concluded that the charges were amply proven—The House judged Mr. McGreevy to be guilty of contempt of the House as well as certain of the charges and ordered his expulsion.

This House ordered his expulsion.

There are other references to support the right of Parliament to charge a member with whatever it wants. I would refer the House

Privilege

to Joseph Maingot's "Parliamentary Privilege in Canada" at page 192, which states:

While privilege may be codified, contempt may not—there is no closed list of classes of offences punishable as a contempt of Parliament.

I would refer the House to the Speaker's ruling of October 29, 1980, which stated:

The dimensions of contempt of Parliament is such that the House will not be constrained in finding a breach of privilege of its Members or of the House. This is precisely the reason that, while our privileges are defined, contempt of the House has no limits.

I hope that helps the hon. member in his deliberations this afternoon.

Mr. McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and also for the dispassionate way in which he presented it in a debate which has become too heated on all sides of the House. I will try to respond in the same spirit.

I agree, if the facts which the hon. member cites are correct, that if letterhead was used for a non-parliamentary purpose, that there is a breach of the privileges of the House. However, it probably would come within the nature of trivial abuse; no more serious than perhaps the way in which many members misuse parliamentary letterhead. It would not bring in the gravamen of the offence being alleged against the hon. member.

I have noted the precedent of 1891. I would tell the House that it would meet the classic test of something committed within the rayon of Parliament in the capacity of the minister in the public works department. It simply brings back the issue that in dealing with old precedents they have to be re-interpreted creatively in the light of changed circumstances and the evolution of the concepts of what Parliament can and should do to its members, including opposition members. The precedents have to be interpreted in the light of their creative growth. The trend is clearly to restrict parliamentary powers, not to extend them.

The hon. member said, and I hope he will not mind my correcting him, that Parliament can do whatever it wants. I think the best answer to that is the answer which Chief Justice Coke gave to King James I, that one is under God and the law. One is bound by the constitutional law of Parliament. That is what we are trying to decide today. That is what this debate is all about.

Frankly, the committee on procedure and House affairs would do us a service if it set out coolly, clearly and without passion the limits of parliamentary power today. If it thinks those powers should be restated, let it indicate, on the basis of expert opinion, how it thinks that should be done. However, it would commit a grave error if it attempted to set itself up as a court of law hearing the substance of the alleged offence. That would be beyond the precedents as they now exist, properly interpreted.

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like my hon. colleague across the way to comment on what I am going to say. I think that the problem we are facing because of the third party has to do with our freedom of speech.

I will come right out and tell you that what my colleague from Charlesbourg did in writing, many of us in the Bloc Québécois have done verbally. Some of those soldiers questioned me on the draft bill introduced by Mr. Parizeau's government and I told them something similar to what the hon. member for Charlesbourg wrote in his communiqué.

Preventing me from doing that would amount to depriving me of my freedom of speech. Can this freedom of speech be tested before a committee of the House or does it go beyond the powers of this House right up to the constitutional level? I would like to hear what our hon. colleague has to say about this.

Mr. McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I think that focusing on freedom of speech is leading the debate away from the issue of Parliament's constitutional law. For example, I have very often said things that my audience was not too pleased to hear, but I understand that I must comply with civil law when I make remarks or comments.

Outside this House, members become subject to civil law and they become accountable. Up until now, no attempt had been made to sue this member for what he said outside the House. That is what we are dealing with here. As far as Parliament is concerned, except in circumstances which are so rare now, given how the constitutional law of Parliament has evolved, there is no substantial issue for Parliament to decide. In my opinion, we are limited to the scope of our privileges, as it stands today.

[*English*]

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have many questions but I will restrict myself to one, which the member is eminently qualified to answer since he is a constitutional expert.

I believe the role of Parliament is to make laws which the courts subsequently enforce.

Our original motion stated we should include the kind of actions that were undertaken by the member as being under the definition of seditious. Members on the other side as well as the members of the official opposition missed that point. What we want to do is clearly define sedition and counselling sedition.

Privilege

Talk about losing your freedom of speech, it was taken away from us by the Liberal amendment which deleted every word before the word “that” and every word after the word “that”. I think that is the essence. Can we in Parliament pass such a law?

Mr. McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can be assured that Parliament has the competence to enact whatever law it wishes subject only to the limits imposed by the Constitution and the charter of rights.

We were discussing the roles and missions of Parliament. The correct arena for the honourable member would be to take up with the House justice committee the question of possible amendments to the Criminal Code in terms of the offence of sedition. That would be a correct route to take and to present reasoned amendments.

It is not for Parliament itself to go backwards to the 17th century and try to set up a parallel system of criminal law covering matters that are properly within the ambit of the Criminal Code.

The member should go to the justice committee if he has views on this and present a project for amendment and see what happens. This is not the correct arena.

• (1820)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ): Mr. Speaker, during my 35 year career at university, I have always been able to recognize intelligence.

An hon. member: Did it often happen?

Mrs. Tremblay: It is very rare, but I would like to commend the member for Vancouver Quadra for his remarkable performance in this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Tremblay: The member for Vancouver Quadra understands the real problem and its significance. He first said that, given the fact that our colleague issued a communiqué on October 26 outside Parliament, outside the House, he was no longer entitled to his privileges, and that this matter must therefore be settled in court.

For the information of the member for Vancouver Quadra, who may not have followed all the news—and I am not criticizing him for that—the matter was brought before the courts twice, once in Quebec and once in Ontario, in proceedings against our colleague from Charlesbourg. In both cases, the action was dismissed. In one case, the judge even said that he considered our colleague’s communiqué as a job offer. The issue, therefore, is clear. Taking this to a civil court of law would not be very successful.

If civil proceedings do not work, and if the House is not concerned—since he said in his last answer to our Reform Party

colleague whose riding I forgot that the House of Commons is the wrong place to debate the question, having even told him to go to the justice committee or introduce a bill—I hope the member for Vancouver Quadra will not disappoint me tomorrow—since the government has announced that it would gag the House—and will in fact oppose the Reform Party’s motion and, consequently, of course, also oppose his party’s amendment, which was cooked up on the sly with the Reform Party’s complicity. It is not something to brag about, but I knew he was intelligent enough to avoid voting on this amendment.

Now, I think it is also important to realize that the Reform Party’s motion is flawed. We were just told that the real intent of the motion was to give a new definition of the word “sedition”. As I had some time this afternoon in the House, listening to all the high flown rhetoric, I checked in the dictionaries we have here.

First, I discovered there were two meanings to the word “sedition”. There is plain sedition and military sedition. Those are two very different things.

Mr. Laurin: And that of the Reform Party.

Mr. Jacob: And that of the Reform Party.

Mrs. Tremblay: And it seems there is also the Reform Party definition of sedition.

An hon. member: That is surely not in the dictionary.

Mrs. Tremblay: Their influence has not been strong enough yet for that type of sedition to be entered in the dictionary.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mrs. Tremblay: So, sedition means “a rebellion against the government in power”. I do not think it applies to our colleague. The little communiqué was quite innocuous, and did not incite to very much—

Some hon. members: Ha, ha.

Mrs. Tremblay: No, no, innocuous in the good sense of the term.

There are also synonyms. I always said to my students at the university—male or female, but I always spoke in the feminine because in my opinion the majority should prevail in grammar as well—that when you really wanted to define the meaning of the word you had to look at all the synonyms to be sure to properly define the concept. It is important to define concepts, especially when you are trying to change a definition and include it in the dictionary. It takes time.

The word sedition in its larger sense has three synonyms. The first one is tumult. Sometimes, seeing the comments of the Minister of Human Resources Development, you wonder whether there is not a bit of sedition in his comments which certainly give rise to tumultuous reactions.

Supply

• (1825)

Another synonym is insurrection. Mr. Trudeau was really afraid of that. He talked about apprehended insurrection, and we know the result in Quebec in 1970: revolt.

Fortunately, on October 27—the day after the famous communiqué—the people of Quebec behaved with dignity, because the action of that Canada that loved us was a huge provocation that could have led to revolt. So, this government could have been accused of sedition.

Now, the military sedition. This is the one which we must deal with, because my colleague was vice-chairman of the standing committee on defence and official opposition critic for defence.

Military sedition is very interesting because, according to the dictionary, we ought to refer to two words to better understand the concept, the first being “pronunciamento”. This is a Spanish word which is found in the French dictionary. It is defined as an act by which a military leader—you are accused of many defects, my dear friend—or a group of military officers declares its refusal to obey the government, or as any coup organized or favoured by the army. Oh boy! It was not the right word, it does not make any sense.

The other synonym was putsch. You know, we are not very used to this kind of thing, we are so distinct from the anglophone community that we do not have a French word for “military sedition”. There is no such thing in our past, so we have to use a Spanish word or an English word, putsch.

Under putsch, we find “uprising”, “*coup de main* by an armed political group”. We are a political group, but we are not armed with a view to taking power. You know that we have absolutely no intention of assuming power here. So, there you are.

This little demonstration had to be made in the House to clearly show that the Reform Party is very poorly organized, and there is more to come.

Now, there is one thing that is very surprising. English Canada woke up—as we know—on October 31, and has been having terrible nightmares ever since. English Canadians have not read, among other measures, Bill 1 tabled by Mr. Parizeau. There was a great deal of discussions here on “the question”, but they did not bother to read the bill, including clause 17 which provided that the government would take necessary measures for Quebec to continue to participate in defence alliances of which Canada is a member. The fact is that we would need soldiers to participate in these alliances. We already had soldiers in Quebec. It would have been silly to train more. I now go on: “Such participation must, however, be compatible with Québec’s desire to give priority to the maintenance of world peace under the leadership of the United Nations Organization”.

In our meetings with soldiers, we explained that. We had a nice little document with questions and answers. We had to give them

some information, as was pointed out by the hon. members for Richelieu and Portneuf, among others. “What will Quebec do, about defence?” Here is what we will do: “We will have a small army whose mandate will be to protect our territory, to give assistance in natural disasters and to participate in the UN peace-keeping missions. A sovereign Quebec will assume its responsibility in collective security and defence through existing international treaties like North Atlantic Treaty Organization and North American Aerospace Defence Command”.

For that, we needed soldiers. We needed officers. We needed all kinds of people. So, my colleague had the idea, the brilliant idea I must say, to tell the members of the armed forces—like the government had the idea to reassure our seniors by telling them that it would cut their pensions—that if a majority of Quebecers were to say yes, we would offer them a job. We never went further than that. Finally, we had very interesting arguments that maybe we should table in this House.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—WITHDRAWAL OF BILL C-12, AN ACT RESPECTING EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IN CANADA

The House resumed from March 12 consideration of the motion and the amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 6.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment.

Call in the members.

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 8)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Chatters
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gilmour
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (MacLeod)	Hoepfner
Johnston	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	Meredith
Morrison	Ramsay
Ringma	Scott (Skeena)
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	White (North Vancouver) —28

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Arseneault	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Bachand	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaunier
Bélanger	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Beauce)	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Calder	Campbell
Cannis	Canuel
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Collenette
Comuzzi	Crawford
Crête	Culbert
Dalphond-Guiral	Davault
de Jong	de Savoye
Debien	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dingwall
Discepola	Dromisky
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Dupuy	Easter
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guimond	Harb
Harvard	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Jacob
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Lalonde	Landry
Langlois	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Marchi
Marleau	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunziata
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Paré
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Proud	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Ringuette-Maltais	Robichaud
Robillard	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Skoke	Solomon

Supply

Speller	St-Laurent
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Whelan	Young
Zed—183	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bélar
Caron	Catterall
Cohen	Eggleton
Gauthier	Guay
Lefebvre	Nunez

• (1855)

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find unanimous consent that the members who are recorded as having voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, the Official Opposition members will be proud to vote yes.

[*English*]

Mr. Ringma: Mr. Speaker, we will need a recorded vote because I do not have unanimity.

Mr. Solomon: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats in the House today, including the member for Burnaby—Kingsway, will be voting yes on this motion.

The Speaker: I do not know if I understood or I heard correctly. The hon. whip of the Reform Party.

Supply

Mr. Ringma: Mr. Speaker, the majority of my members will likely vote yes to this. There are some who would choose to vote no. We are going to have to canvass at least the Reform to get their vote.

The Speaker: We do not know at this point how many members we are talking about.

Mr. Ringma: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that you simply canvass the Reform to see how many nays there are, the rest will vote yes.

(The House divided on the motion, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 9)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Althouse
Asselin	Bachand
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Blaikie	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brien
Canuel	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphonf-Guiral
Daviault	de Jong
de Savoye	Debien
Deshaies	Dubé
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Forseth
Frazier	Gagnon (Québec)
Gilmour	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hart	Hermanson
Hill (Macleod)	Jacob
Johnston	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Lebel	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Loubier	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Paré	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Robinson
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	Speaker
St-Laurent	Stinson
Taylor	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
White (North Vancouver)—75	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Arseneault
Assadourian	Augustine
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélangier
Bernier (Beauce)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Calder

Campbell	Cannis
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Clancy
Collenette	Comuzzi
Crawford	Culbert
DeVillers	Dingwall
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Dupuy	Easter
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hayes	Hoeppner
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Karygiannis	Keys
Kirkby	Knutson
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Loney
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Marchi
Marleau	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunziata	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Ringuette-Maltais
Robichaud	Robillard
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Shepherd	Skoke
Speller	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Ur	Valeri
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Young	Zed—138

PAIRED MEMBERS

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bélaïr
Caron	Catterall
Cohen	Eggleton
Gauthier	Guay
Lefebvre	Nunez

● (1910)

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

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

SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on February 29 I asked the Minister for International Trade why Canada chose to conclude an agreement in principle with the United States on matters relating to softwood lumber rather than take this dispute to a NAFTA dispute resolution panel.

This is the process we chose in 1994 after the U.S. imposed a duty on imported Canadian lumber. The duty was overturned by a bilateral panel which ruled that Canada stumpage fees do not constitute an unfair subsidy as was claimed by a U.S. lumber lobby. The U.S. appealed the decision to an extraordinary challenge committee which again ruled in Canada's favour.

According to the minister, the U.S. congress looked on these defeats and simply changed the laws. Rather than go through the uncertainty involved in another NAFTA panel process, the Government of Canada, several provinces and the lumber industry chose to make a deal with the Americans.

The crux of the matter is that NAFTA does not prevent United States' industries from using protectionist countervailing duties to harass Canadian exporters. It only provides that a binational panel can review U.S. governmental determinations to see if U.S. law has been applied correctly.

• (1915)

Obviously this is a serious flaw within the NAFTA. There are no clear cut rules on subsidies, nor are there any real definitions of what constitutes a subsidy. These are shortcomings that must be remedied as soon as possible.

In the meantime it appears we are engaged in a war of attrition with American protectionist forces, which is only intensified during an election year in the United States. The minister knows the Americans have applied to set up a NAFTA panel to rule on the legality of Canada's set of tariffs on supply managed commodities, which were negotiated during the last round of GATT. The United States is also signatory to this agreement. According to its reading of events Washington now claims that NAFTA takes precedence over the GATT agreement and that Canada's tariffs must be eliminated.

I am confident that Canada will emerge victorious from this most recent NAFTA panel decision. The fact remains there is nothing to stop the United States from launching an extraordinary challenge or from changing its laws again. What does Canada do then? Do we continue to stand by the principles of NAFTA, flawed as they may be, or do we simply throw in the towel on our dairy, egg and poultry producers? I am sure the Minister for International

Adjournment Debate

Trade will agree with me that this case is shaping up as the largest trade dispute ever between Canada and the United States.

However, even if Canada wins the case, and I am sure we will, under the current atmosphere of rising American protectionism this battle could drag on for several more years for the reasons I have just alluded to.

Let us be clear what is at stake here. According to a study conducted by economic forecasters, if the United States succeeds in knocking down the tariff wall that covers Canada's dairy, egg and poultry producers, by the year 2000 the opening border will wipe out 28,000 Canadian farms, farming and food processing jobs. This would result in \$3.4 billion in lost sales and would cost the government \$2.7 billion in lost taxes.

Obviously if the upcoming NAFTA panel decision on the legality of Canada's tariff levels were to go against Canada we would have a very serious problem on our hands. What I would like to know, and perhaps the Minister for International Trade can tell me, is in the event of a Canadian victory what steps will he take to ensure these GATT negotiated tariffs are not simply bargained away through a special deal with the protectionist minded Americans? Will the minister go to the wall for Canada's dairy, egg and poultry producers?

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Lambton—Middlesex has been quite vigilant in bringing the interests of Canadian agricultural producers to the forefront each time she speaks in the House of Commons. The minister and the government listened very carefully to the concerns she raised.

In answer to the specific question, it is the hope of the government that actions to reach an agreement with the United States were done to put an end to almost 15 years of litigation between Canada and U.S. softwood lumber producers. I know the member is fully aware that although we have remedies under the NAFTA, many times our counterparts in the U.S. seem to become engaged with frivolous disputes which tie up the system for an undue length of time.

This was one of the considerations the Canadian government had to look at when the latest dispute arose. The Canadian industry and provincial governments decided negotiating an acceptable agreement to guarantee security of access to the U.S. market was preferable to the uncertainties and costs of fighting a countervail duty case.

I remind the House that in order to take the softwood lumber dispute to a NAFTA chapter 19 panel the United States would have to first launch a countervailing duty investigation and determine that Canadian lumber exports to the U.S. were being subsidized and conclude that U.S. producers were being injured. Furthermore, if it had so decided, the United States would have imposed the duty on Canadian softwood lumber exports. Such a duty would have had significant negative impacts on the Canadian lumber industry and its employees.

Adjournment Debate

This industry is extremely important to Canada. It employs about 60,000 people across the country. Canadian exporters of softwood lumber to the U.S. reached record levels in 1995 of over \$8 billion. This represents approximately 60 per cent of Canadian softwood lumber production. The value of these exports has grown substantially since 1990.

Therefore in striking a deal with the U.S. the agreement is designed to avoid another long, protracted and costly trade battle. The agreement which comes into effect on April 1, 1996 will give Canadian softwood lumber exporters security of market access to the U.S. market for five years.

I also assure the member that this deal should not be looked at as a precedent. I do not think it is. The hon. member would find that the

Minister for International Trade and the government will, as she said, go to the wall to protect the interests of Canadian supply side manufacturers, as we have the right to do under the GATT agreement.

Softwood lumber was a very special case. I assure the member her concerns and those of the people she represents will be taken into consideration in any future plans that the Government of Canada has with respect to supporting our producers.

The Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.20 p.m.)

APPENDIX

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE–MALTAIS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

MR. DON BOUDRIA

MRS. MADELEINE DALPHOND–GUIRAL

MR. GILLES DUCEPPE

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

MR. BOB RINGMA

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Quebec	Lib.
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	Saskatchewan	NDP
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	New Brunswick	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Ontario	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	Quebec	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Quebec	Ind.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Alberta	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Ontario	Ind. Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Saskatchewan	Lib.

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; BQ—Bloc Québécois; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; NDP—New Democratic Party; PC—Progressive Conservative; Ind.—Independent.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Ontario	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	Quebec	PC
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	Quebec	BQ
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup	Quebec	BQ
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	New Brunswick	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Nova Scotia	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	British Columbia	Ref.
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Ontario	Lib.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Manitoba	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	Quebec	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
Fry, Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la- Madeleine	Quebec	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Manitoba	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	British Columbia	Ref.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ontario	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Manitoba	Lib.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Newfoundland	Lib.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Manitoba	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	Lib.
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Alberta	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux- Montagnes	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Newfoundland	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des- Prairies	Quebec	BQ
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Ontario	Lib.
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York — Sunbury	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	Saskatchewan	NDP
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	British Columbia	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Ontario	Lib.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Ontario	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	Lib.
VACANCY	Etobicoke North	Ontario	
VACANCY	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	
VACANCY	Labrador	Newfoundland	
VACANCY	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	
VACANCY	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Quebec	
VACANCY	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Ref.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Ref.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	Lib.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	Ref.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	Lib.
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	Ref.
Fry, Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	Ref.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	Ref.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	Ref.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	Ref.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	NDP
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Lib.
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Lib.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Lib.
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Lib.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Lib.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Lib.

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	Lib.
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	Lib.
Ringuette–Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri–Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	Lib.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York — Sunbury	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of Human Resources Development	Acadie — Bathurst	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Lib.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
VACANCY	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	
VACANCY	Labrador	
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiaq	Lib.
Blondin-Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Lib.
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Lib.
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Lib.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Lib.
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Lib.
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Lib.
ONTARIO (99)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Ind. Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boudria, Don	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Stormont — Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Lib.
Milliken, Peter	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.
VACANCY	Etobicoke North	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Allmand, Hon. Warren	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	BQ
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup	BQ
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	BQ
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	BQ
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	BQ
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ
VACANCY	Lac-Saint-Jean	
VACANCY	Papineau — Saint-Michel	
VACANCY	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	NDP
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	NDP
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Lib.
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Lib.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Ref.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Ref.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Lib.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	NDP
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	NDP

YUKON (1)

McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP
-------------------------	-------	-----

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chair: Eleni Bakopanos

Vice-Chairmen: Stan Dromisky
Osvaldo Nunez

Bernie Collins
Christiane Gagnon

Hugh Hanrahan
Glen McKinnon

Val Meredith
Dennis J. Mills

Maria Minna
Rose-Marie Ur

(11)

Associate Members

Colleen Beaumier
Simon de Jong

Maud Debien
Paul Forseth

Beryl Gaffney
Sharon Hayes

Gar Knutson
John Loney

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs: Monique Guay
Jean Payne

Peter Adams
Gérard Asselin

Ron Fewchuk
Paul Forseth

Karen Kraft Sloan
Raymond Lavigne

Keith Martin
Paul Steckle

(11)

Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman
David Chatters
Rex Crawford
John Cummins

John Finlay
Maurice Godin
Clifford Lincoln
Bob Mills

Pat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Julian Reed

Geoff Regan
Darrel Stinson
Len Taylor

FINANCE

Chairman: Jim Peterson

Vice-Chairs: Yvan Loubier
Susan Whelan

Richard Bélisle
Leon E. Benoit
Dianne Brushett

Barry Campbell
Harbance Singh Dhaliwal
Ronald J. Duhamel

Ron Fewchuk
Herb Grubel
Gary Pillitteri

Roger Pomerleau
Monte Solberg
Brent St. Denis

(15)

Associate Members

Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Judy Bethel
Jan Brown
Brenda Chamberlain
Paul Crête

Nick Discepola
Jim Gouk
Bill Graham
Stephen Harper
Jake E. Hoepfner

Dale Johnston
Karen Kraft Sloan
René Laurin
Peter Milliken
Bob Mills

Andy Mitchell
Nelson Riis
Yves Rocheleau
Jim Silye
John Williams

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

Vice-Chairmen: Yvan Bernier
Derek Wells

Diane Ablonczy
René Canuel

Harold Culbert
Harbance Singh Dhaliwal

Ted McWhinney
Jean Payne

Mike Scott
Harry Verran

(11)

Associate Members

Vic Althouse
John Cummins

Ron Fewchuk
Fred Mifflin

Roger Simmons
Paul Steckle

Elsie Wayne

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron
John English

Sarkis Assadourian
Colleen Beaumier
Michel Dupuy

Jesse Flis
David Iftody
Francis G. LeBlanc

Bob Mills
Lee Morrison
Philippe Paré

Charlie Penson
Benoît Sauvageau
Bob Speller

(15)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Leon E. Benoit
Bill Blaikie
David Chatters
Maud Debien

Jack Frazer
Beryl Gaffney
Herb Grubel
Jean H. Leroux
John Loney

Gurbax Singh Malhi
Keith Martin
Ted McWhinney
Val Meredith

Rey D. Pagtakan
Janko Perić
Svend J. Robinson
Paddy Torsney

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chair: Albina Guarnieri

Vice-Chairmen: Eugène Bellemare
Gilbert Fillion

John Bryden
Paul Crête

Bill Gilmour
Dick Harris

John Harvard
Ovid L. Jackson

Gurbax Singh Malhi
George S. Rideout

(11)

Associate Members

Mauril Bélanger
Ghislain Lebel
Ian McClelland

Carolyn Parrish
Janko Perić
George Proud

John Solomon
Randy White

Ted White
John Williams

HEALTH

Chairman: Roger Simmons

Vice-Chairs: Beryl Gaffney
Pauline Picard

Michel Daviault
Sharon Hayes

Grant Hill
John Murphy

Andy Scott
Georgette Sheridan

Paul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Maurice Dumas

Laurent Lavigne
Keith Martin
Audrey McLaughlin

Réal Ménard
Pat O'Brien
Svend J. Robinson

Roseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Maurizio Bevilacqua

Vice-Chairs: Jean Augustine
Francine Lalonde

Warren Allmand
Jan Brown
Paul Crête

Antoine Dubé
Daphne Jennings
Dale Johnston

Larry McCormick
Robert D. Nault
Pat O'Brien

George Proud
Geoff Regan
Anna Terrana

(15)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. Benoit

John Cannis
Marlene Cowling
Paul DeVillers

Jim Gouk
Herb Grubel
Réal Ménard

Maria Minna
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott

LIAISON**Chairman:**

Reg Alcock
Eleni Bakopanos
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles Caccia

Mary Clancy
Shaughnessy Cohen
Sheila Finestone
Bill Graham
Albina Guarneri

Vice-Chairman:

Michel Guimond
Clifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim Peterson

Roger Simmons
Lyle Vanclief
David Walker
Paul Zed

(19)

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS**Chair:****Mary Clancy****Vice-Chairmen:****Robert Bertrand
Jean H. Leroux**

George S. Baker
John Cannis

Jack Frazer
Jim Hart

Jean-Marc Jacob
John O'Reilly

John Richardson
Bob Wood

(11)

Associate Members

Stéphane Bergeron
Bill Blaikie
Pierre de Savoye

Jesse Flis
Gar Knutson
John Maloney

Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
Pat O'Brien

Bob Ringma
Svend J. Robinson
Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES**Chairman: Andy Mitchell****Vice-Chairmen:****René Canuel
Peter Thalheimer**

Réginald Bélair
David Chatters
Marlene Cowling

Bernard Deshaies
Monique Guay
Bonnie Hickey

David Iftody
Ron MacDonald
Julian Reed

Benoît Serré
Darrel Stinson
Chuck Strahl

(15)

Associate Members

Jim Abbott
Leon E. Benoit

John Finlay
Roger Gallaway

Jay Hill
John Solomon

Brent St. Denis
Derek Wells

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS**Chairman: Paul Zed****Vice-Chairs:****Marlene Catterall
François Langlois**

Mauril Bélanger
Don Boudria
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Jack Frazer
Mac Harb
René Laurin

John Loney
Peter Milliken
Carolyn Parrish

Bob Ringma
Ray Speaker

(14)

Associate Members

Robert Bertrand
Dianne Brushett
John Cummins
Ken Epp
Ren Fewchuk

Deborah Grey
Michel Guimond
Hugh Hanrahan
Stephen Harper

Dick Harris
Jim Jordan
John Solomon
Darrel Stinson

Suzanne Tremblay
Elsie Wayne
Ted White
John Williams

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**Chair:****Carolyn Parrish**

Mauril Bélanger

Darrel Stinson

François Langlois

(4)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS**Chairman: Michel Guimond****Vice-Chairmen: Denis Paradis
Andrew Telegdi**Sue Barnes
Richard Bélisle
Rex CrawfordIvan Grose
Leonard HopkinsCharles Hubbard
Jim SilyeBenoît Tremblay
John Williams

(12)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
John BrydenMac Harb
Elijah HarperRené Laurin
Ian McClellandAlex Shepherd
John Solomon**TRANSPORT****Chairman: Reg Alcock****Vice-Chairmen: André Caron
Joe Comuzzi**David Chatters
Joe FontanaJim Gouk
Charles HubbardJim Jordan
Stan KeyesRaymond Lavigne
Paul Mercier

(11)

Associate MembersVic Althouse
Leon E. Benoit
Ivan GroseDick Harris
Jake E. Hoepfner
Ovid L. JacksonJohn Maloney
Philippe ParéBernard Patry
Elsie Wayne**STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES****LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT****Joint Chairman:****Vice-Chairman:**Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Peter Adams
Roger Gallaway
Jim Karygiannis
Philip MayfieldPaul Mercier
Pat O'Brien
Roseanne Skoke

(7)

Associate Member

Ted White

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**Joint Chairman:****Vice-Chairman:**Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Warren Allmand
Eugène Bellemare
Cliff Breitzkreuz
Patrick GagnonJohn Godfrey
Jean-Paul Marchand
Benoît Serré

(7)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairman:

Vice-Chairman:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gilbert Fillion
Mac Harb
Gar Knutson
Ghislain Lebel

Derek Lee
Dan McTeague
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(8)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. BOB KILGER

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. David Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Paul Zed	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada
Francis G. LeBlanc	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Guy H. Arseneault	to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
Karen Kraft Sloan	Minister of the Environment
Morris Bodnar	to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
John Harvard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Barry Campbell	to Minister of Finance
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Ron MacDonald	to Minister for International Trade
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Marlene Cowling	to Minister of Natural Resources
Gordon Kirkby	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
George Proud	to Minister of Labour
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
John Godfrey	to Minister for International Cooperation

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 13, 1996

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Canada–United States Twinning Program	
Mr. Assadourian	635
Banks	
Mr. Bernier (Beauce)	635
Health Services Research Fund	
Mrs. Hayes	635
Employment	
Mr. Taylor	635
Regional Economic Development	
Mr. Landry	636
Stan Darling	
Mr. Mitchell	636
National Farm Safety Week	
Mr. Maloney	636
National Farm Safety Week	
Mrs. Ur	636
Curling	
Mr. Penson	637
Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs	
Mr. de Savoye	637
First Baptist Girls Choir	
Mrs. Brushett	637
Dunblane School Tragedy	
Mr. Flis	637
Missile Tests	
Mr. McWhinney	637
Unemployment Insurance Reform	
Mr. Canuel	638
Reform Party of Canada	
Mr. Epp	638
Mining Industry	
Mr. Thalheimer	638
Quebec's English Speaking Community	
Mr. Bertrand	638

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Unemployment Insurance Reform	
Mr. Gauthier	639
Mr. Gauthier	639
Mr. Young	639
Mr. Gauthier	639
Mr. Young	639
Mrs. Lalonde	639
Mr. Young	639
Mrs. Lalonde	640
Mr. Young	640

Employment	
Mr. Manning	640
Mr. Peters	640
Mr. Manning	640
Mr. Peters	640
Mr. Manning	640
Mr. Peters	641
Disability Tax Credit	
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	641
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	641
Mr. Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	641
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	641
Old Age Security	
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	641
Mr. Young	641
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	642
Mr. Young	642
Collection of Unpaid Taxes	
Mr. Guimond	642
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	642
Mr. Guimond	642
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	642
Employment	
Mr. Solberg	642
Mr. Peters	643
Mr. Solberg	643
Mr. Peters	643
Securities	
Mrs. Debien	643
Mr. Massé	643
Mrs. Debien	643
Mr. Massé	643
Taxation	
Mr. Shepherd	644
Mr. Peters	644
Canadian Wheat Board	
Mr. Hermanson	644
Mr. Goodale	644
Mr. Hermanson	644
Mr. Goodale	644
Canadian Security Intelligence Service	
Mr. Langlois	645
Mr. Gray	645
Mr. Langlois	645
Mr. Gray	645
Justice	
Mr. Ramsay	645
Mr. Gray	645
Mr. Ramsay	645
Mr. Gray	645
Health	
Mr. Caccia	645
Mr. Dingwall	646
Mr. Robinson	646

Mr. Dingwall	646
Presence in gallery	
The Speaker	646
Point of Order	
Oral Question Period	
Mr. Duceppe	646
The Speaker	646
Mr. Young	646

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Zed	647
Private Members' Bills	
Mr. Caccia	647
Business of the House	
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	647
The Speaker	647
Petitions	
Gasoline Tax	
Mr. Patry	647
Taxation	
Mr. Szabo	647
Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages	
Mr. Szabo	647
Human Rights	
Mr. Robinson	647
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Robinson	648
Animal Rights	
Ms. Torsney	648
Gasoline Taxes	
Mr. Althouse	648
Vietnam	
Mr. Caccia	648
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Mr. Perić	648
Rights of the Unborn	
Mr. Perić	648
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Zed	648
Privilege	
Communiqué from the Member for Charlesbourg	
Mr. Zed	648
Motion	649
Mr. Hart	649

Mr. Gauthier	650
Mr. Boudria	652
Mr. Manning	653
Mr. Zed	654
Mr. Bellehumeur	654
Mr. Lebel	655
Mr. Lee	656
Mr. Plamondon	657
Mr. Ringma	658
Mr. Duceppe	658
Ms. Clancy	661
Mr. Morrison	662
Mr. Bryden	663
Mr. Lebel	664
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	665
Mr. Pomerleau	665
Mr. Benoit	665
Mr. Abbott	666
Notice of Closure Motion	
Mr. Gagliano	666
Communiqué from the Member for Charlesbourg	
Motion	667
Mrs. Lalonde	668
Mr. Szabo	668
Mr. Bellehumeur	669
Mr. Discepola	669
Mr. McWhinney	669
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	671
Mr. Hart	671
Mr. de Savoye	672
Mr. Epp	672
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	673

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply	
Allotted Day—Withdrawal of Bill C-12, An Act Respecting Employment Insurance in Canada	
Consideration resumed of motion and amendment	674
Amendment negatived on division: Yeas, 28;	
Nays, 183	674
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 75;	
Nays, 138	676

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Softwood Lumber Industry	
Mrs. Ur	677
Mr. MacDonald	677
Appendix	

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste – lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canada Communication Group — Publishing
45 Sacré–Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non – livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:
Groupe Communication Canada — Édition
45 boulevard Sacré–Coeur,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes

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

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

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

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