



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 057 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, June 5, 1996**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the  
Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 5, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

**The Speaker:** As is our practice on Wednesdays, we will now sing O Canada, which will be led by the member for Halifax West.

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

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

*[English]*

### OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as stated by the Minister of Labour on Monday, eliminating accidents in the workplace is both a social and economic necessity. Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week lets us focus on the tremendous toll that these accidents take on human life and productivity.

This year's theme of "Training—Target Zero Accidents" shows that training is a key factor to eliminating accidents. How do we target zero accidents? In response I say by integrating occupational safety and health in our day to day activities, for example by choosing the right equipment, learning to lift things properly and taking the time to speak to our workers and co-workers about safer practices.

We can reduce the grim statistics through teamwork. In that spirit I would like to congratulate the Canadian Society of Safety Engineering for sponsoring this annual event. I encourage Canadians to participate in events this week and to work together to make our workplaces safer and more productive.

\* \* \*

### MARRIAGE

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, June is the month when the hearts of many young adults become twitter patted and marriage is soon to follow. In fact many young couples have made that move just prior to June, including my son and his new wife.

On May 25 I attended another wedding of a young couple, Krista and Jerry, and was asked to give a toast to the bride. As a member of Parliament, I took the opportunity on behalf of the Prime Minister and the House of Commons to wish Krista and Jerry the very best in their marriage.

Realizing that during the rest of 1996 there will be thousands of Canadians joining in holy matrimony, I thought it would be nice if members would take a second for all of us to collectively wish the very best to all newlyweds of 1996. May you live a long prosperous life and may your marriage be fruitful. God bless each and every family on behalf of all members of Parliament.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]*

### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, National Transportation Week is on until June 8. It gives me great pleasure to draw attention to this event, especially since federal transportation policies provide us every day with more reasons to wish for Quebec sovereignty.

If a single government had jurisdiction over transportation, we would never have faced the uncontrolled development of road transport without first making better use of existing rail and shipping services. Rail transport comes under federal jurisdiction while road transport is a provincial responsibility. Because of this artificial division of powers between the federal and provincial governments, intermodality could not become a major tool for government action.

Quebec sovereignty will solve part of the problem in this area. In order to modernize the whole transportation system, society in both Canada and Quebec must equip itself with modern tools such as sovereignty-partnership and set aside an antiquated and ineffective Constitution.

\* \* \*

*[English]*

### MINING

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago residents of Whitehorse, Yukon were surprised when they awoke to find that the greenbelts behind their

*S. O. 31*

homes were being staked for mining. This came as some considerable surprise and has raised a large amount of public concern.

It is quite legal under the Yukon Quartz Mining Act to do this staking. However, it was not clearly the intention of the city of Whitehorse when it formulated these greenbelts in residential areas that the greenbelts would be open to staking.

The city of Whitehorse has appealed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for action. The territorial government has supported that appeal, as have I.

The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development can halt the claims. He can stop them today. I therefore urge the minister to immediately grant a temporary prohibition order on claims staking to allow for the development of detailed plans for land use in the city of Whitehorse.

I say to the minister, do not put off to tomorrow what can be done today.

\* \* \*

**STUDENT EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, across Canada this summer, students are looking for summer jobs. In Halifax West we are responding.

The summer career placement program is off to a promising start. Over 100 sponsors have joined the federal government to create over 200 summer jobs for our youth. These are not just McJobs. They include lifeguards, veterinary assistants and community development officers, all worthwhile activities.

I am confident the summer career placement program will be a resounding success.

From Terrance Bay to Timberlea, from Boutiliers Point to Bedford, students are working this summer in Halifax West.

\* \* \*

**MUSKOKA AIR FAIR**

**Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the organizers of a terrific event that took place in my riding last weekend. It was called the Muskoka Air Fair and it attracted literally thousands of visitors and aviation enthusiasts to the riding.

● (1405)

We were fortunate enough to experience a spectacular performance by our Canadian world renowned Snowbirds air demonstration squadron which really drew the crowds. Astronaut Major Chris Hadfield also came to the air fair and met with scores of visitors, particularly our young people. He is a true ambassador.

Tourism is a mainstay of the economy in my riding. My constituents need to be creative and proactive when it comes to attracting businesses to the area. This air show took many, many long hours of hard work to come into being. It took insight, foresight and determination and it had an impact.

I congratulate all the volunteers and organizers who worked so hard to make a difference.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**QUEBEC PREMIER**

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, during his previous visit to the United States in March 1994 as leader of the Bloc Quebecois, Lucien Bouchard chose a particular terminology to describe with precision the nature of the option he is defending.

He told the *Globe and Mail*: “We want Quebec to leave the Canadian federation. I am not reluctant to use the term ‘separation’ as it objectively describes the current situation”.

While addressing the Foreign Policy Association in New York this week, the new PQ leader used the words “sovereignty” or “sovereignist” on four separate occasions but did not at any time utter the term “separatist”.

Even outside Quebec, the PQ leader continues to create confusion as to his goal by refusing to clearly explain that the sovereignty he is referring to cannot be achieved until Quebec first separates from the rest of Canada.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Canadian Environment Week, it seems important to stress the fact that the environment is a major concern and that, unfortunately, governments are neglecting this concern more and more for economic reasons.

Neo-liberalism is in fashion, a fashion affecting even environmental policies. Governments are going soft. Their resolve to take strict action against polluters is weakening. It is easier to back away and promote voluntary and self monitoring measures by and for polluters.

This trend poses a great threat. This threat is hanging over the future of a planet that we are devastating at an accelerated pace without apparently feeling any urgent need for vigorous action.

People of our generation can expect to live in an acceptable environment, but what about our children? Will they have to live inside bubbles, forced to protect and isolate themselves from an

increasingly hostile environment. We must stop talking and start acting. • (1410)

\* \* \*

[English]

### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this is National Environment Week.

This government and others continue to ignore the single unifying cause of the destruction of our agricultural lands, water quality and ozone that combine to make our environment increasingly compromised. The primary cause of the environmental degradation I speak about is our own population growth rate, with its increasing consumption of our dwindling resources which produces environmental degradation and populations under stress. This is a vicious cycle that no one is looking at because they are not prepared to deal with the politically incorrect topic of our own reproductive growth rates.

Our own reproductive success is destroying the beautiful home we call Earth. The response from governments on the environment have been motherhood statements and a nibbling around the edges. Even domestically the government has failed to act on a number of important issues, including the Taro dump site in Hamilton, the clean-up of 24 hazardous toxic sites in Canada, and our endangered species.

If this inaction is indicative of the government's response to the environment, then we are all in big trouble.

\* \* \*

### VIA RAIL

**Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, many residents of my riding of Etobicoke—Lakeshore are concerned about the future of the Toronto VIA Rail maintenance centre and the jobs of its employees. Located in Etobicoke the Toronto VIA Rail maintenance centre services equipment and trains that run in the busy Windsor-Quebec corridor.

The streamlining of VIA Rail's passenger rail service that has taken place over the past few years has resulted in a reduction in staff across Canada. The employees of the Toronto VIA Rail maintenance centre have met these challenges and continue to provide top notch service for locomotives which carry people of all ages to destinations across Canada.

I know that the Minister of Transport and VIA Rail are making efforts to ensure efficiency and the continuance of safe and reliable passenger rail service for all Canadians.

*S. O. 31*

### NEWSPAPERS

**Mr. Jim Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as a result of his recently announced purchase, Conrad Black now owns daily newspapers in every province in Canada except two. This latest acquisition of 20 additional dailies boosts his ownership of Canadian newspapers to 58 from British Columbia to Newfoundland. This is 40 per cent of Canada's total daily newspaper circulation. Canadians are very concerned with such a concentration of control.

Canada has 104 daily newspapers. Of the 104 dailies only 14 remain independently owned. The Brockville *Recorder & Times* in my riding of Leeds—Grenville is one of these independently owned newspapers.

Friday, May 24 was truly black Friday in the Canadian newspaper business. Canadian tax legislation discourages foreign investment or ownership of newspapers or publications in this country. I am sure there is a rational explanation for the current rules controlling newspaper ownership in Canada, but if the rules continue to allow Canadian newspapers and their ownership to fall into fewer and fewer hands—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Natural Resources has indicated time and again that 25 per cent of her department's research and development budget goes to Quebec.

The time has come to set the record straight. When the minister says that 25 per cent of the funds are spent in Quebec, she is distorting reality by not including in Ontario's share the funds allocated to the national capital region, when in fact a large portion of this region is located in Ontario and 60 per cent of her department's expenditures in research and development are made in that region alone.

The fact of the matter is that, in 1995-96, only 14.9 per cent of Natural Resources Canada's research and development budget, or \$7.8 million out of an overall budget of \$52 million, went to Quebec.

And the big picture is not any brighter. According to Statistics Canada, between 1971 and 1991, only 18.6 per cent of the federal government's research and development funding went to Quebec, as compared to 50 per cent for Ontario.

*Oral Questions*

[English]

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Prime Minister told Canadians to get used to unemployment because of the global economy. However, a couple of weeks later he said that more foreign trade missions were needed to spur investment and exports. First the global economy kills jobs, then it creates them.

After the election he spent billions, borrowed at the expense of future generations, on infrastructure projects such as to upgrade the Calgary Saddledome and build a road to nowhere in Nova Scotia. He said that government created jobs, but a couple of years later he now says that only business can create jobs. This uncertainty about how jobs are created is frightening millions of Canadians who cannot find work or who are afraid for their jobs.

The Prime Minister needs a copy of Reform's 5-R jobs plan. If he takes his promise of jobs, jobs, jobs seriously, he will read it and then replace his empty political rhetoric with a real plan for putting Canada back to work.

\* \* \*

**FIXED LINK PROJECT**

**Mr. Joe McGuire (Egmont, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, notice was given on Friday, May 31, 1996 to the federal Minister of Public Works and Government Services by the contractor Strait Crossing Incorporated that in one year, on May 31, 1997, the bridge connecting mainland Canada with Prince Edward Island will be officially opened.

This gigantic \$800 million project which is a unique public sector-private sector partnership is on schedule and under budget. This in itself is unique for a project of such magnitude. Two thousand, four hundred Canadians work on the job site and 2,000 Canadians work off the job site.

Under P.E.I.'s terms of entry into Confederation in 1873 the Government of Canada was obliged to provide continuous and efficient year-round transportation for people, goods and services between P.E.I. and the mainland. This engineering marvel, a 13 kilometre bridge, will continue to fulfil that agreement. It was made possible by an amendment to the terms of Confederation passed by the federal government in 1993.

It is interesting to note that engineers from all over the world are coming to P.E.I. to study the innovative technology being used to erect the bridge. Hopefully, Canadian engineering students will avail themselves of the opportunity as well.

I invite this House and the people of Canada to come to P.E.I. and view this wonder of the world.

● (1415)

**REFORM PARTY CONVENTION**

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party is having a big convention this weekend in Vancouver. Canadians are wondering what steps the Reform Party is taking to preserve party dignity. To assist, a reading from the gospel according to the leader, the hon. member for Calgary Southwest: "If you think that it is going to be that type of meeting, get as many sane, sober people there as possible. Overwhelm the kook element".

Canadians will wonder which membership list the Reform Party has borrowed to overwhelm the kook element. To quote the Reform gospel again: "Why should a few extremists and eccentrics have more influence with you than I do? Why should they have more influence than the large number of Reformers who are neither extreme nor eccentric?"

Where are these Reformers who are neither extreme nor eccentric? Tune in this weekend on Canada's parliamentary channel and see the greatest circus since P.T. Barnum.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Manito Thompson who is Minister of Municipal and Community Affairs and Minister Responsible for the Women's Directorate, Government of the Northwest Territories.

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

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**CUBA**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the consequences of the American Helms-Burton Act, which has extra-territorial effect and is intended to strengthen the U.S. embargo against Cuba, are extremely serious, since Canada is Cuba's major economic partner. Yesterday, the countries of the Organization of American States reached an unanimous decision to present a draft resolution against this American legislation.

Given that Canada and Mexico are partners in both the OAS and NAFTA, and given that the Prime Minister is scheduled to be meeting with the President of Mexico in a few days, does the Prime Minister intend to make use of the economic and political clout the two countries wield with the U.S. and to propose to his counterpart a joint strategy in defence of this American legislation?

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as everyone here knows, we have protested on behalf of Canada right from the beginning. Later, I went to meet with the Caribbean heads of government and convinced them to adopt a joint resolution. Mexico has protested against this act. We have had occasion to discuss it with the European community, and it is my belief that the Americans are totally isolated in this initiative to adopt extra-territorial legislation.

We shall be keeping up the pressure on the American government. I myself have spoken with the President, and the matter will certainly be raised, as the hon. member has suggested, with our Mexican partner because we most firmly believe that it is absolutely contrary to both the letter and the spirit of NAFTA.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister. Following along in the same vein, during the Prime Minister of France's visit to Quebec and Canada, which is scheduled for next week, does the Prime Minister intend to discuss the matter, in order to have it placed on the agenda of the next G-7 summit, which will take place at Lyon at the end of June?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe that the French government has protested, as has the European Community in general. I believe that all the countries have protested, or at least the community as a whole. Every time we have the opportunity to meet with our foreign counterparts, we raise this problem, and I am sure I shall have the opportunity to discuss it with Mr. Juppé. He will, perhaps, be able to bring pressure to bear on the President of France, who is the current head of the G-7, so that the problem may be raised during his term.

• (1420)

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, following along again in the same vein, since the extra-territorial nature of the Helms-Burton Act is contrary to international trade arrangements, can the Prime Minister tell us whether Canada has taken any steps to take this dispute before the World Trade Organization?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know there is talk of its being submitted to NAFTA and the International Trade Commission, but I do not know if this will take the form of a Canadian initiative or not. All the countries have protested, and I am sure that the organization will be apprised of this in one way or another.

I have personally raised the issue with the U.S. government on a number of occasions. I think the President will be making a statement on this matter shortly. We believe the Americans will not be able to continue along this path. Here in Canada we are looking at the possibility of amending some of our legislation to counteract the effects of the American legislation.

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Helms-Burton legislation is having considerable impact. This August, a provision will come into effect that may lead to thousands of cases of prosecution against businesses with interests in Cuba. We are talking about nearly 6,000 legal claims including a number involving Canadian businesses.

My question is for the Prime Minister. How does he intend helping businesses that will be prosecuted under this legislation?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I just indicated, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Trade and perhaps others are studying possible reforms that might encourage or at least help the victims of any suits brought against Canadians.

As I understand it, the American administration has some leeway in applying certain parts of the law. We have made representations to the American Secretary of State and to the administration in general in the hopes that they would use the flexibility available to them to shield Canadians or at least leave them out of this matter.

**Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, that is all very well, but time is of the essence. There are only two months left.

When will the Prime Minister implement a realistic strategy to prevent Canadian business from feeling the effects of this legislation?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has very little sway over the United States Congress, which is empowered to pass legislation. What we did, and I am happy to have been the first government leader to raise the issue, was to stimulate interest in the international community.

As I just said, we contacted Mexico immediately. We also had a motion passed by all the Caribbean prime ministers, we are raising the matter at all public forums, and I think that the Americans are beginning to realize the legislation has little sense.

It is always rather difficult to discuss with Americans during an electoral period, it will perhaps be a little easier in November.

\* \* \*

[English]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister of agriculture has set a lofty goal for Canada of exporting \$23 billion worth of agri-food products by the year 2000. The number would be up from \$17.3 billion in the current year.

*Oral Questions*

Meanwhile the minister continues to build and reinforce roadblocks that prevent Canadian farmers from developing new export markets to help reach his goals.

Let me give an example. The Canadian Wheat Board has stooped to biting and scratching in its attempt to protect its monopoly while bungling barley sales for the last two years and going on a witch hunt if farmers dare to challenge the board's right to be the sole marketing authority of their grain.

Will the minister make changes now, not some future vague time, that will allow farmers to develop new export opportunities for their wheat and barley outside the Canadian Wheat Board if they so choose?

• (1425 )

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party continues to make demands for pre-emptory changes in the Canadian grain marketing system.

The hon. gentleman will know opinions in western Canada about best methods of grain marketing are divided and those on both sides of the question hold their opinions very sincerely and strongly. There has been a debate on this issue in western Canada for many months. Much of that debate has generated over time far more heat than light.

For that reason we have attempted to bring some focus and some logic into the discussion by establishing the western grain marketing panel, within which all of the various points of view can be addressed in a thorough, logical and transparent manner.

The membership of that panel, including nine prominent Canadians, includes every range of opinion on grain marketing from one extreme to the other. The panel is working very hard and very well together.

We expect to receive the report from the panel by the end of this month. Once we have that report we will all be in a position to make logical, fair and decent decisions for the future. I think it would be highly inappropriate to pre-empt that process now.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that was a swing and miss. We will miss our target by at least \$2 billion or \$3 billion with that type of answer.

Let us try another tact. The minister of agriculture has failed to establish a whole farm NISA arrangement with all the provinces—another failure. The agriculture sector is becoming more vulnerable to the interprovincial trade barriers we have seen in the past. Ontario veal producers are being hurt by provincial companies in Quebec. Alberta's farm income stabilization plan has Saskatchewan cattle feeders worried. The list is getting longer and longer.

Will the Liberal government exercise its rightful role, a federal role, to prevent or remove interprovincial trade barriers on agriculture goods so the industry can flourish and actually meet the

minister's targets for export rather than scrapping internally between the provinces?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the representations contained in the latter part of the hon. gentlemen's question I am sure will be music to the ears of the Minister of Industry, who is responsible for internal trade negotiations.

I hope the hon. gentleman would use his good offices in a constructive manner to encourage the provinces, which have the jurisdiction in a number of the areas to which he has referred, to co-operate constructively with the Government of Canada so we can make progress in a reasonable timeframe toward greater internal trade freedom.

It is an anomaly when there are more internal trade restrictions within Canada than there are between Canada and some foreign jurisdictions.

Specifically on the issue of our trade performance, I am happy to report the most recent statistics indicate our agri-food exports have now surpassed \$17.4 billion worth. We are well on our way to the \$20 billion target.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister knows he can attribute that to higher commodity prices and if the prices drop he will fall far below his targets. The minister is not a farmer and with the way he sucks and blows at the same time it is good he is not a veterinarian either.

Let us try another tact. The United States has launched a NAFTA challenge against Canadian tariffs on supply managed goods. Hopefully we will win this dispute, but in the long term and in the interest of reaching his goal the roadblock must be removed in order for dairy and poultry industries to gain access to the U.S. market. He can be certain the—

**The Speaker:** The question please.

**Mr. Hermanson:** Will the minister recognize the Americans will eventually gain access to our markets? For the benefit of the industry, knowing that freer trade will be forced upon them, will the minister have a plan to reach his export targets by allowing the supply managed industries to access U.S. markets?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, buried in this series of questions is an ongoing attack by the Reform Party against institutions like the Canadian Wheat Board and against marketing systems like supply management.

We are vigorously defending the Canadian supply management system because we believe our position is legally correct as a matter of trade law, because supply management over the last 25 years has served Canadians, both producers and consumers, very well, and because we undertook to Canadian agriculture that we



would defend supply management. We will not succumb to the blandishments of the Reform Party.

\* \* \*

• (1430)

[Translation]

### INFORMATION HIGHWAY

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

In July 1995, Quebec's advisory committee on the information highway, composed of major stakeholders in this industry, said in its report that language constitutes a vital stake in a knowledge based economy. It was shown at the Cotonou Francophone Summit that Quebec has the expertise in developing francophone contents destined for the information highway.

Does the Prime Minister intend, at his meeting with his French counterpart scheduled for next week, to promote the key role of Quebec in this sector and to draw the attention of the French Prime Minister to this expertise?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is what we did in Cotonou in our presentation before all heads of government and heads of state of francophone countries.

There was a demonstration in which Canadians showed that we can use the Internet in both languages, English and French. This demonstration was put on by Canadian technicians using Canadian products, to my great pride. People could thus see that here in Canada we can work in English and in French, something that other francophone countries want to be able to do in the future.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, at the Cotonou Summit, Canadian expertise was indeed recognized: the technique came from New Brunswick, but the content came from Quebec.

Does the Prime Minister therefore undertake to see that, should multimedia development agreements be signed with France, Quebec's expertise with respect to content will be recognized and given a significant role to play?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member has just taken the words right out of my mouth. It was New Brunswick and Quebec together who succeeded in showing the Francophonie how to go about it.

In this sector, there is expertise in Quebec, and there is also expertise in New Brunswick and in Ontario; that is what Canada is all about. We have francophones in Canada who have to work in both languages and who can modify any American program in the field for use in French.

### Oral Questions

It was with great pride that I was able to demonstrate this to member countries of the Francophonie, all of whom have English speaking neighbours, such as in Africa, and who wanted to benefit from the expertise of Quebec, of New Brunswick and of Ontario. We will continue this promotion and show that Canada is a country that can run well.

\* \* \*

[English]

### LABRADOR POWER

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, recently the Minister of Natural Resources was before the standing committee where she explained that one of the reasons we do not have a completed internal trade agreement on the energy side is that Quebec refuses to allow Labrador to wield power through its territories.

Now we hear the companies looking to process Labrador ore may be forced to buy power from Quebec Hydro rather than their own Labrador power companies because of the 1961 Churchill Falls agreement.

What can the minister assure Labrador power and Labradorians that Labrador will be allowed to process and provide power for its own Labrador ore bodies?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have explained to the hon. member on a number of occasions, the issue is one about which there is ongoing interprovincial discussion. This is not an issue on which the federal government can dictate an outcome.

As a government we choose to act in the spirit of co-operation and we continue to facilitate discussions between the provinces in relation to the energy chapter of the internal trade agreement, in particular as that chapter relates to electricity markets and the restructuring of those markets in Canada.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in answer to my questions before the standing committee last week, the minister promised she would ask the Prime Minister if we could place this issue on the agenda of the first ministers conference coming up in June to see if we could settle this internal trade agreement, this energy sector agreement, once and for all.

Could she update the House on her progress and whether the Prime Minister has put that on the agenda? I would be interested to know.

• (1435)

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have discussed the matter with my colleague, the Minister of Industry. The internal trade agreement is his responsibility.

*Oral Questions*

I have worked very closely with my hon. colleague. I am sure we will be discussing the matter with the Prime Minister in terms of what aspects of the internal trade agreement will be on the first ministers agenda later this month.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SOMALIA INQUIRY**

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

The credibility of the Chief of Staff, General Jean Boyle, is once again questioned by the Somalia inquiry commission.

Indeed, the general claimed he was informed of the falsification of documents last September 22, when in fact he may have known about it as early as September 15. The general is also said to have signed 68 falsified documents. Worse still, he is even said to have met with the department's former director of public relations to discuss an eventual testimony before the inquiry commission.

How does the minister explain that General Boyle signed the same falsified documents as Colonel Haswell but got away with it, while Colonel Haswell is facing several charges? Is there a double standard in military justice?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows from previous answers I have given in the House that it is inappropriate for me to comment on evidence given at the inquiry.

I ask the hon. member to wait and let everybody have their say before drawing any conclusions.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on April 25, following the tabling of documents arousing new suspicions on the involvement of the Chief of Staff in the cover-up, the military police had to reopen its investigation.

My question to the minister is as follows: What is happening with this investigation, and when does the minister intend to make it public?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not comment on ongoing investigations by the military police. I ask the hon. member to wait until the inquiry deals with these matters and then he will get all the answers.

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Many Canadians with disabilities are frightened and concerned that they have fallen through the cracks of government policy. Previously programs in support of disability employment measures were primarily the responsibility of and were co-ordinated by various federal government initiatives.

Under the new employment insurance regime persons with disabilities must have a previous attachment to the labour force to be eligible for training.

What is the government's responsibility to unemployed Canadians with disabilities and what does the minister envision his personal role to be?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know I am appearing before the committee this afternoon which is charged by the House of Commons with matters relating to Canadians with disabilities.

With respect to the question of funding, as the hon. member knows, the Government of Canada in the speech from the throne and on a number of occasions has indicated its intention to withdraw from the area of manpower training.

One thing we will have to determine in our conversations with representatives of the disabled community is how we can achieve the objective demanded of us by the provinces to withdraw from labour training but still ensure persons with disabilities are taken care of, as well they should be and as I believe they should be.

When the hon. member asks me how I envision the responsibility of the Minister of Human Resources Development, it is our responsibility as a national government to make sure those individuals who need assistance, help and support receive it. In our negotiations with the provinces we will ensure that.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, persons with disabilities and groups representing persons with disabilities feel orphaned and vulnerable and have felt that way for some time. They feel that perhaps the minister's department does not have the same commitment to persons with disabilities that he obviously has.

● (1440)

If Canada is not to become a patchwork of standards as it relates to persons with disabilities, federal leadership is absolutely necessary. That leadership has been exemplary for the last 15 or 20 years. We have been world leaders.

*Oral Questions*

As the minister stated, the Canada Health and Social Transfer Act devolves responsibility to the provinces. Will the minister assure the House that he will use his office to ensure that disability related concerns are placed on the agenda at the forthcoming first ministers' conference?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be very careful when we speak. Whether they are Canadians with disabilities or not, one has to recognize that Canada, as a federation, is very much a patchwork.

Provinces deliver the educational programs made available to Canadians whether they have disabilities or not. The same thing applies to health programs, rehabilitation programs and vocational training programs.

I understand and I hope that we will be able to find a mechanism, in co-operation and consultation with the disabled community, that will allow us to maintain that national visibility, and make sure that these problems are addressed.

The community affected by the changes taking place will also have to make its voice heard by the provincial premiers and their governments. It should not keep coming to the Government of Canada looking for leadership when the services are being delivered to a very large degree by the provinces, as has been the case in the past. We have to make sure we are all working co-operatively to try to find appropriate solutions for the disabled community, and for that matter for all Canadians who have needs in areas where services are delivered by the provinces.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development in Quebec.

On several occasions, the City of Saint-Hubert made representations to the minister, including one for the obtention of a fund to promote and maintain employment in the region. We now know that the closing of the land force command headquarters and of the other facilities in Saint-Hubert will result in the loss of 1,400 jobs.

Can the minister tell the House if his government intends to provide a fund to promote and maintain employment in the region, to make up for the negative impact of this closure?

**Hon. Martin Cauchon (Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I did have an opportunity to meet the mayor and some officials of Saint-Hub-

ert, regarding the closure of the base. A number of facilities have been closed across Canada, and it is essentially up to the Department of National Defence to ensure that everything is done in a normal and appropriate fashion for the communities concerned.

During my last meeting with the mayor of Saint-Hubert, I told him we would set up a local investment fund of about \$1 million. This investment fund, to be used exclusively to restructure local economic interests, seemed acceptable. Other matters were also raised by the mayor of Saint-Hubert, including payments in lieu of taxes and the fixed assets involve. All these issues are being settled the way they are elsewhere in Canada, with a corporation taking charge of the infrastructures.

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, \$1 million is almost a joke. Why is the minister saying he is giving \$1 million, considering the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency did not hesitate to grant a \$7.5 million fund to make up for the closing of the Cornwallis base, in Nova Scotia?

**Hon. Martin Cauchon (Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, closures were made all over the country. Each case was reviewed on its own merits. We took into consideration the location of each base, as well as the impact of its closure on the whole community.

• (1445)

Saint-Hubert is in a very good location, close to Montreal. The investment fund of \$1 million which we are setting up will fully serve the needs of the community and will greatly help it face the minor economic impact that may result from the closing of the military base.

\* \* \*

[English]

**INDIAN AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding between First Nations and other Canadians. Often we see unwarranted resentment of basic aboriginal and treaty rights on hunting, education, health and taxation. This government has a responsibility to ensure these issues are presented in a more progressive way.

What is the minister doing to promote understanding, education and awareness of aboriginal peoples in Canada?

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member talks about understanding, he is talking about relationships between people. At any given time 15 negotiations are taking place, from the Micmacs of Nova Scotia to the Northwest Territories, as well

### Oral Questions

as the B.C. treaty process. These negotiations tend to have a life of their own.

Within the last couple of months many encouraging things have happened. The municipalities will sign an agreement with First Nations in Calgary on Monday. This will be a first in Canada. Aboriginal recognition day is to be celebrated June 21. These are people.

The Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, which is composed of people, is entering into an agreement with the First Nations of New Brunswick, as is the Toronto-Dominion Bank in Saskatchewan. Business organizations from Montreal are meeting in Kahnawake with the Kahnawake Mohawks in two months. They had the biggest meeting they have ever had with the aboriginal people in Montreal just a couple of months ago.

I commend the member for Rimouski—Témiscouata who is reviving the bill to pardon Louis Riel, a great Canadian leader, half French, half aboriginal. That is the relation that I think is needed and the direction in which we are going and I am quite pleased.

\* \* \*

### EMPLOYMENT

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals have promised job, jobs and more jobs. Now the Prince Rupert grain terminal has announced that it will be shutting down its operations temporarily on June 15, throwing 91 employees out of work.

While the grain terminals cut costs, CN Rail, the Canadian Wheat Board and the Prince Rupert Port Corporation have failed to provide a competitive, efficient service that would see more grain going through Prince Rupert.

Why has the government which is responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, the Prince Rupert Port Corporation and the new Canadian Transportation Act failed to implement efficiencies that would keep Canada's closest grain terminal to the Pacific rim open for business?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the principal difficulty affecting Prince Rupert this year is a common difficulty that is affecting all Canadian grain ports and that is, quite frankly, a shortage of supply.

The hon. gentleman will remember that a couple of years ago the predicament was exactly the opposite with a huge volume of grain and congestion in the grain handling and transportation system.

The good news in this situation is that supply and demand have become far more balanced. It is far more favourable from the farmers' point of view. The volumes in Canada at the present time are lower than they have been historically. In fact, around the world

grain supplies are probably at a 20-year low. As a result of that, prices have increased dramatically to the farmer's advantage.

The difficulty facing Prince Rupert is that grain supplies are lower now than they have been in a long time.

**Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is talking about a lot of things, except freight rates, port costs and a few other things which are contributing to this.

Individuals in Prince Rupert are being laid off. Farmers continue to be brow-beaten by this inflexible government. The ministers of agriculture and transport should make the changes necessary to improve transportation so that grain will continue to move through the port.

Why is the government making working Canadians and Prince Rupert pay the price for a government controlled uncompetitive grain transportation system?

• (1450)

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, whatever the marketing system, if the grain supplies are low and the volume of grain is simply not there to move, there is nothing that either the government or the opposition can do to magically increase the volume.

I would point out that we are anticipating a good production season in 1996. We anticipate Canadian grain volumes will be substantially improved. With prices in the world, that is once again good news for farmers.

Recently the House enacted amendments to the legislation pertaining to transportation generally, and grain transportation in particular. Those changes in legislation should improve the regulatory system to make sure that we are evolving toward a system that is faster and cheaper and more efficient and one in which the benefits are fairly shared among farmers, shippers and the railways.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### FAMILY TRUSTS

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance.

In his May 1996 report, the auditor general has brought to light the fact that \$2 billion's worth of family trusts had been transferred to the United States free of tax. The Minister of Finance reacted to this report by asking the Standing Committee on Finance to consider amendments that could be made to the Income Tax Act to prevent this kind of thing from ever happening again.

*Oral Questions*

Does the minister acknowledge the fact that all the Standing Committee on Finance has been asked to do is to review the specific provisions of the Income Tax Act mentioned by the auditor general and make recommendations to prevent another scandal?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, and I am sure yours, that parliamentary committees are the masters of their agendas.

I am glad that the committee is reviewing the file that the hon. member has referenced. We will look forward to the recommendations.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I will remind the minister that, while supporting a review of the Income Tax Act, we in the opposition believe we have a duty to shed some light on what government officials did, on December 23, 1991, to help millionaires save on their taxes.

Why does the government object to our lifting the veil that had been cast on the conduct of certain senior government officials, a conduct condemned by the auditor general himself, to put a stop to the flight of capital across the border? What does the government have to hide? Who is it trying to protect?

[English]

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will say again that parliamentary committees have full authority to determine their own agendas.

It is my understanding that the finance committee is looking at these aspects as they relate to the Income Tax Act. If there are other issues that are of concern to the members of Parliament and the recommendations that are coming forward, they will be at public accounts committee.

\* \* \*

#### OATH OF CITIZENSHIP

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, recently the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration stated that it was the intention of the government to modernize the oath of citizenship.

Most Canadians would agree that the oath should reflect contemporary views of the rights and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship.

Would such an allegiance to Canada be in addition to the current oath of allegiance to Her Majesty or would it replace the oath to Her Majesty?

[Translation]

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have received the report of the parliamentary committee on immigration and citizenship. This report contains a large number of recommendations, including one on the oath of allegiance under the Citizenship Act.

We are currently looking at the possibility of updating the oath of allegiance, to bring it into line with our times. Let there be no mistake: our goal is to strengthen Canadian identity and, with this in mind, all options are being considered.

[English]

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians can accept the premise that new citizens should take an oath of allegiance to Canada. Why limit such an oath to new Canadians?

If the government will require all new Canadian citizens have to take an oath of allegiance to Canada, does it not believe that the members of this House should be required to take an oath of allegiance to Canada as well?

• (1455)

**The Speaker:** I am not sure that question falls under the responsibilities of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. I think we will pass and go to the hon. member for Drummond.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on March 13, the minister announced his intention to introduce a complete bill on new reproductive technologies before the summer recess.

To date, the Minister of Health has simply announced a regulation on sperm deposits and has promised a general strategy, but not a bill.

My question is for the Minister of Health. With the report of the Baird commission tabled over two and a half years ago, and the urgent need for legislation, how does the minister explain his inability to draft a bill on reproductive technologies?

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. We will be able to table in the House a bill on new reproductive technologies within two weeks.

*Oral Questions***NIGERIA**

**Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa.

Reports of attacks on Nigerians working for democratic reform in Nigeria are very disturbing. First, the president-elect has been under detention by the military since 1994 and now, yesterday, the president's wife was gunned down on a street in Lagos.

Could the secretary of state tell the House how the Canadian government is responding to this tragic and brutal slaying?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada deplores and condemns the assassination of Mrs. Abiola. As my colleague said, her husband is a great democrat who has been in prison in Nigeria since 1994. Her assassination yesterday contributes to the fear and insecurity in that country.

Canada has been insisting that Nigeria return to democracy and respect of human rights. Mrs. Abiola has been a strong fighter, not only for the rights of her husband, but for those of all Nigerians. We send to her family and to all of the supporters of democracy in Nigeria our sincere sympathy.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this year the Minister of Finance snuck in on the fine print of his budget plan—I refer to the footnote on page 67 of his seniors' benefits booklet—a 20 per cent clawback for middle income seniors. This is a 20 per cent tax. It is on top of the unconscionable rates already imposed on all Canadians by the government, while the Minister of Finance boasts about no new taxes.

Will the Minister of Finance explain why middle income seniors, who built this country and worked hard to secure their retirement, will now find themselves the most heavily taxed people in the country?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well that in an era of scarce, indeed shrinking financial resources, it is crucial to focus help on those who need it most. That is what we have done in this instance.

The hon. member will also know that it is important to ensure that there will be a pension system available for young Canadians comparable to the one which the country now enjoys. That also is what we have done.

What we have done is far preferable to the position advocated by the Reform Party, which would lead to the complete evisceration of the Canada pension plan and government support for retired seniors.

\* \* \*

**GOODS AND SERVICES TAX**

**Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Finance.

He will be aware that in yesterday's byelection in Nova Scotia the GST harmonization was an issue that was front and centre and that the Liberals came in a humiliating third place.

**An hon. member:** Who came in first?

**Mr. Riis:** The NDP came first. He will also be aware that the premiers of the western provinces have asked that he withdraw from the GST harmonization scheme.

Will he now recognize that this is the wrong course to take, follow the advice of the western premiers and pull out of that GST harmonization scheme?

● (1500)

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should quote from Robert Shepherd, a columnist for the *Globe and Mail* referring to what has been done. I do not often quote from the *Globe and Mail*: "Sure the feds are using other provinces' tax revenues to ease the harmonization clause for New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, just as they did to top up Ontario's coffers when the floor dropped out of its tax base during the 1991 recession or Alberta's when energy prices fell suddenly".

He could have gone to talk about the support the federal government provided western grain farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba when they required help.

Let me simply say national unity is not helped with provincial premiers engaged in empty fed bashing or attacking other provinces. National unity is helped when the country recognizes the regions come together to help each other.

\* \* \*

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I draw to the attention of the House the presence in the gallery of the Canadian Healthy Environment National Award winners and finalists.

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

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### REPORT OF THE CHIEF ELECTORAL OFFICER

**The Speaker:** I have the honour to lay upon the table the report of the Chief Electoral Officer of Canada entitled "The March 1996 Byelections—Technological Innovations: Reaping the Rewards".

[Translation]

This document is deemed permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

\* \* \*

[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 21 petitions.

\* \* \*

### ENVIRONMENT WEEK

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this week Canada is celebrating Environment Week. While we take this time every year to acknowledge the importance of a healthy environment to Canadians, this year we also take pride in celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Department of the Environment. Therefore it is both a time to reflect on our successes as a nation and take stock of the challenges that still confront communities across Canada.

There is a very simple equation we must understand. A healthy environment will add to the health of our families and communities, while an unhealthy environment will hurt us all.

Pollution Probe states that 6 per cent of all respiratory admissions to Canadian hospitals are smog related. Doctors and health practitioners in urban areas tell us smog and air pollution cause increased health problems to heart and respiratory disease sufferers.

Yesterday in the air summit organized by the government of metropolitan Toronto this was very clear. It also costs our health care system over a billion dollars a year, conservatively, for these respiratory ailments. Polluted drinking water has an even more noticeable cause and effect.

• (1505)

So is it not time we all started making healthy choices for our environment and for ourselves? All Canadians and all levels of

### Routine Proceedings

government need to subscribe to strong national standards of environmental quality for all Canadians in all regions of this great country.

[Translation]

After all, what we are really talking about is making a choice for healthy neighbourhoods; a choice for clean water to drink; a choice for beaches where our children can swim; and a choice for clean air.

[English]

This is a choice we have to work for. It is a choice in lifestyle, a choice in how we recycle and reuse. It involves how we get to work as well as how we work, and of course how we use our resources to promote our economy without sacrificing a renewable resource and source of jobs and wealth for our citizens.

Everyday Canadians are making those choices and there are a great many individuals among us who are working to promote a healthier Canadian environment. A few of those individuals are with us today in the public gallery who moments ago the House and the Chair recognized.

[Translation]

Today, I have the pleasure of announcing the winners of Canada's Healthy Environment Awards. We had over 200 nominees this year, all of whom have shown a dedication to the environment which is quite remarkable.

[English]

Of course I cannot mention them all by name, but they range in age from their teens to their seventies. They are both municipal and corporate leaders as well as students and teachers. To give an idea of the kinds of achievements we are celebrating here today, let me point briefly to the youth leadership winners.

Thirteen-year old Jean-Dominic Lévesque-René of Quebec has worked hard to promote awareness about the link between pesticides and cancer, while secondary student Sara McEachern from British Columbia helped produce a video about what children can do to save planet earth. These are but two examples of the choices young Canadians have made to improve Canada's environment.

The environmental citizens we honour today, the environmental patriots really, have proven that irrespective of their walks of life all Canadians are empowered to make an individual contribution to a healthier and more sustainable environment.

We talk in the House about all the things government should do for the environment but we tend to forget that it is the individual who often makes the critical difference. Without great fanfare or publicity they do it quietly, powerfully and effectively. They are people who take responsibility for their neighbourhoods and ultimately their country.

*Routine Proceedings*

Governments must therefore do their part to promote this brand of environmental citizenship. The House will be dealing with a number of important environmental concerns in the coming days and months, not the least of which will be a revitalized Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the main tool box Canada has at its disposition in terms of controlling what goes in our air and in our water.

There is also endangered species legislation which Canadians tell us constantly at all levels is important to preserve because of the animals and plants we care about. If we do not take care of them we are not taking care of ourselves.

We are also maintaining the international leadership Canada has been able to forge worldwide, which means honouring our commitments and taking leadership roles on issues such as climate change.

[*Translation*]

We will also continue our environmental partnership with the United States and Mexico in a meeting of the Commission for Environmental Co-operation in Toronto at the end of June.

[*English*]

In many ways our environment goes straight to the heart of what makes us a nation. Our respect and love for the land and sea is part of our national and natural heritage. It is a source of national pride and it continues to attract people from all corners of the globe. Consequently we must plan for the future in order to protect this irreplaceable resource.

• (1510)

The Prime Minister said the environment must become one of the major priorities for this government as we prepare for the 21st century.

Please join me in congratulating some of the Canadians with us here today who are helping to make that pledge a reality.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to rise in this House today to recognize Environment Week.

I agree with the Minister of the Environment that it is important to draw attention to the success stories of individuals and corporations that have understood how vital it is for our common future that we protect and enhance our biophysical environment.

Like the minister, the *Globe and Mail* noted yesterday the outstanding contribution to the cause of the environment of individuals like David Suzuki, NGOs like Greenpeace and Pollution Probe, and corporations like Cascade.

For my part, I would like to recognize the contribution made by all those who, while they may not win a prize for it, make sure, on a daily basis, to reduce their energy consumption, to recycle and to buy fewer overpackaged products, in a word, to act in a way that respects the integrity of the natural environment they feel responsible for.

I am confident that, in the near future, these Canadians and Quebecers will succeed in imposing their wishes and values on the government as well as on those corporations still refusing to make the environment a priority.

On the one hand, I share the minister's hopes to see environmental citizenship develop among Canadians and Quebecers of all ages. On the other hand, I must dissociate myself from him, when he talks about the most effective means to achieve our common goal.

In his speech, the minister referred to the 25th anniversary of Environment Canada. While it is true that, since it was established, this department has contributed to the protection of the environment, we must nevertheless recognize that what it has done mainly is cause a great deal of duplication and overlap, much as the minister stubbornly denies it. But interference by the federal government has been condemned time and time again by successive Quebec governments, along with the inefficiencies it causes and, more importantly, the lack of respect for regional uniqueness it reflects.

Documents, such as the environmental framework entitled *Cadre de référence sur le partage des rôles et responsabilités entre Québec et le gouvernement fédéral en matière d'environnement et de faune* published by a certain Liberal government in August of 1994, show the negative impact of overlap on the management of government responsibilities with regard to the environment.

In his speech, the minister referred to the future Canadian Environmental Protection Act and to the endangered species legislation he intends to introduce in this House by next year.

I hope that the minister has learned from past mistakes and that, in an effort to better protect our health and our natural heritage, he will consider the comments humbly submitted to him by the official opposition as well as by provincial governments, including that of Quebec, which fear another federal attempt to unilaterally impose its will on the provinces, which already play a credible role in this area.

The recent conference of federal and provincial environment ministers gives us some hope that Ottawa may adopt a new, more flexible approach.

The Bloc Québécois is happy to see the positive results of that conference, including an action plan on climatic change.



Yet, the minister's recent comments before the standing committee on the environment suggested that the CCME was no longer a useful working tool for the federal government.

In closing, I would like to add that, in 1996, no government, department, business leader or other decision maker should ignore his or her responsibilities or, even worse, hurt the cause of the environment.

• (1515)

Each decision must therefore be made in light of its impact on the delicate balance of our global environment. The health of our children and of all future generations is at stake.

[*English*]

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to respond today to the environment minister's statement on Environment Week.

Our environment is very important. It continues to top opinion polls as one of the most important subjects to British Columbians and I think to all Canadians who are very proud of our environment in Canada. We want to make sure that our healthy environment is maintained.

As has been pointed out, a healthy environment also leads to a healthy economy. Certainly anything we can do to enhance our economy, look after our economy, as well as look after our environment is a tremendous tag team approach. That is important to our whole country.

Canadians from coast to coast are very proud of their land. They have a very close association with the land. Canadians are proud when visitors to our country comment on our clean streets, our clean water, our clean surroundings. Our visitors are envious of our environment and we have a tremendous responsibility to make sure it is maintained.

Living very close to the Canada-U.S. border as I do, I often hear comments from our American visitors who come up to admire Cultus Lake and other clean bodies of water in my riding. They are very pleased to visit Canada. It is a tremendous tourist attraction to have a clean environmental record.

Canadians themselves are to be congratulated on maintaining a high level of environmental awareness and environmental excellence. This has been achieved through hard work on behalf of most Canadians who share that concern.

The minister mentioned that his department received over 200 nominees for the Canadian Healthy Environment Awards. I was exceptionally proud to see a group from my own riding as one of those nominees. Student representatives as well as the kitchen crew from Kent Elementary School in Agassiz, B.C. were nominated.

### *Routine Proceedings*

With only 23 candidates from the entire province, they can be very proud to have been nominated for this award.

Perhaps the minister forgot to mention that there was a little contest on the Hill today for the greenest, most environmentally aware parliamentary office. I was very pleased that he gave the Reform whip's office the award for the cleanest and most environmentally sensitive office on the Hill. I know the minister will try harder next year in order to achieve that award for his own office.

The minister said in his speech that the significance of this week is to reflect on our successes. If he was referring to the successes of Canadians who have gone the extra mile to make improvements to the environment, then he is very correct. The evidence is in the environment awards presented to the 200 nominees. However, if he was referring just to the successes of his own department, then I would argue it was not so obvious. Since assuming power, former environment minister Sheila Copps and the present minister have talked a good talk about the environment but have not always been able to follow through.

Sheila Copps, who today is fighting for re-election in Hamilton, is clearly embarrassed by her record in her own riding. Whenever the issue of the Taro dump comes up, Ms. Copps refuses to comment on it. Again last night there was a debate on that subject. I think the reason is that for over two years she had a chance as the environment minister to do an environmental assessment on the Taro dump site and she refused. Today the residents of Hamilton are judging her byelection campaign in part on her lack of action in that area.

As mentioned by the member for Fraser Valley West, in Sydney, Nova Scotia the tar ponds are a real problem. They are laden with PCBs. Is the minister going to move to clean that up soon? He knows the site. He has been there. The talk is right but we need some action on the Nova Scotia tar ponds problem. Although we are celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Department of the Environment today, I hope it does not take another 25 years to clean up the tar ponds. We have to get moving on it rather than just talking about it.

Another problem the minister is aware of is off the coast of Prince Edward Island. On the ocean floor is the *Irving Whale* oil barge with its 4,000 tonnes of heavy bunker sea fuel oil. Last summer the government spent more than \$12 million in an attempt to lift that barge only to discover that the barge also contained 6,800 litres of PCBs.

• (1520)

Again, not the current minister but the minister at the time, Ms. Sheila Copps, said she did not know that PCBs were on board but the operation had to be stopped halfway through. As the member for New Westminster—Burnaby and the Reform Party pointed out, Ms. Copps had actually tabled a brief in the House of Commons that she did know about this but had not taken it into account before

*Routine Proceedings*

she started the lifting project. It was really a \$12 million failed experiment to lift the barge.

Today the minister said that a healthy environment will add to the health of our families and our communities. I would hope on the projects I specifically mentioned the minister will realize that those specific sites are making people in that area nervous about their health and their communities as well. I hope he will take action on those sooner rather than later.

The minister also stated that governments must do their part to promote the idea of environmental citizenship. He is right. They must take part and it must be very much a leadership role. I know he is working with the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment to try to reduce the duplication to make sure that while the environment is protected, the regulatory mess does not become an impediment to environmental clean-ups and to find ways to work with the provinces to make sure it happens efficiently.

I know he has spoken the right words. I hope he will take that lead and make sure the agreement between the environment ministers actually results in a cleaner environment for all of Canada.

In closing, let me again congratulate all those who received the achievement awards as well as all those who were nominated. Through these people we see that actions speak much louder than words. I extend my congratulations to them and to the minister for initiating and handing out those awards. I wish the best of luck to the minister on next year's office award.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As the New Democratic Party environment critic, I would like an opportunity to respond today as well. I wonder if you would seek unanimous consent from the Chamber.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am pleased to do so. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for The Battlefords—Meadow Lake to respond?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Len Taylor (The Battlefords—Meadow Lake, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the will of the House to allow me to say a few words today on Environment Week. I congratulate the Minister of the Environment for his strong words in support of the environment and I congratulate those who this week have been recognized for their environmental achievements.

There certainly are a great number of people across Canada who are actively engaged in environmental projects, activities and educational matters. They are doing a great deal to further the interests of this planet. I congratulate each and every one of them.

A great number of people are concerned about the future of the environment, about the future of the habitat on Earth and indeed about the planet itself. They may not have been able to participate

in local projects or to initiate them, but they want to see those who are able to work on environmental matters have the resources to do so. They want to see the federal government take the necessary action to ensure there is a good strong federal presence on environmental issues.

I noticed a slight change today in some of the language the minister is using. I simply want to take a minute to point out a couple of things. Recently the minister has talked about the need for a strong federal role on the environment. The other day in question period I took the opportunity to congratulate him on his stand on a strong federal role. Following the meeting of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, the minister is now talking about strong national standards instead of the need for a strong federal role. The ministers have begun to talk about national standards rather than the presence of the federal government in the field.

• (1525 )

Members of the public will recognize there is a big difference between the need for strong national standards, which we all adhere to, and the need for a strong federal role, a governmental presence in environmental issues. I can stress that by pointing to a couple of specific areas that need some attention, particularly when we look at what will be happening in the near future.

The Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development recently issued a report on the review of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. The government response to the CEPA review fell short of expectations.

The amendments to CEPA that the government must put forward should be coming forward in the very near future. It is very important to people concerned about the environment across Canada that the message which was sent to the government by the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development be fulfilled. That message was about the need for a strong federal role in dealing with toxic chemicals and other regulations under CEPA.

On the biotechnology chapter, to actually consider moving biotechnology to agriculture from the environment so that those who are promoting the business of biotechnology will also be charged with enforcing regulatory compliance makes absolutely no sense. We have to keep these matters within the context of the environment.

I do not want to abuse the time the House has given me today because I appreciate it very much. I mentioned the Fisheries Act in a question the other day. I want to reiterate that to the minister.

At the Canadian Environmental Network meeting in Hamilton on the weekend, the minister received a strong statement about the federal role in the environment which was signed by 100 organizations across Canada. I would ask the minister to review, support and act on that statement from CEN.

*Routine Proceedings*

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

## INDUSTRY

**Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present in both official languages the first report of the Standing Committee on Industry. In accordance with its order of reference of Monday, May 22, 1996, your committee has considered Bill C-4, an act to amend the Standards Council of Canada Act and agrees to report it without amendment.

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 27 and to special order, I move:

That, during the 10 sitting days before June 23, 1996, on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays the ordinary time of daily adjournment shall be 9.30 p.m.

**The Deputy Speaker:** It is a debatable motion. Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** On division.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

• (1530)

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion. I move:

That four members of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and two staff persons of the committee be authorized to travel to Victoria, British Columbia to attend the annual conference of the Canada Council of Public Accounts Committees from September 8 to September 10, 1996.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the parties have been consulted, and I think you will find unanimous consent for this motion.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

[*English*]

## PETITIONS

## JUSTICE

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions to present. One is from citizens of London, Ontario and the other is from citizens of Toronto.

The petitioners say that abolishing judicial review for convicted lifers under article 745 of the Criminal Code will only serve to increase both the human and economic costs of the criminal justice system and increase public fear and misconceptions about crime among the Canadian public.

They say that article 745 is not a loophole, does not provide automatic release and is actually carried out by a jury made up of members of the community. They say that if there are concerns that the individual under review poses a risk of committing violence in the community, that person is not released.

Therefore the petitioners call on Parliament to oppose the repeal of article 745 and to launch a concerted public education campaign to promote the need for more responsible and humane criminal justice approaches to enhance the safety of all Canadians.

## IMPAIRED DRIVING

**Mr. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition signed by 2,016 petitioners.

The petitioners request that Parliament proceed immediately with amendments to the Criminal Code which will ensure that a sentence given to anyone convicted of driving while impaired or causing injury or death while impaired reflect both the severity of the crime and zero tolerance by Canada toward the crime.

[*Translation*]

## RAW MILK CHEESE

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, 73,300 people have signed a petition asking the Minister of Health not to go ahead with his plan to amend the regulations on importing raw milk cheese into Canada.

To avoid cluttering up the House, I am tabling a list of 45 signatures requesting the minister not to amend the regulations. I will send the remaining signatures to the minister directly.

[*English*]

## TAXATION

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

*Routine Proceedings*

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

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

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

## ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second comes from Godfrey, Ontario.

The petitioners 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 on Parliament to enact legislation to require health warning labels to be placed on the containers of all alcoholic beverages to caution expectant mothers and others of the risks associated with alcohol consumption.

## ENDANGERED SPECIES

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

The first is from residents of Etobicoke, Ontario. The petitioners support effective endangered species legislation. Therefore they pray and call on Parliament to support the strengthening of the recent legislative proposal for an effective Endangered Species Act.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Prince Albert—Churchill River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is also from residents of Etobicoke, Ontario.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament will not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the charter of rights and freedoms to add the phrase sexual orientation.

• (1535)

## AGE OF CONSENT

**Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour of presenting the following petition.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament amend the Criminal Code of Canada to set the age of consent at 18 so as provide protection from exploitation and abuses. There are close to 1,000 signatures.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Question No. 13.

[Text]

Question No. 13—**Mr. Gilmour:**

What was the total dollar amount (direct and indirect) and source of government funding included in the 1995-96 estimates to the Western Canada Wilderness Committee?

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** In 1995-96, Human Resources Development Canada provided funding in the amount of \$200,000 to the Western Canada Wilderness Committee for a youth service Canada project.

In 1995-96, the following departments and agencies report that they have not provided any funding to the Western Canada Wilderness Committee: Canadian International Development Agency; Department of Canadian Heritage; Environment Canada; National Capital Commission; Natural Resources Canada.

Other departments and agencies have not been canvassed concerning this question as they had not provided funding to the Western Wilderness Committee in previous questions dealing with this subject.

\* \* \*

[English]

## QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 2 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remain questions be allowed to stand.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, still for the same reason. I also rose on May 27, 1996 and I do so today with respect to Question Q-19, a question on the Order Paper for over 45 days, since I tabled it on March 6.

Yesterday, I met the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs in committee, he appeared to be very knowledgeable when answering

my questions. Since this is a question that relates directly to his area of responsibility, it does not take a rocket scientist and 200 officials to research it.

I would simply like to know if, in the past five years, there existed—within the Privy Council, the Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, or elsewhere in the federal government—an emergency measures co-ordinating unit, and if so, who and what are its past and present members, budget meeting dates, and subjects of discussion at each meeting? Has this unit drawn up plans for emergency situations or not, and, if so, what are those plans?

This sort of thing, in a department that spends millions of dollars, ought to be easy enough to answer quickly.

I ask the government opposite when it will answer my question. These questions are easily answered. Millions of dollars were spent on the referendum, and on Canadian unity. Surely they can calculate figures and do accounts. They should be able to answer such simple questions.

I warn the representative of the Liberal government, that I will ask this question every week. Perhaps that will not please the minister before me, the member for Hull—Aylmer. Perhaps you do not find it pleasing because some of the money was spent while you were Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Perhaps we should find out how you spent this money, and how much you spent in Quebec. Answer the questions, if you have nothing to hide. Instead of answering me directly, while your microphone is not on and we cannot hear your stupid remarks—

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Dear colleague, I think the point is clear. Before asking our colleague's permission to honour this request, does the parliamentary secretary wish to answer the hon. member?

[English]

**Mr. Zed:** Mr. Speaker, as always, my colleague is eloquent in his attempts to make his point. We appreciate his patience.

If he has already spoken to the minister on the subject then no doubt he has received some assurances the answer he was seeking is available. We are attempting to get the information clarified and it is certainly our hope to provide the information to the member as soon as it becomes available.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there agreement to accept the Order for Return?

**An hon. member:** No.

*Supply*

[Translation]

**The Deputy Speaker:** I would like to inform my colleagues that, because of the ministerial statement, Government Orders will be extended by 23 minutes.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

### SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ)** moved:

That this House condemn the federal government for its regressive research and development policies in regard to Quebec, in particular its unilateral decision to cut the federal contribution of \$7.2 million planned for the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion in Varennes.

She said: Mr. Speaker, given the short time available, I will share my 20-minute period with the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonneuve.

• (1540)

The non-votable motion put forward by the official opposition for debate today is about research and development.

For a few years, the Bloc Québécois has been deploring the fact that Quebec is being underfinanced by the federal government in the area of research and development. Year after year, the figures clearly show that Quebec does not receive its fair share of the money invested in research and development by the federal government. More recently, the latest round of federal cuts has widened the gap, especially the federal government's withdrawal from the only major scientific project in Quebec, the Varennes tokamak project.

My motion reads as follows:

That this House condemn the federal government for its regressive research and development policies in regard to Quebec, in particular its unilateral decision to cut the federal contribution of \$7.2 million planned for the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion in Varennes.

I would like to set the record straight on a completely erroneous piece of information often used by the Minister of Natural Resources in answering the official opposition's questions. In fact, my colleague from Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies pointed this out to the House this afternoon during statements by members just before question period.

When the minister compares Quebec's share with that of the other provinces, she never includes the amounts allocated to the national capital region, almost all of which is located in Ontario.

*Supply*

Let us look a little more closely at this situation, in light of a study done by the Quebec Ministry of Industry, Trade, Science and Technology on federal spending in research and development.

Between 1979 and 1991, six out of ten provinces were overfinanced, Ontario, of course, coming out ahead with a \$3 billion surplus.

During the same period, Quebec was seriously underfinanced by \$2.5 billion, followed by Alberta with \$1.5 billion, British Columbia with \$369 million, and Saskatchewan with \$124 million. In the last few years, however, the situation has been getting a little better in Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Alberta.

The most common indicator showing how intensive the research and development effort was is the ratio of net domestic R and D expenditures to gross domestic product.

On that score, if the federal government had been fair, this ratio would have been 1.82 per cent, instead of 1.71 per cent in 1991.

Research and development funding is usually divided between intra- and extra-mural expenditures.

On the subject of intra-mural expenditures, that is to say expenditures for federal laboratories, the study showed that, for one thing, only 13.8 per cent of intra-mural expenditures went to Quebec, compared to 57.7 per cent to Ontario.

The high concentration of federal laboratories in the Ottawa region only partly explains why Ontario received such a large share of the funding. In the areas of natural science and engineering, the federal government has been carrying out more intra-mural research outside of Ottawa, but still within Ontario, than in any of the four other major regions of Canada, namely Quebec, British Columbia, the prairies and Atlantic Canada.

It is also estimated that, between 1963 and 1991, Quebec lost, in intra-mural funding alone, more than \$5.3 billion in 1991 dollars.

In addition, in 1991, the relative scarcity of federal research and development laboratories in Quebec translated into a shortage of more than 2,230 person-years, or eight times the combined staff level of the Biotechnology Research Institute and the Industrial Materials Institute, two of the main federal laboratories in the Montreal area.

Finally, as regards assistance to businesses, or extra-mural expenditures, the study concluded that, with its \$32 million deficit, Quebec was the only province to have incurred in 1991 a significant deficit in terms of federal industrial research and development expenditures.

There is an unmistakable connection between the location of federal research facilities and the allocation of federal business. It

is therefore little wonder that, over the 1979-1990 period, Ottawa businesses were awarded more contracts and that the annual amounts paid to each of them for federal research and development work were much higher than anywhere else.

• (1545)

A June 1995 study commissioned by the INRS, Quebec's national institute for scientific research, came to similar conclusions. The authors of the study also pointed out that only 25 of the 156 federal laboratories in Canada are located in Quebec. This means 16 per cent of them, compared to 62 per cent for Ontario, or a 40 per cent difference. Laboratories in Quebec only employ 3,002 of the 22,360 scientists and technicians working in federal facilities, barely 13.4 per cent of the total, compared to 49 per cent for Ontario.

The authors of the study also pointed out that, since 1980, the Government of Canada has been favouring the advanced technology sector. The effect of this policy is that the four federal laboratories in Quebec simply do not compare with the new ones in Ontario and Manitoba. For example, a huge federal facility employing 2,227 researchers in the nuclear energy sector was set up in Ontario, while another one employs 925 people in Manitoba. There is simply no comparison with the situation in Quebec.

Quebec's largest laboratory was established in the aerospace sector. It employs 268 people, while another facility located in Ottawa recruited 297 people. It would have been much simpler to centralize, for once, the aerospace industry in a single Quebec location.

A new communication and information techniques facility hired 180 people in Quebec, but three similar laboratories located in Ottawa employ 566 people. The authors of the study also indicated that the proportion of contracts awarded in Quebec under the federal contracting out policy went down from 21.6 per cent to 13 per cent over a period of about 20 years ending in 1994.

Since 1985, this proportion never exceeded 15.5 per cent. In fact, barely 4 per cent of Quebec companies active in research and development get federal contracts in the science and technology sector. In Canada, there does not seem to be money available for science, research and knowledge. Yet, these will be the keys to success in the 21st century. By contrast, the federal government can afford to spend over \$7 million on flags and kites, as pointed out yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

I ask the government to reread the letter written by the president of the Canadian Association of Physicists, Mr. Vincett. Before concluding, I will read a few excerpts of his letter. In reference to the background, Mr. Vincett writes:

*Supply**[English]*

“Your government has consistently stressed the importance of science and technology to Canada’s economic future. You have kept cuts to the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council to a level less than that suffered by many agencies. More recently, your government’s report ‘Science and Technology for the New Century’ has again emphasized the critical role of science and technology”.

*[Translation]*

In reference to the issue, the president says:

*[English]*

“Recent deficit reduction efforts have obliged Natural Resources Canada to concentrate on its core mandate which is not of course science and technology. Yet the budget which supports science of broad national importance has not been transferred to Industry Canada. As a result, major national science facilities will lose their funding. This together with the likely effects on the university research infrastructure of cuts to the transfer payments and the significant closures which are occurring as a result of cuts to the national science and engineering research council place your entire science and technology strategy at serious risk and endanger the future health of the economy as we move into a knowledge based world”.

*[Translation]*

In reference to the importance of basic science, Mr. Vincett writes:

*[English]*

“The threatened damage to Canada’s basic effort will be a disaster for future economic growth since basic science is the foundation upon which most technological and economic advances depend. As the chairman of the Bank of Nova Scotia said in 1994: ‘Public support for science—is one of the very few categories of government spending that deserves to be increased—studies have shown conclusively that the overall return to society from investment in knowledge creation is extremely high’”.

- (1550)

*[Translation]*

The solution proposed by the president is the following:

*[English]*

“This issue transcends individual government departments. Unlike most of the developed world, Canada does not have a co-ordinated policy for the establishment, operation and closure of national scientific facilities. As a result, actions in one department can have a devastating effect on programs in another. I strongly

urge you to establish an expert committee to report to you quickly on what such a co-ordinated policy should contain”.

*[Translation]*

It would be in the interest of the ministers who received a copy of this letter, and the Prime Minister, to read it over again, to make sure Canada is not headed for an even worse economic future.

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, you may be sure that if the official opposition has decided to dedicate one of its opposition days to research and development, it is because we have very serious reasons for wanting to see corrective action taken. I hope that the Minister of Natural Resources, who we just heard is going to take part in the debate, will understand fully the gravity of the situation.

Before going into detail, I know that my colleague, the member for Verchères, will give a complete picture of the discrimination being suffered by the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion, since, as you know, the government is getting ready to close down unilaterally what is undoubtedly one, if not the, major natural sciences facility in Quebec.

I hope that the minister will take advantage of this debate to honour a commitment she made when she appeared before the natural resources sub-committee, and give a solemn undertaking to find alternative funding, because that is the solution.

We can understand that the government must put its fiscal house in order. But why is it that for decades now—in fact, it started with the creation of the National Research Council of Canada in the 1950s—Quebec has systematically and consistently lost out when it comes to research and development?

So that it is very clear what we are talking about during the debate, I would like to propose that we define research and development as work that is creative in nature and that is carried out in a systematic fashion in order to increase the stock of knowledge or devise new applications for this knowledge.

Why is research and development so important and why have all industrialized countries that have taken charge of their development been concerned with having a rigorous and consistent policy, which incidentally is not the case for Canada, which, as we speak, still has no systematic research and development policy? Unbelievably, its policy is completely ad hoc.

Research and development is important because it adds to knowledge, and it adds to value added, obviously enabling us to establish links with the important export sector.

It is nonetheless very obvious that Canada’s research and development performance is very weak, and I am anxious to hear what the Minister of Natural Resources has to say about this, because all industrialized countries do R and D. On average,

*Supply*

industrialized countries devote 2.3 per cent of their GDP to research and development policies or investments.

• (1555)

Imagine, for a few years already, Canada has been stagnating with investments amounting to 1.5 per cent. Simply put, of all industrialized countries, only Italy, Iceland and Ireland show a worse performance than Canada. Sweden, Japan, Switzerland, the United States, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and Austria perform better than Canada with regard to R & D.

What is worrisome and should bring Quebec ministers to spring into action is the systemic discrimination against Quebec regarding R & D. Some would say that, looking at the system as a whole, there might be some discrepancies in certain sectors, which is acceptable.

But who in the government, which minister is going to be frank and lucid enough to explain to us how it is that there is a four billion dollar a year difference between investments made by the federal government in a province like Ontario and its investments in Quebec? How can that be explained?

I know that the Minister of Natural Resources will be at a loss to explain this. How can she explain that, year in and year out, there are between 25 and 30 federal research laboratories in Quebec and close to 80 in Ontario? Are there factors we should know about which could explain this state of affairs?

I will give you more precise numbers to show that, if the official opposition has decided to talk about R & D, it is not on a whim, it is not because we think that this is only a bad stretch we have to go through.

The Minister of Natural Resources, who is the most incendiary of all ministers in this government, must be aware of the discrimination Quebec has been the victim of for the last three decades. The government's systematic interventions and policies in this respect started in the 1950s and have been going on now for three, almost four decades.

It found a way to concentrate most of its investments in what the member for Rimouski-Témiscouata rightly called *intra muros* projects; namely, the federal government spends around seven billion dollars on its R & D policies according to two principles. It does it in its laboratories, the number of which is estimated at about 177.

The natural resources minister will certainly share the indignation I feel when I see that the government did not see fit to establish a regional development policy in the area of research and development. Had it been serious, it would have ensured that Atlantic

Canada, western Canada, Ontario and Quebec could benefit equally from investments in R and D.

I understand this is not a mathematical question. But when there is a difference such as the one that exists between Quebec and Ontario, a difference supported by the government, what are we to think? I challenge the minister. When we analysed the merits of the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion project, which involved Hydro-Quebec and the Institut national de la recherche scientifique, what scientist in Quebec would have thought that somebody would be foolhardy enough—and I think irresponsible would be the right word to use here—to cancel such a project?

Everybody agrees that the minister was a brilliant lawyer in the past and I challenge her to rise in this House and name one scientist in Quebec who supports her decision. The fact is that there are two major research and development projects in Quebec: the Canadian Space Agency, whose \$300 million budget was reduced to about \$200 million, and the Varennes project.

• (1600)

It is quite simple: in the area of research and development, especially natural sciences, whenever we looked for examples of major projects, we had two of them before us: the Canadian Space Agency, which was cut, and the project under the responsibility of the Minister of Natural Resources.

The merits of this project were unanimously recognized, first of all, because \$70 million was invested in infrastructure and second, because 100 researchers with Ph. D.'s in engineering, in physics and in other fields that are extremely important to economic development were involved.

Everyone was in favour. The whole scientific community had hopes of a promising future for this project. Then, without warning, the government had the nerve to unilaterally and shamelessly cut one of Quebec's most promising projects. That is what federalism means in the area of research and development: the inability to arbitrate, to strike a balance that could have helped Quebec in the past and that could still help it today.

What corrective measures is the government proposing? In fact, the whole history of research and development since the 1950s is a history of systemic discrimination against Quebec. Let me say, in closing, that only in one program did Quebec play a significant role: the Defence Industry Productivity Program or DIPP, which is understandable since the Canadian aerospace and aircraft manufacturing industries are concentrated in Montreal. Believe it or not, this government has the nerve and the chutzpah to dismantle this program, so that Quebec is now losing out in all areas of research and development.



*Supply*

[English]

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):**

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to respond to the comments made by my hon. colleagues on the other side of the House.

First let me thank my colleague for his reference to me as a brilliant lawyer. I believe it is undue flattery as will be revealed in the coming minutes. Anyway, I thank him for that.

It is an honour for me to be able to respond to the motion by the hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata. If I understand the motion, the hon. member wants to condemn the Government of Canada for “its regressive research and development policies in regard to Quebec”. She then goes on to criticize a decision to cut the federal contribution to the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion in Varennes.

I submit that the hon. member does not want, will not look and does not want to look at the federal S and T strategy in the broader context of what it means for all Canadians. This is obviously the hon. member’s prerogative.

Evidently she is not interested in science and technology policy beyond the borders of her home province. Nor does she want to put the Government of Canada’s spending on science and technology in the context of the overall strategy to reduce the deficit. She ignores the federal deficit in the same week that her former leader, the premier of Quebec, has gone to the investment community of New York to tell American investors that his number one preoccupation is to cut Quebec’s deficit.

Perhaps she will take the advice of her former leader, the now premier of Quebec, if she will not listen to what we have to say on this side of the House. I am certain that the premier of Quebec will tell her that deficit reduction requires tough choices. He will tell her that she has to assess her priorities. Not every program can continue to receive funding if we want to bring the deficit under control.

I will argue that the federal government cannot provide funding for fusion R and D at this time because fusion research does not meet our current criteria for funding. There is every indication that it will take at least another 30 years of research before energy supplies from fusion technology can be realized on a commercial basis.

● (1605)

We have had to make tough choices. We know we have had to cut funding for some programs that we would otherwise want to maintain. Above all, we have to make strategic decisions on how best to invest the \$5.5 billion that the Government of Canada spends on science and technology.

Out of that S and T budget, the Government of Canada spent \$3.1 billion on research and development initiatives in 1992-93. Did Quebec get a fair share of that investment? Did the federal government, as the hon. member accuses, implement a regressive R and D policy for Quebec? Members will find that Quebec received \$692 million in federal R and D spending in that year. Another \$13 million was spent on the Quebec side of the border in the national capital region.

Taking the national capital region out of the formula, as many industrialized countries do in calculating regional distribution of R and D spending, we find that the \$692 million spent in Quebec represents 28 per cent of all spending outside the national capital region. I would suggest that is more than fair. More to the point, I do not see how the hon. member opposite can complain that the federal government has regressive R and D policies with regard to Quebec.

The amount of \$692 million is a very sizeable investment in Quebec R and D. It comes from a tax base into which all Canadians pay. An independent Quebec would have to come up with a similar amount, in addition to its current provincial spending, if it wanted to maintain the current level of R and D in the province of Quebec.

In addition, members across and all Quebecers should carefully consider the investment that the Government of Canada has made into new research facilities over the past number of years.

Let me cite only a few examples. In 1987 Quebec got the Food Research and Development Centre and the Maurice Lamontagne Institute. In 1989, it got the space agency, a research agency, I believe it is fair to say, of which all Canadians are immensely proud. All Canadians were proud to see Canadian astronaut Marc Garneau on his second shuttle mission two weeks ago.

The true measure of federal investment in R and D is not measured even by such major investments as these. It is also measured by R and D grants and contracts to industry and universities. Quebec receives 30 per cent of that type of funding. In addition, Quebec gets a higher than average share of R and D tax credits because of the concentration of R and D in that province. According to a recent report from Simon Fraser Institute, Quebec based firms claimed 41 per cent of all R and D tax credits claimed in Canada in 1992.

Since 1981 the investment of the federal government in fusion research at the Tokamak de Varennes alone has amounted to \$90 million. This investment has helped to develop scientific and industrial research in Quebec.

The federal government is continuing to fund research and development of energy technology in the province. It will be primarily, and I have said this in the House before, in areas of energy efficiency and renewable energy systems at Varennes

*Supply*

laboratories, which opened four years ago. This program has an annual budget of \$6 million and employs approximately 50 people.

In nuclear energy, the mandate of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited is to seek to maintain a viable, competitive business in supplying and servicing Candu reactors at a reduced cost to the federal government.

Electricity generation from Candu nuclear energy technology is an economic reality today. Candu is already a success and has a good chance of achieving even greater success internationally. High technology industries in Quebec will continue to benefit from the nuclear industry through contracts developed from Candu sales to Korea and through the good performance of the Gentilly-2 Candu reactor. Consultants' studies show that a typical Candu 6 sale overseas could bring over \$100 million in contracts to Quebec and generate about 4,000 person years of employment.

• (1610)

I would ask the hon. member opposite again; how in light of these numbers, in light of these benefits to Quebec, can she make the case that the federal government has regressive R and D policies for Quebec?

Let me broaden the scope of my argument for the benefit of all members of the House and put the decision regarding federal funding for fusion R and D in the context of overall federal priorities and the priorities for federal participation in science and technology activities.

As all members know, the Government of Canada faces the challenge of reducing the deficit in order to manage the debt and maintain a stable foundation for new jobs and growth across the nation. We are determined to meet our objectives, and as we all know, we are making progress toward our objectives.

In addition, at this time we are living up to our commitment to all Canadians to be fair and compassionate in our decision making by putting in place new building blocks for security and prosperity.

The criteria that my department is using to determine its priorities for research and development activities mirror the overall emphasis on jobs and growth in the near term that the federal government is focusing on as a whole. Specifically, the energy R and D priorities at Natural Resources Canada are sustainable development, energy efficiency, renewable energy sources, the science of climate change and non-conventional hydrocarbon resources.

Every thoughtful Canadian who is concerned about the vast range of services provided by the federal government and the equally vast cost of providing these services knows that the government must set priorities and must make difficult decisions. That is why this government was elected, to make these decisions,

to allocate our limited funding accordingly and to take action. The federal government must concentrate its resources on its highest priorities and strive for their success.

The focus of the federal government is on activities that will bring results in the near to medium term. As I noted earlier, commercial generation of electricity from fusion is uncertain. Assuming that an economically viable technology could be developed, it is at least 30 years away.

Last March, following extensive consultations with Canadians the Government of Canada introduced a science and technology strategy that lays the foundation for the decisions we must make in prioritizing S and T in Canada.

The strategy demonstrates concretely how the federal government is getting its house in order so that it will be a better partner to the other players in Canada's innovation system, the private sector, academic institutions and other orders of government. The strategy sets out the Government of Canada's priorities in four key areas.

First, it defines national goals for science and technology. These goals are sustainable job creation and economic growth, improved quality of life and advancement of knowledge.

Second, it describes the federal government's core S and T activities.

Third, it outlines a new system of governance within federal departments that bring science and technology to the centre of the decision making process in cabinet.

Finally, the S and T strategy provides operating principles to guide federal departments and agencies.

Keeping in mind these over-arching principles, let us return to the question of energy R and D. Canada is amply endowed with a variety of resources for the generation of electricity, including hydro, fossil, nuclear and renewable energy sources. We have assigned a high priority to research into efficiency gains in the current production and use of energy.

• (1615)

The national fusion program is a good program but it does not rank as a high priority in the federal government's overall science and technology objectives. Cuts are planned for federal funding for fusion research in both Ontario and Quebec. There will also be cuts to the basic science program of Atomic Energy Canada Ltd., mostly in Ontario.

For a number of years the federal government has co-funded research and development of fusion, the national fusion program, in partnership with Hydro Quebec and Ontario Hydro. Recently the annual cost has been \$7.2 million for the Quebec part of the program and \$4.4 million for the Ontario portion.

More than 70 Canadian high technology companies and 6 universities have benefited and will continue to benefit well into the future from the fusion research program. As I mentioned, in drawing up the 1996-97 budget the government decided not to provide funds for research and development of fusion beyond March 1997.

The agreements among the partners stipulate one year's notice for ending contributions to the program. We have exercised that right. This provides for an orderly transition. The other partners have a year in which to make adjustments.

Hydro Quebec and Ontario Hydro have the option of continuing with the program independent of federal funding. Most of the industrial and commercial benefits of such work would be in Ontario and Quebec. If these provincial utilities consider fusion to be a priority it is reasonable to expect that they devote more resources to this priority.

As I mentioned in committee last week, I have asked my officials to facilitate discussions to help the utilities and other interested parties during the transition to seek alternative sources of funding. I make it clear again this afternoon that there will be no more funding from the Government of Canada.

Taxpayers would like the government to participate in many of the outstanding projects which merit public support, but informed and concerned taxpayers also know as never before that government resources are limited. They elected this government to make tough decisions. Our decision to terminate funding for fusion R and D is one of those decisions.

I believe I have established a solid argument that justifies the Government of Canada's decision to terminate federal funding for fusion R and D. The government is doing all it can to meet its overall priorities of addressing the deficit and improving the climate for jobs and growth. Meeting these objectives will provide substantial benefits for present and future generations of all Canadians.

We are determined to meet our objectives and we are making progress toward our objectives. We have identified clear and consistent criteria on near term goals to prioritize our spending and we are making the tough and necessary decisions keeping us on track to meet our deficit reduction targets and, as important, to meet our objectives in terms of encouraging jobs and growth.

The Government of Canada is making a substantial contribution to R and D in Quebec. I do not think anything could be clearer in light of the numbers I discussed earlier. Simply put, however, fusion does not meet our criteria but we are working on many other programs in the province of Quebec and all over the country that do meet our S and T criteria.

### *Supply*

This is not a regressive policy for R and D in Quebec. This is a policy with a clear vision to encourage jobs and growth for present and future generations of Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to what the minister had to say and my conclusion is that she would be well advised to find out more about Quebec. It is clear that she has been unable to identify accurately the difficulties facing Quebec, and in particular has failed to make the comparisons that must be made concerning investment in Ontario as opposed to Quebec.

• (1620)

I have two questions for her. Is the minister prepared to admit that, when Quebec and Ontario are compared, there really is a difference between research contracts awarded to federal laboratories? Does she agree, and on what figures does she base her answer? And if she does not agree, can she tell us why and on the basis of what figures? The first department to identify this difference was the Quebec Federal Office of Regional Development. It funded a study that mentioned a \$4 billion difference.

I think that the minister will have to agree with the official opposition's evaluation of R and D spending. Can the minister again tell us what she intends to do to find alternative funding, which can come from the National Research Council of Canada or the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council? These are, after all, organizations that give out grants and have budgets of close to \$400 million.

I would like the minister, out of respect for Quebec, for its scientific community, and for the R and D deficit it is assuming, to rise today in her place and promise, as she did before the committee, but to now do so clearly here in the House so that it really means something, and so that among our fellow parliamentarians we can keep our promises. I would like the minister to rise and tell us what she intends to do to find alternative funding so that we can save the tokamak facility. This is why we are here as the official opposition and I think that we are fulfilling our responsibilities. That is the only real way to defend the interests of Quebec.

[*English*]

**Ms. McLellan:** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows since he and I have talked about this on numerous occasions, I have undertaken to nominate someone from my department who will be available to work with other stakeholders, if requested, to find alternative funding for the Tokamak fusion project. I made that statement in committee last week. It is a policy which we pursue in relation to all areas where the federal government is withdrawing, changing or restructuring its role, and there is a transition period

*Supply*

involved. I will nominate that person. If that person is requested to participate in a multi-stakeholder project, so much the better.

I have to make it very clear, as I did in committee, there is no alternative funding within the federal government for this project.

I return to a point I have made before. Fusion research is not commercially viable at this point. However, fusion research is pursued for commercial applicability and there are some entities in this country that stand to gain much more than others if fusion research sometime in the future, in the next 30 or 40 years, does become commercially viable. Hydro Quebec is one of those entities. Ontario Hydro is another.

The Canadian taxpayer has incubated fusion research for some 20 years. The federal government and the Canadian taxpayer have spent \$90 million incubating fusion research in the province of Quebec and some \$42 million incubating fusion research in the province of Ontario. If fusion is a priority for these two provinces, for the two utilities or for other elements of the private sector, I suggest Canadian taxpayers have done their part. It is now time for others, for whom this research may provide direct economic gain in the future, to pick up the shortfall and make fusion research a priority.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to a point I made in my address, which was in reference to the letter from Professor Vincett stating that, contrary to all of the evolved countries in the world, Canada has not established a co-ordination policy. The professor said:

[English]

“As a result, action in one department can have a devastating effect on programs in another. I strongly urge you to establish an expert committee to report to you quickly on what such a co-ordinated policy should contain.

• (1625)

“In the meantime, to avoid unintended damage which could take decades to repair I appeal to you to provide at a minimum bridge funding to the centres involved until an integrated policy is in place or alternate financing has been found. If clear action is not taken in the next month or two, the researchers involved will take jobs abroad and our investment in most of these programs will be irretrievably lost”.

[Translation]

Such is the advice of a Canadian expert, the president of the Canadian Association of Physicists, which groups together 1,500 of Canada's top brains.

What does the minister have to say in reply? She received a copy of the letter, as did the Minister of Finance, as did the Secretary of State for Science, Research and Development, as did the Prime Minister, as did the Minister of Industry. What reply can she give us on this?

[English]

**Ms. McLellan:** Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the opinions expressed in that letter. Let me reiterate a point I have made before in the House. No one is suggesting the science that was done at Tokamak was not good science. No one is suggesting the people who have done that research are not fine scientists. That is not the issue here.

The issue is one of the appropriate role of the federal government. We need to consider and define that role in the context of the fiscal situation in which we find ourselves. Unfortunately it is not possible for the government to continue to do everything it has done in the past. It has become necessary, perhaps cruelly necessary, for the government to make very tough choices and to prioritize the limited funds we have available.

Therefore I return to the prioritization of our energy research that I outlined in the remarks I made a few minutes ago. We have determined our energy R and D priorities within the federal government: sustainable development, energy efficiency, renewable energy sources, the science of climate change and non-conventional hydrocarbon resources.

We also have to think about the nation. We are an energy rich nation, unlike some others. For example, our friends, the Japanese, have very few energy sources. Therefore it would make perfect sense for them to pursue research into an area like fusion. They are net importers of energy and therefore that becomes an issue of national security for them. They want to have within their country the means to be secure relating to energy production.

Canada is a net exporter of energy, whether it is oil, natural gas, hydro. The province of Quebec has tremendous hydro resources. It probably has some of the world's best research and development as it relates to the production of hydro power. We have wind, solar power. We have a wide variety of indigenous energy sources.

We need to do more research in relation to those energy sources. We need to understand the impacts on the environment of the extraction of oil, natural gas. We need to understand the effects of the development of hydro dams on surrounding areas, communities and indigenous peoples. We need to understand more about how we can use energy more efficiently.

We are a large nation with a very small population base. We use energy intensely to travel, to transport goods and people, to heat our homes in the worst conditions of winter. We need to spend a lot of our research efforts in relation to energy efficiency.

That is what we have done. Those are the priorities we have established based on our strengths and on our challenges. They are not the same priorities for other countries that do not have the wealth of energy sources that we have.

• (1630)

We have prioritized our energy research. We have thought long and hard about it. It was not capricious nor frivolous. We have to maximize the benefit of our limited resources for all Canadians. I believe we have done that.

[Translation]

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the catastrophic decision by the Minister of Natural Resources, namely the closure of one of the most outstanding of scientific projects, I would like to know whether the minister visited the Varennes installations before making her decision.

If not, would the minister agree, by asking the MP concerned to organize a meeting, to make an on site visit to the tokamak installations? Perhaps the minister is one of those people who learns best by seeing things, and she needs to actually go there. If she goes to the Varennes region and meets the people there, perhaps she will change her mind.

[English]

**Ms. McLellan:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows, based on our previous discussions which are always most enjoyable and vigorous, that I have not visited the facility, nor do I think it is necessary to visit the facility to establish the federal government's priorities in relation to energy research.

I have outlined why we have established the priorities. Those priorities are not based on this facility or that facility. They are based upon the energy strengths of the nation and our short to medium term energy research needs.

I thank the hon. member for his invitation and hope that sometime in the future—

**Mr. Bergeron:** If it is not closed.

**Ms. McLellan:** Let me just say that the decision rests in the hands of those who stand to benefit the most: the province of Quebec, Hydro Quebec and private sector companies.

To return to the point I made before, we cannot do all things. In the present fiscal situation we have had to make difficult choices.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member's has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow her to continue?

**An hon. member:** No.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the motion presented in the House today, rightfully draws attention to the fact that the government is guilty of yet again of acting against

### Supply

Quebec's interests. This time we are talking about inadequate funding for research and development in Quebec. The current imbalance between Quebec's demographic load and the amount of money invested in the province is really indecent. Quebec, representing nearly 25 per cent of Canada's population, receives a mere pittance from federal department coffers.

By way of example, Fisheries and Oceans Canada invests only 11 or 12 per cent of its research and development budget in Quebec. It is the same story with Transport Canada, which invests only 17.6 per cent of its research and development money there. We could name a host of federal departments, but I think it would be appropriate to describe the injustice we currently face in the riding of Verchères. I am of course talking about the forward looking tokamak project in Varennes.

Managed by the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion in Varennes, Quebec, this project is vital not only for the people in the riding of Verchères, not only for Quebecers, not only for Canadians, but for everyone in the world, in the long run.

I will explain. You know that the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion in Varennes has been trying for a number of years to develop a new form of energy that would not negatively impact the environment: nuclear fusion.

• (1635)

Within the context of international co-operation the likes of which probably have never been seen with countries like Japan, Australia, China, the member countries of the European Union, Russia, and so on, Canada is a partner, albeit it a very modest one, in the development of this form of energy. Since all the work is co-ordinated to avoid unnecessary duplication, each research centre around the world works on one aspect of the research and shares its knowledge with the others.

Canada therefore clearly benefits from international expertise in this area and from the resultant transfer of technology. Withdrawing from nuclear fusion research at this point may mean missing the boat when this form of energy starts to be used. This form of energy would come from nuclear fusion, not from the traditional nuclear fission which produces radioactive waste material.

For your information, let me tell you that the word "tokamak" is a contraction of the Russian words for toroidal chamber, which refers to the shape of the reactor bearing that name. But, now this large scale and forward-looking project, full of promise of a pollution-free future, may now disappear, at least in Canada, because of a lack of funding and, in fact, of a lack of vision.

Indeed, following the last federal budget, the Department of Natural Resources, which finances Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, which in turn finances the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion, announced that after March 1997, it would no longer finance this large scale program, cofinanced equally by Hydro-

*Supply*

Québec, the Institut national de la recherche scientifique and, of course, Natural Resources Canada.

This unilateral decision, without any consultation with the interested parties in this project, sends the message that this kind of joint project cannot work in Canada. Indeed, how can there be partnership or concertation, when one of the parties may withdraw at anytime, without warning, without explaining the reasons for its withdrawal, without any consultation?

The figures involved should be kept in mind. If this decision to put an end to the \$7.2 million funding is maintained, it will not be without consequences. New material for \$11 million will never be used. Twenty years of development and \$70 million infrastructures will be wasted. The minister was speaking earlier of an amount of \$90 million and she was crediting herself with it, but it must be understood that the federal government provides 50 per cent of the funding for the tokamak project. About 100 direct jobs will be lost, over half of them being highly qualified scientific or engineering positions, no to mention the indirect jobs generated by the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion.

This research centre does not operate in isolation. A study done in October 1995 by INRS Urbanisation showed that businesses and laboratories had developed new expertise after having been awarded contracts with the centre. It seems that 18 small businesses in Quebec have developed new high technology expertise that they did not have before. They all gained greater credibility as corporations following their co-operation with the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion.

Let us take one of the numerous examples of the spinoffs that co-operation with the centre can generate. One of the small corporations which worked with it, Technologies MPB, was awarded a \$62 million foreign contract thanks to the expertise acquired while working on the tokamak project. This is why I find it absurd and unreasonable to cut off the funding for such a structural project, despite the minister's explanations that these cuts come at a time of budgetary constraints.

I remind the House that we are discussing a project that costs the federal government only \$7.2 million, because there are other partners. And, speaking of budget cuts, last year, the federal government increased its funding to the TRIUMF project in British Columbia from \$19.3 million to 34.3 million, all federal money.

In Ontario this time, the federal government is maintaining the same level of funding for the ambitious neutrino research program in Sudbury.

• (1640)

While cutting \$7.2 million, in the name of fiscal restraint, from a structuring project which is sure to create jobs and generate new technologies, the federal government is sinking \$10 million worth

of taxpayers' money in a flag waving campaign. It is going to distribute flags and kites while cutting hundreds of jobs in Quebec. This is an outrage.

I see the minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development-Quebec. I hope he is taking note of the debate going on here today.

It is again in Ontario that the development of the CANDU reactor is taking place; the economic spinoffs of this project, which would be definitely less in Quebec than in Ontario, have not yet been established.

Fielding questions from the Bloc Québécois, the minister first said, in this House, that Quebec receives over 25 per cent of the regional R and D budget. The key word in this is "regional". The minister is referring to regional expenditures and, believe me, it is extremely difficult to understand what is included in this new accounting method the minister seems to have invented.

Having asked for explanations on numerous occasions, we finally learned that expenditures in the national capital region appeared nowhere. In fact, it is as if some kind of 11th zone had been created, an 11th region, 11th province for which all expenditures would be erased. We believe the minister is playing with figures dangerously because her method for recording her department's expenses shows some intellectual dishonesty and, thereby, a total lack of respect for Canadians and Quebecers.

What is certain is that the sums allocated to R & D in Ontario are considerably higher than those invested in R & D in Quebec. For example, again, a 1993-1994 list of all federal research centres in natural sciences and engineering shows that, in the National Capital Region, there are 40 centres and 6,138 jobs in Ottawa and its suburbs on the Ontario side. Compared to that, only two centres, and 111 jobs, are located in Hull.

If the Department of Natural Resources reflects the rest of the federal government, and we know it does, Quebec is definitely a loser in the area of amounts invested on its territory.

Fortunately, we have figures that depict a reality quite different from that of the minister. The Syndicat des professionnels scientifiques de l'Institut de recherche en énergie has shown that only 17 per cent of the R & D budgets of Natural Resources Canada are spent in Quebec.

If the department maintains its decision to reduce its share of financing and finally brings the Tokamak project to a close, that percentage will drop to 12 per cent only. If we include in these numbers the budgets of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, Quebec's share goes down to 8 per cent and, without the Tokamak project, it is reduced to 6 per cent, for a population that represents 25 per cent of the total population of Canada.

*Supply*

After looking at these numbers, it is easy to understand why such a wave of protest came from Quebec. All the people closely or remotely involved in the project have shown or have tried to show the federal government how illogical its decision was and have expressed their frustration and their inability to understand such an unacceptable decision from the government.

The Bloc Québécois was the first to ask the minister, in the House and in committee, about the reasons of her decision, which seems unjustified to us. The Quebec government even passed a motion unanimously on this federal decision on April 17.

We have seen the Quebec government join the Bloc Québécois to defend this important issue of the Tokamak project in Varennes, and even the federal Liberal Association of Verchères riding added its voice to ask the federal government to review this nonsensical decision. The Quebec and Canadian scientific community, which is generally very low-key, also protested against this absurd decision. Besides political interventions, we have seen all kinds of groups getting involved so the minister would reverse her decision—

• (1645)

**The Deputy Speaker:** Your time is up. We must now move to questions and comments.

**Mr. Bergeron:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**The Deputy Speaker:** On a point of order, but I hope it is not a request to speak longer.

**Mr. Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, I would merely need a minute to conclude. May I ask for consent to allow me to finish my speech?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to extend the hon. member's speaking time?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. members for allowing me to finish my speech.

Several associations, coalitions and municipalities in the riding of Verchères also believe that the minister's decision in this case defies logic. The scope of protests is striking. All 15 municipalities in the Société de développement économique de la Rive-Sud unanimously passed a resolution supporting the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion.

In Varennes, both the Corporation de développement économique and city officials passed resolutions supporting the tokamak project. Thinking that this sizeable support for the continuation of the project had woken up the minister, we were delighted to hear her undertake before the Standing Committee on Natural Re-

sources on May 30, to consider various options to find new sources of funding.

But yesterday, during question period, the minister seemed to indicate that she had not made any commitments. We could not believe that the minister would shamelessly go back on her word. She must be reminded of how important project tokamak is for future generations. That is why we feel the minister must do all she can now to correct this decision, this mistake, that her department should never have made in the first place.

Varennes' tokamak project is one of the few major energy development projects in Quebec to which Ottawa contributes. That is why the federal government must reconsider, to show that it is not totally lacking in vision as far as long term energy development is concerned.

**Mr. René Canuel (Matapédia—Matane, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke very passionately and with solid reasoning about the tokamak project. True, we did question the minister at the Standing Committee on Natural Resources to try to change her mind and make her understand that this project was very important for both Varennes and Quebec as a whole.

When the minister talks about 25 per cent of the research and development budget going to Quebec, she always excludes the national capital region yet, as you know full well, most of the research work is done in this region.

There are other very important issues relating to research and development. I, however, realize more and more that this centralizing government has no respect whatsoever for provincial jurisdiction. When it can take something away from Quebec, I would go so far as to say it takes great pleasure in doing so.

For many years, this government did not hesitate to use its so-called power to spend, which is more like its power to get us into a \$600 billion debt. There are some alarming expenditures. Spending \$2 million to celebrate Canada Day is all fine and good but, when jobs are being cut in regions with research and development facilities, especially in Varennes, it is unacceptable.

The government is ignoring the Constitution and getting involved, often despite the opposition of Quebec and the other provinces, in areas in which it has no business. There are areas it should never have stepped in. When the time comes to invest money, it gets cold feet. But at other times, it is only too happy to butt in.

Again, when the minister tells us that 25 per cent of the budget goes to Quebec, we very often ask her to give us some figures supporting her statement. The committee asked her to submit these figures in writing. We never received them. I am the Bloc critic on natural resources, and a Liberal member told me that Bloc members' comments are imbued with poetry. I am sorry, but I now want to produce some numbers.

*Supply*

• (1650)

In 1979, Quebec received 14.9 per cent of the federal funds allocated for research and development. Do you know what was Ontario's proportion? It was 53.4 per cent. I can give you the figures for 1980, 1981 and 1982. In 1980, Quebec received 15 per cent, compared to 53.9 per cent for Ontario. I will skip a few years, so as not to bore you.

In 1984, 17.6 per cent was awarded to Quebec and 47.9 per cent to Ontario. In 1988, it was 19.6 per cent for Quebec and 50.5 per cent for Ontario. In 1990, Quebec got 18.8 per cent and Ontario 50.8 per cent. In 1991, Quebec received 20.6 per cent and Ontario 49 per cent. On average, Quebec got 18 per cent during these years, while Ontario received 50 per cent. These are Statistics Canada figures, catalogue No. 88,001.

We are speaking on behalf of Varennes, and I am personally speaking on behalf of the Maurice-Lamontagne Institute, located in my riding, in Sainte-Flavie. The institute is a very modern facility where researchers from all over the world come to show fellow researchers what can be done in the fishery sector. They come to the Maurice-Lamontagne Institute to meet our researchers and to seek their advice, and the government wants to reduce its funding. Again, this is taking place in Quebec. Again, this is taking place in a rural community. We have the unique opportunity of having researchers in a rural community and the government is making drastic cuts.

Mr. Speaker, you will agree that this is not acceptable. Quebecers cannot understand such a measure. The government seems to take pleasure in cutting its support to institutions which are the pride of Quebecers, namely the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean, the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion, and the Maurice-Lamontagne Institute. If at least they were cutting assistance rationally and spreading the cuts over four or five years in order to help people recover, take stock of the situation and carry on. But no. Almost overnight, they say sorry and cut assistance everywhere. Perhaps it is true that they are cutting everywhere, but one would be mistaken in thinking that the amount cut is fair. It is not fair for Quebec. I just proved that, according to the figures for the 1979-1991 period, not one year only but over a full 13 year period, Quebec got 18.6 per cent compared to 50 per cent for Ontario.

However, we, in Quebec, have been spoiled in some areas. We have been spoiled with unemployment insurance that, since the new reform, I call poverty insurance. There are no jobs yet, as everyone knows, the contributions to this plan come from employers and employees.

I just came from a committee meeting, where the president of the Canadian forest producers was five minutes ago. He told me the way the eastern plan subsidies in Quebec had been cut—and this is the president talking—is completely unacceptable because the

forest industry in particular, an industry I know very well, is very profitable for the government. It is profitable in two specific ways: through taxes and income taxes collected and through the unemployment benefits that do not have to be paid out. The government does not have to pay for it, but we know the government seems to get upset when someone gets unemployment benefits, which is why it set such very harsh standards. Assistance for the forest industry has been cut.

• (1655)

Back home, in the community of Causapscal in my riding, a forestry school opened recently and is doing very well. I was just told that research is still carried out at that school. In Rimouski, we had a centre on the Eastern Plan, where new technologies were developed. Everyone came to see what was going on there and was delighted, the owner could see how many species he had on his property, what was going on, if the trees were mature or not, what forestry activities he could undertake and what he could expect over a five or six year period.

We also wanted to get involved in genetic research. As you well know, there is a lot of genetic research needed in the forestry area. Sometimes, more than one generation is needed before a tree can be harvested. A lot could be accomplished through genetic research. We started, but \$6.5 million were cut overnight and we were told that the Eastern Plan was a thing of the past.

As we know, research and development play a key role in the economy of modern societies. Everybody knows that. Since Confederation, Quebec has never received its fair share, never. This year, with all the programs being cut, what little Quebec has will again be reduced. I talked earlier about the Lamontagne Institute. That institute stands to lose 30 per cent of its subsidies and that is totally unacceptable. This is the only federal centre with such a mission in the province of Quebec.

I could quote numerous studies on this issue that prove beyond any doubt that Quebec has unfortunately been taken in, year after year. Some people tend to believe or want the rest of Canada to believe that Quebec is the spoiled child of Confederation. Nothing could be further from the truth.

If Quebecers are not given the opportunity to carry out research and development, they will come to understand that they need their own country to do what needs to be done. Then, they will be able to get involved in research and development and to hold their heads up high.

[English]

**The Deputy Speaker:** As colleagues may have noticed, the Reform Party missed its turn in the speaking order. I wonder if there would be a disposition to give consent to have the Reform member speak now before the two Liberal members speak.



*Supply*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing that change. I am sure their patience is conditioned by the fact that I have not yet given my speech. I am sure at the end of it they will have altered their opinion.

The motion before the House today reads:

That this House condemn the federal government for its regressive research and development policies in regard to Quebec, in particular its unilateral decision to cut the federal contribution of \$7.2 million planned for the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion in Varennes.

I am honoured to speak to this motion on behalf of my party. This is not my usual area of specialization. I will not speak long, but I have been asked by my colleagues from Okanagan Centre and Fraser Valley East, who know much more about this, to speak on their behalf.

What is the Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion in Varennes? Varennes is a very nice place on the south shore of Quebec, northeast of Montreal. I had the pleasure of being there last summer. It is a very nice community.

The Canadian Centre for Magnetic Fusion is a joint venture, funded by Hydro Quebec, Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. and the National Institute of Scientific Research. It carries out research in the field of fusion, which hopes to provide a source of energy using fusion of elements such as heavy hydrogen. This energy source is readily available and would provide pollution free energy. The problem is this technology is not commercially viable.

The project at Varennes has yet to produce energy because so far creating the reaction uses more energy than it gives off.

Financing has been provided thus far by the federal government and by the Quebec government. The annual provincial government budget is about \$14.4 million, where the federal portion is half of that, \$7.2 million per annum.

• (1700)

The most recent promised federal funding for the project was given in 1992 for five years. Therefore this funding has been all along set to expire in 1997. This has been understood from the beginning and there should be no surprise with these developments. There was a small reduction in federal support for this project to the tune of \$2 million per annum beginning in 1994.

On a worldwide scale the amount of federal spending on the project at Varennes amounts to about three-eighths of one per cent of worldwide spending in this area. This is an important fact to mention because these are projects where economy of scale is very important. There is a worldwide trend to cut much of this research.

Funding for fusion in the United States has dropped by about \$100 million per annum. The European Union project is about to undergo a review and will likely see some spending cuts.

The federal government in Canada, along with its partners, has put in over 20 years of money into this project, about \$70 million of infrastructure money, although frankly I and my party would doubt this equipment has held its value. I am quite sure the present value of this is significantly lower.

The Minister of Natural Resources has slashed Varennes funding but it is important to note this has been done along with similar cuts in other areas, also slashing the fusion program in Mississauga. We have seen other such cuts in western Canada. The KAON particle accelerator has been cut. A similar project, the ITER project in Ontario near Pickering, has not been funded, although in our view there is a possibility of considerable international investment at no cost to Canadians if that goes ahead.

There is in spite of this cut to funding an \$11 million upgrade now underway which can be viewed as either a complete waste of money or a giveaway to Hydro Quebec.

The Bloc Quebecois has raised the issue of cutting funding to Varennes is a very isolated issue. It has raised it in neither the broad context of science and technology policy in Canada nor in the broad context of regional fairness and regional allocation of development and other funds in Canada.

Instead, as is repeatedly the case, the Bloc Quebecois has raised this issue simply as a Quebec issue, pointing out that Quebec has been cut something and therefore we are making this an issue. This is repeatedly the role of the Bloc Quebecois in Parliament. Not that I dismiss all these concerns but I wish they were presented in a broader context. I think it would be much more helpful if they were analysed in a broader context.

I think sometimes there are reaches. Earlier today Bloc members suggest Quebec only gets its share of money if we count the Quebec portion of the national capital region. It escapes me why we would not count the Quebec portion of the national capital region, but that assertion was made.

Some of these general concerns, though, about federal priorities and how they impact the regions I think are value. Before I become more critical let me comment on that a little. There has been a view in the country historically, which my party has spoken about, that the central core of the country is its industrial engine and to treat the other regions of the country as simply markets and simply a source of cheap resources. This has been a longstanding pattern. It goes back to the foundation of the country and it continues at times to be reflected in federal policy, I think with some frustration.

*Supply*

In the Mulroney era that attitude was demonstrated in spades when the current regional development agencies were set up. At the time the Mulroney government had established the two major regional agencies in Atlantic Canada and western Canada.

We took some amusement at the original alignment of those agencies. The government announced the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency—the carefully selected word opportunity—coupled at the time with the minister of public works, a very traditional view of Atlantic Canada.

• (1705)

The western diversification initiative—keying in on the western word diversification—was put under the minister of grains and oilseeds at the time and funding for regional development in Ontario and Quebec remained with Industry Canada under science and technology. The symbolism of that spoke spades about the government's view of the country and its economic development.

There have been a lot of problems in these kinds of projects and these kinds of allocations. I have not seen recent analyses, but it was stated some years ago that companies that received western diversification initiatives were making contributions to the Conservative Party at the rate of 85 per cent. I suppose it is coincidental that all of the qualified companies were Conservative. I suspect that has changed since 1993.

If we want to take a broader view of resource allocation there are other examples where the grievances being aired by the Bloc today do not hold up.

In recent days the hon. member for Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia has pointed out that CIDA gives a huge percentage of its contracts and resources to companies based in Quebec. Seventy per cent of the top 20 CIDA contracts went to Quebec based firms. It also turns out that most of these firms were making donations to the Liberal Party. This is another trend. As I said, the government changes office and suddenly all the competence in the country seems to change partisan stripe as well. In 1995, 57 per cent of CIDA contracts were undertaken by Quebec firms.

I point this out not to say these Quebec members are not making reasonable grievances here, but I am not clear that this can be analysed in an isolated case by case context. We all know the airline and aerospace industry has been concentrated in Quebec with not insignificant federal government help in that outcome over the years.

I am not sure what the Bloc Quebecois is really suggesting with this motion other than to point out Quebec is not getting this project and that therefore this is injustice. I do not know what it is suggesting the solution is. We have never heard any suggestions from the Bloc Quebecois about a systemic solution. We have never

heard any suggestion that we would have, as was suggested by our party, published analysis by the federal government of its regional allocation to spending and taxation measures across various government departments. It is simply suggesting Quebec is not getting its fair share in this area. This is based on very specific numbers of dollars spent in Quebec specifically by Atomic Energy Ltd. of Canada.

Are Bloc members suggesting every province should have a nuclear reactor or fusion facilities? I do not think this is necessarily a realistic suggestion.

Let me make some concerns about how the Bloc is approaching these problems which it believes to be serious. I think with proper analysis we could reach a solution to these things. However, let us not forget whenever we hear one of these grievances about a Quebec project this is coming from a sovereigntist party. What exactly is it about sovereignty that would help this situation?

Let me make three concerns that I think would be raised instantly. First, sovereignty would reduce the economies of scale of Canada and Quebec. In economies such as these economies of scale in major advances of scientific and commercial research are very important. I cannot see how either Canada or Quebec would be better off with smaller economies of scale, which would result in these areas after separation.

Second, and I have pointed this out repeatedly, if Quebec were not part of Canada it would have no money whatsoever in these project areas from the federal government. It would be receiving nothing, zero. I think that needs to be repeated.

Sovereignists are using these projects as lamp posts rather than street lights; in other words, for support rather than enlightenment. I suggest that if the Variance project were to be funded that would not in any way change the inclination of the sovereignty movement to pursue its objective. Once again, I think this is a justification rather than a real motivation.

Finally, and I do have to ask this on behalf of my own constituents who ask this constantly, if the Bloc Quebecois raises concerns like this, and if it really wants to leave Canada and asserts that it will leave and furthermore will leave without any commitment to leave legally or without any commitment to pay its full 25 per cent share of the national debt when it does leave, why in the world would the federal government or other Canadian taxpayers want to make a long term capital investment in Quebec in any case? These are serious questions being asked in the rest of the country.

• (1710)

I conclude without dismissing the broader concerns entirely. I do not think they are addressed by the motion and obviously the Reform Party will not associate itself with the motion.

*Supply*

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have been listening carefully to the hon. member for Calgary West, a young man who seems quite reasonable and moderate in his remarks. Listening to him has helped me understand how true it is that we have two solitudes in this country, the French speaking community in Quebec and the English speaking community in the rest of Canada, two communities that do not understand each other.

I do not know if the hon. member is well versed in history, but if he knew the history of his country and of mine, he would know that Quebec and the other provinces which first founded this country invested a lot of money in the development of Western Canada. My colleague is from Calgary, Alberta, a province which is quite rich today, but was poor for a long period of time. Quebec, Ontario and other provinces invested a lot of money in the development of western provinces. Today, Alberta is rich.

My colleague should understand that Quebecers do not in any way resent the fact that western provinces are rich. We simply want our share. I have here figures on research and development that demonstrate conclusively that Quebec does not get its fair share.

Let me remind my colleague that Quebec taxpayers pay \$30 billion in taxes in Ottawa annually. We should also receive some money from Ottawa, and we do. Unfortunately, the money we receive is for welfare, because our province is now poor. Why? Due to the policies of the central government.

Canada is built in such a way that Ontario always gets the biggest piece of the pie, that is, 50 per cent of the research and development funds. Quebec has everything it needs to be as rich as Ontario, except an English-speaking majority. I will tell my hon. colleague that a minority that does not control its economy has to rely on the majority.

I heard him say: "Why, if they do not really want to separate, are they still making claims?" This is part of our mandate. As long as the Bloc Quebecois is in Ottawa, we will protect Quebec's rights. We, the 53 Bloc members, were sent here mainly to protect Quebec's interests. And, under the British system, we formed the official opposition.

I want to say to the hon. member that the claims we make are for ourselves, are not directed against Western Canada at all. I think Western Canada must also get its fair share and this is important but when we look at the figures, we see that Quebec received only 18.6 per cent of research and development monies from 1979 to 1991.

With this, which is more a comment than a question, I am trying to explain Quebec's history to the hon. member who may not know it. Perhaps he knows his own province's history.

● (1715)

We, in Quebec, took part in the development of Canada. What we want now is to get back the 24 per cent we contributed and not only social assistance and unemployment insurance. Cuts are made there also. We want what is rightfully ours. We are here to fight for Quebecers.

I do not have a question for my colleague but I would appreciate his telling us what he thinks about all that.

**Mr. Harper (Calgary West):** Madam Speaker, I believe the hon. member has expressed an opinion. I forgot that this is an instance, an incident, a cut that the Bloc Quebecois is taking, without any proof, as the representation of federalism in Canada and of the history of this country. I believe we need more than a single incident to prove a point.

The hon. member said there are two solitudes. I take note of his words. There are two solitudes: Quebec and the rest of Canada. The Bloc Quebecois feels it must defend Quebec's interests against the rest of Canada. It is a regrettable perspective, in my opinion, because I believe there are more than two solitudes in Canada. There are very different regions and perspectives in Canada, and that is why the Reform Party exists in the west. I believe it is difficult to represent the rest of Canada as only one bloc ready to attack Quebec. I believe this sovereigntist perspective is a rather simplistic and incorrect.

We recognize that the country started in the east. I admit that the east took part in the west's development. I do not quote the Prime Minister often, but the Prime Minister himself said that the rest of Canada and Quebec profit from the development of Alberta's tar sands. It is important to recognize it.

If we talk about the development of Quebec, we must make an analysis of the sovereigntist movement's impact in this development. If we consider the economic slow-down that occurred, especially in the last generation, we must ask ourselves if the sovereigntist movement helped or impeded economic growth in Quebec. I think it is obvious.

Mr. Bouchard went to the United States this week and, in order to attract investments in Quebec, he himself felt the need to assure Americans that he would not hold another referendum in the next few years. If the Bloc Quebecois is truly concerned about development problems in Quebec, the sovereigntist movement is not helping to solve this problem.

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for my colleague from Calgary West. I would like him to put himself in my place this afternoon and imagine that he is the hon. member for Saint-Jean, if only for one minute. I have a concrete example for him and it is not a sovereigntist example but an economic example.

*Supply*

Last year, the federal government decided to invest \$2 billion in armoured vehicles. It gave that money to a GM factory in London, Ontario, saying: "You are the Canadian centre of excellence for armoured vehicles".

Now, there will be a turret on the armoured vehicles and the Canadian centre of excellence for turrets is Oerlikon, in my riding.

• (1720)

I ask my colleague from Calgary what his reaction would be if he were the member for a riding which happens to be the centre of excellence for turrets and saw the contract given to a company outside his riding. That is negating the existence of an international centre of excellence. In Quebec, we foot 24 per cent of the bill but we get only 17 per cent back.

I am talking about research and development funds. Ontario received \$2 billion because it has a centre of excellence but our own centre of excellence, which could do its part of the contract, was told that it will get nothing. This is a typical example. How would the member react if he were representing a riding that was the victim of such an injustice?

[*English*]

**Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak in this debate. It is important that we focus on exactly what this is all about.

This is not about a fair share for one part of the country or a fair share for another part of the country. This is about governing. It is about the Minister of Natural Resources standing up to her obligations. It is about the Minister of Natural Resources doing her job. It is about the Minister of Natural Resources understanding that government is about setting priorities and acting on those priorities. That is what this decision is about.

It has nothing to do with one part of Canada getting this and another part of Canada getting that. This is an understanding. The Minister of Natural Resources, in conjunction with members of Parliament and with members of her department, have decided what is and is not a priority in terms of R and D in Canada. They have made hard and tough choices.

We are in a climate of fiscal restraint. We are in a time when government has to make choices. The minister has made sound choices. She has made good choices. She has made choices that are in the best interests of all Canadians, regardless of where they live from coast to coast to coast. That is what this debate is about. That is what this decision is about. It has nothing to do with fair shares in different parts of the country. When members opposite try to suggest that it is, I would suggest they are wrong.

Let us look at R and D in Canada and in particular that which comes out of NRCan. A great deal of it takes place all across Canada, including in the province of Quebec.

For example, there is a new research and development impact network that is going to be helping research organizations in Quebec measure the results of R and D. The network will refine and adapt tools for measuring the social and economic impacts of research and promote the exchange of best practices. This will enhance the ability of Quebec scientists and others to strengthen their contacts across Canada and around the world.

Another example is the national topographic data base. This is a mapping service developed by Geomatics Canada and based in Sherbrooke, Quebec. It provides sophisticated information on such geographical features as rivers, lakes, mountain ranges, vegetation, cities, railroads and roads.

Another example is Canada's network of model forests. It makes Quebec industry, non-governmental organizations and aboriginal groups partners in the sustainable management of forests. News about successful new techniques is shared quickly among all partners, including those in Quebec through an extensive information network.

There are many more examples. The government established the Canadian Space Agency in 1989 to promote the peaceful use and development of space for the social and economic benefit of Canadians. In June 1993 the space agency moved to St. Hubert, Quebec, bringing 350 high technology jobs to that province.

All of us in this House and across Canada take great pride in the visible accomplishments of our space program and the scientists who are in this Quebec based organization who support it.

• (1725)

This past week, we had the example of astronaut Marc Garneau returning from outer space, a Quebecer who demonstrates clearly that participation in this important program is from across Canada.

There are other examples. Let us turn to the mining sector. Mining is a big and important part of northern Ontario. The natural resource department undertakes its research across Canada, including in Quebec.

In mining, the department administers the mine environmental neutral drainage program, as an example. It was established in 1988. The program brings together a consortium to co-ordinate research into ways of reducing the impact on the environment of drainage from mining sites.

This is an important environmental concern. New methods have been developed to neutralize the effects of acids from tailings and waste rock. This research, which is carried out in co-operation with 20 mining companies across Canada, helps ensure that neighbour-

ing properties, lakes and rivers in Quebec as well as in the rest of Canada, can be protected.

Since 1989, a total of \$1.5 million has been spent or committed on the mine environmental neutral drainage program in Quebec by NRCan and a further \$650,000 is going to be spent in that province in the next few years.

Another important example is research in the area of energy, which is taking place at the energy diversification and research laboratory in Varennes, Quebec, a joint enterprise in association with the Institut de recherche d'Hydro Québec, Institut national de recherche scientifique, ABB, the international engineering firm and 20 other partners.

This facility has staff of almost 50 scientists, engineers and technicians and has an annual budget of almost \$6 million. The mission of the laboratory is to conduct applied research into energy efficiency, renewable energy and to do so in close co-operation with industry.

This facility, which operates in the province of Quebec, has a long list of achievements: the development of a high efficiency absorption heat pump designed for small commercial buildings, new catalytic gas combustion system with greatly enhanced efficiency and a new study on converting the conventional diesel system used in remote locations to a new hybrid photovoltaic wind diesel system.

What this demonstrates to the members of this House, to people from across Canada whether they live in Ontario, in British Columbia or the province of Quebec, is that the minister and the government do not make their decisions based on geography. They do not make their decisions based on trying to make an absolutely even equation so much in, so much out. That is not how Canada operates.

This demonstrates that the government undertakes its job, in this case research, across Canada. It does not make its decisions based on whether it makes sense geographically. It makes its decision based on what it should do. Does it make sense scientifically? Is it a Canadian priority? Is it a governmental priority given what the science and technology of the day is? Is it a priority that we can deal with in terms of the fiscal environment, the fiscal context within which we are operating?

That is what the government does. That is what the minister has done. To suggest somehow that this is a plot or some devious way of withholding funding from a province just is not so. It is not that at all.

I have clearly demonstrated that when we look at where we undertake this activity. It takes place in Ontario. It takes place in the west. It takes place in the maritimes and it takes place in Quebec as well. That is important for the people who live everywhere in Canada, including the people in Quebec, to understand.

### *Supply*

The suggestion that this withdrawal of funding is some sort of plot is simply wrong.

There are priorities today in research. Fusion research is something that could have great returns, but that is not going to happen for quite some time, 20 or 30 years in the future. The minister has had to make a decision based on what our priorities are today and based on our ability to have a return on that investment in the short term. That was an appropriate decision for the minister to make. It was an appropriate decision for the government to make.

● (1730)

I believe all Canadians should applaud what is being done here. We are making those tough choices that have to be made and we are allocating those resources in the best interests of all Canadians, regardless of where they live, from coast to coast.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I feel that the question I asked was an excellent one, but unfortunately there was no time to answer it. I am therefore leaping at the opportunity I now have to ask it again, but I shall adapt it in light of what the hon. member from Ontario has just said.

I do indeed have the statistics here. He claims geography is not important, that what is important is how the money is invested and what return there is on it. I would, however, just draw his attention to the fact that his province receives 50 per cent of all of these research projects, and Quebec only 18.6 per cent. That is just a coincidence. It is probably why he believes that geography is not important.

But I will take another tack, picking up on my example from before. There are several centres of excellence in Canada. Often the government states that it will give contracts to these centres of excellence. There is one such centre for armoured vehicles in Ontario, GM in London. As I said, these vehicles need to be fitted with a specific turret and turret gun. The other centre of excellence in Canada is Oerlikon Aerospace, which is in Saint-Jean.

I would ask whether he considers it fair that \$2 billion are being given to the centre in London, Ontario, which decides to have its turrets manufactured by its affiliates, which are in the U.S. moreover, with Delco getting some \$600 million, whereas the department ought to insist the turrets be manufactured at Saint-Jean. From the geographical point of view, then, I have trouble understanding how such an uneven distribution can be made.

As for expertise—and this is my question—why has the government not awarded the turret part of the armoured vehicle contract to Oerlikon? If the hon. member from Ontario were in my shoes, I think he too would be offended that things were being done this way. This is, therefore, one example related specifically to his address, in which he states that expertise and return on investment

*Supply*

are what count. Let him explain to us, then, why this was not the case with Oerlikon and GM in London, and the turrets.

[English]

**Mr. Mitchell:** Madam Speaker, I will give a broad response to that question.

Let us think about the model the hon. member is suggesting. We heard about this not too long ago in the House with respect to another matter. The hon. member is suggesting that if it makes sense to invest money in a particular part of Canada what we would have to do is say let us put that money there because it makes sense. Then, because we have to worry about geographic concerns and a claim saying it should have been somewhere else, we would have to invest similar amounts in Quebec, in the maritimes, in British Columbia and in the prairies simply to keep an equal balance because there would be a concern that one part of the country was receiving more than another part of the country. As an ex-banker I can say it would not take long with that kind of scenario for the country to become bankrupt.

If there is a \$2 billion project in Ontario that makes sense, the member is suggesting we would have to invest \$2 billion in Quebec, \$2 billion in the maritimes and \$2 billion in the west to keep everybody happy. We would have to spend \$8 billion to have a \$2 billion project.

That is not the way things will work. That is not the way they should work. It certainly is not the way the minister is to work. It certainly is not the way the government is to work.

I relate this to something I debated with a Bloc member in a previous debate. Think about a family. I know the Bloc may have difficulty with this, but Quebec is a part of the Canadian family. It is a proud part of the Canadian family. So is Ontario and so are all the other parts of the country. We are a family. We have been a family for 129 years and it has worked well. It has not been without problems, but it worked well. I am a parent and I have a number of children. We provide resources, not necessarily equally divided, but resources which are in the best interests of the family. We provide resources that move us forward. We provide resources based on the overall good of the family.

• (1735)

As a government that is what we are doing. We are providing resources in the best interests of all Canadians, making sound economic decision, sound investment decisions, decisions which make sense in the economic environment in which we find ourselves and that are good for Canadians, regardless of where they live in this great and united country.

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the debate.

I feel it is most important to put into context the decision of the government to discontinue the funding of the national fusion program. In program review, the most necessary examination of priorities of all programs, the government of Canada made some extremely difficult decisions.

As the minister mentioned, at Natural Resources Canada it was decided to give priority to research and development in energy which improve the efficiency of oil, gas and electricity and the development of renewable energy technologies such as biotechnology, solar and wind energy. Fusion does not come under any of these priorities.

To expedite the advancement of the strategic directions decided by NRCan the department is fostering the sharing of scientific knowledge throughout the country and working with parties in specific priority areas. I will provide some examples.

It uses the information highway to transfer high quality science and technology quickly to users. NRCan is making a major contribution to the highway by facilitating the supply and exchange of digital data organized and retrieved by geographical location. Such geo reference data are produced by a variety of government and industry sources. All are based on the fundamental systems created and maintained by the department.

NRCan works with the Government of Quebec and other provinces to define and develop the national spatial data infrastructure, this part of the information highway dealing with the management and exchange of geo referenced data. Called the geography lane, it covers all applications with significant geographic content. The department's geo route project also provides access to the network at the entry level for students, researchers and businesses for anyone in Quebec or elsewhere looking for geographical information.

The national atlas information service offers electronic samples of national atlas products and allows users to select a theme such as minerals, transportation or population density to create a customized map. The atlas is available on the Internet as a worldwide web site. The site won a gold medal at the 1995 technology in government week.

The department takes full advantage of the Internet to disseminate information. For example, anyone may obtain immediate access to national information regarding forest fires. A daily fire and weather index provides data crucial to controlling and managing forest fires in Quebec and across the country.

Partners and clients now have regular access to geo scientific data bases throughout the Internet and dedicated information centres set up in provincial facilities. Residents of Quebec may conduct searches, obtain reports and read public files. People are now buying maps via the Internet.

Internationally the department is strengthening its overseas links to create and expand markets for companies in Quebec and other provinces to improve access to foreign technologies and collaborate on global projects.

Canada works with other countries to develop international standards, scientific criteria and indicators and certification systems for global sustainable forestry. Without such certification fostered by NRCan Quebec forest products could encounter future trade barriers because of environmental requirements. As the leader of Canadian geomatics teams, NRCan is playing a strategic role in winning business abroad.

• (1740)

Most of these international projects involve Quebec firms. Under a \$22 million contract Quebec based companies are modernizing Mexico's national mapping system. The leader of this project is SNC Lavalin. Subcontractors are Photosur-Geomat of Montreal and Le Centre canadien de geomatique of Sherbrooke. Another two-year contract is underway in Saudi Arabia. With funding from the Canadian International Development Agency, the department is working with a consortium of Canadian companies on a digital mapping project in Russia.

Companies involved with projects in Russia include DMR Group of Montreal, Tecsum of Montreal and Roche of Quebec. Working in Romania are Tecsum, and Pro-Sig and Sima of Montreal. Other overseas projects where Quebec companies are providing leading technology are in Lebanon, Burkina Faso and Argentina. As part of the efforts to pursue the marketing of energy and technology abroad, the department is leading a hydro technology mission to Poland.

NRCan keeps Canada at the forefront of geoscientific research through active participation in the international ocean drilling program. Canadian proposals for deployment of a drilling ship have resulted in more than \$20 million of scientific drilling immediately offshore of Canada.

The department also provides administration for the International Union of Surveying and Mapping, an organization which provides a forum for exchanging science and technology information in geomatics.

Another example is an agreement with European community for the exchange of information on technologies in key areas of

*Supply*

mining, mineral processing, metals recycling, waste reduction and related environmental issues.

Natural Resources Canada communicates the importance of science and technology to students all across this great country of ours. The geomatics professional development program matches recent university graduates with potential leaders in Geomatics Canada in a two-year program. NRCan personnel receive an infusion of fresh ideas and innovations. The graduates gain valuable work experience. The industry obtains graduates who have been trained to apply the latest academic and scientific skills.

A new link of growing importance is SchoolNet, which connects more than 15,000 schools across the country via the Internet. NRCan provides maps, geography databases and community profiles. Through this network a school in Jonquiere could obtain detailed geographic information about Montreal or anywhere else in Canada. For one project, an atlas of Canadian communities, created in partnership with the Canadian Association of School Principals, youngsters collected maps, photographs and stories about their communities. These were compiled in an atlas, packaged on a compact disc and provided through SchoolNet.

Another program, the youth science awareness program for schools, is designed to develop interest and capabilities of youth in science and encourage the pursuit of careers in scientific fields. A junior energy program was aimed at children in grades four, five and six. "Conserving Energy in Canada" explains this important priority to grades seven to ten. Scientists from NRCan also serve as part time professors at universities, providing strong links between the department's research laboratories and students.

This is a short description of the many and varied ways Natural Resources Canada is meeting the scientific needs of a whole range of Canadians from each province, including Quebec society. This includes students from primary school through university, teachers and professors, researchers, scientists, technicians, public administrators, business people, those engaging in mining, forestry, energy and geo-science, public interest groups and environmentalists.

• (1745)

Natural Resources Canada is investing its limited resources to meet the most pressing, present and future needs in science and technology. As a science department of the federal government, Natural Resources Canada is amply fulfilling its mandate to serve the needs of all Canadians, ensuring the place of all Canadians in the future and prosperity of Canada.

In view of these many ongoing programs, directly and indirectly benefiting all Canadians, the difficult decision to end funding for the national fusion program was appropriate, wise and entirely in keeping with the best interests of all the people of Canada and Quebec.

*Private Members' Business*

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the remarks of my Liberal colleague. He recited a list of many things the government has done, a sort of litany that tells us very little about percentages.

In August 1995, the Quebec department of industry, commerce, science and technology produced a study on federal R and D spending. The main conclusions of the study, which analysed specific federal spending in this sector using a grid with a number of criteria, are that between 1979 and 1991, six provinces out of ten were overfunded in R and D.

Ontario, of course, was at the top of the list. For the last 10 years, it has received 50 per cent of the funding. According to the study, during the same period Quebec came last, with underfunding of \$2.5 billion, the amount it would have received if it had been treated equitably.

This study concluded that if federal funding had been equitable in 1991, the relationship between gross domestic spending on R and D and GDP, the indicator most often used to show the intensity of R and D effort, would have been higher in Quebec than in any other Canadian province.

The question I would like to ask my colleague is this: Can Quebec reach its full potential? In other words, by remaining in Canada, can Quebec hope to receive its fair share? We think it cannot. Recent history says it cannot. Quebec is not receiving its fair share.

As I was saying earlier, what we get from the federal government is social transfer payments. The central government has no policy for developing a specific region, as I see it, except that if you are part of the majority and you live in Ontario, you could care less. They say you should go where the getting is good, and the getting is almost always good in Ontario.

Does the member think that Quebec can hope to develop by staying within Confederation? I think not, and I would like the member to prove otherwise. If he cannot, this discourse that we have been listening to for 30 years and that is slowly but surely destroying us has got to stop.

[English]

**Mr. Kirkby:** Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for his question which is very specific and pointed.

Today we are talking specifically about funding to a particular project within Quebec, the magnetic fusion project. There has been some discussion about the amount of resources going to the province for science and technology.

• (1750)

I can assure the hon. member, coming from a province like Saskatchewan, that we are not overly financed in the area of research and development, probably less so than the province of Quebec. I believe this to be more than likely an accurate statement. It strikes me as being a bit like the hon. member complaining because he has no shoes. I am complaining because I have no feet.

The hon. member should keep all these things in perspective. Each of these different programs goes on in different regions across the country. Sometimes one area or another, for very legitimate reasons, will be a larger beneficiary of specific resources. However, after taking into account all the things the federal government does in all parts of the country, we are all well served.

When the maritime provinces have a need, the government is there to assist in meeting the need. As well, the people of other provinces share in meeting that need. It is the same with the province of Quebec. When there is a need in that province, people from the rest of Canada are there to assist in meeting that need. However, the people in Saskatchewan receive next to nothing in research and development dollars.

When taking into account all of the benefits we have in being Canadian, I am very proud to be a Canadian citizen. I am proud to be part of a country that cares about every region, where we share our wealth one with other so we all can benefit.

At different times in our history different provinces have had needs. Before oil was discovered in Alberta, it needed help from the rest of country and received that help. Now Alberta is helping other areas of the country.

When we look back over our history all regions of the country have needed assistance from time to time and all regions of the country have received it. When we consider our history and all of the difficulties and challenges that the different regions have had, we have all been well served by Confederation. As a result of this kind of caring, sharing and working together, I can say that I am very proud to be a Canadian.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** It being 5.53 p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that proceedings on the motion have expired.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### REFERENDUMS

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should, in accordance with international law, be willing to consider negotiating with any secessionist claim in the event of a future referendum, if and only if the following criteria are met: (1) the secessionist unit be comprised of a "people" meeting international standards;



(2) the people must have been subject to a denial of political freedom or human rights in a discriminatory manner; (3) the seceding unit must demonstrate in practical terms that it has and can create a practicable and governable state which can assert effective control over a reasonably well defined territory; (4) a clear and precise question is asked as to whether the population in question wishes to secede from Canada; and (5) two-thirds of the population vote in favour of the clear and precise question.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to introduce Motion No. 206 today. This motion would be unnecessary if the government had had a plan to deal with the national referendum issue that still haunts us to this day.

• (1755)

The national unity issue that we thought would be finished at the end of last year is unfortunately in front of us once again. The separatist leadership in Quebec continues to pursue a course and is trying to carve up this beautiful country that we know as Canada. The separatist politicians in Quebec are trying to seduce the population in Quebec, to try to lead them to the holy grail of separation.

The purpose of this motion is to put forward some terms of secession, some identifiable groundwork for the criteria for secession. What is patently evident from last October 30 is that the federal government did not have a plan A or a plan B. It did not have a plan if it was a yes vote and did not have a plan if it was a no vote. Sadly, after discussions in the House over the last two weeks and on questioning the government, it has repeatedly demonstrated that it still does not have a plan as our country moves inexorably toward the edge of a cliff of separation.

I have put forward Motion No. 206 in which I have tried to use the criteria under international law that is commonly respected throughout the world. The premier of Quebec has said that international law will be respected over internal law. The Prime Minister has said that international law will be respected. The attorney general of Quebec has said the same thing. No one has defined what it is in international law that allows an area to secede.

That is what Motion No. 206 is all about. It states that an area in Canada can secede if it meets the following five criteria: (1) that the secessionist unit be comprised of a "people"; (2) these people have been subject to a denial of their political freedom or human rights in a discriminatory manner; (3) the seceding unit must demonstrate that they can create a government; (4) that a clear and precise question be asked; and (5) that the question be passed by a two-thirds majority.

Those are the terms of secession. Those are the criteria which are required if the international community is going to recognize a new

### *Private Members' Business*

country. It is being applied all over the world. It was applied in the case of Czechoslovakia. The Slovak Republic could not secede from Czechoslovakia because it could not meet these criteria.

If Quebec or another part of this country wishes to secede it will have to fulfil these five criteria also. If it does not then it will not be recognized as a country in the international community.

I am appalled that the government chose not to make my motion votable. Incidentally, this is the only OECD country in the world that has non-votable private members' motions. What a waste of time and money. It costs the taxpayer \$25,000 an hour to keep this place open, and for what? I caution the government in the future to be democratic, give members the power to represent their people and make these private members' motions, all of them, votable.

This motion came from the lack of desire, will and courage by the government to demonstrate and define for the Canadian people what it takes to secede. Does Quebec meet the five criteria that I mentioned? Let us take a look.

Part of the criteria is that the rights of the people in Quebec have to be abrogated. They claim that their rights have been abrogated. They claim that somehow they became second class citizens. One can only become a second class citizen if one allows it to happen. I am completely fed up with the whining that takes place from the separatist politicians and I know the members of this House are also.

Let us take a look at the facts. Are Quebecers second class citizens? Have the people of Quebec had their rights abrogated? For 24 of the last 26 years the prime ministers of this country have been Quebecers. Three out of the ten supreme court justices are from Quebec. Quebec's separate civil code is respected by the rest of the country. Quebec is allowed to have its own pension plan. It has opted out of the CPP. It is tolerated by the rest of Canada.

• (1800)

Let us take a look at the cold, hard economics. Members of the Bloc have said that the people of Quebec have not received their fair share. Let us look at the facts.

Since 1972 the province of Quebec has received \$2.6 billion, at least, in excess of what it has paid out. From 1961 to 1991 the province of Quebec has received net transfers of \$160 billion, funded by the rest of Canada. It is funded by the same part of Canada the separatists believe they are being abused by and treated as second class citizens. If that is being treated as a second class citizen, count British Columbia in.

*Private Members' Business*

Firms have been encouraged to operate in Quebec. Eighty-five thousand people in Quebec work in federal government jobs. A further 25,000 work in Ontario. Is that second class citizenship? Is that having their rights abused? I challenge anybody to name another country in the world where the people are supposedly having their rights abused because they receive economic and constitutional benefits. Those are the facts that Quebec has had to endure.

I ask the separatist politicians who keep complaining about their lot in life as a part of Canada to put themselves in the shoes of those living outside Quebec. They should put themselves in the shoes of the people who live in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario or Newfoundland. How do they feel about having to give their tax dollars to Quebec? That is a measure of tolerance. What we have seen in this whole debate is a measure of great intolerance. If we demonstrate that, this country will surely fracture.

What has been the response of the separatist politicians in Quebec? What did they do after the referendum? They blamed their defeat on the immigrants. They closed down hospitals in the immigrant populated areas of Montreal. That was not by accident; it was done deliberately to drive out the immigrant population that voted for a united Canada. That is absolutely disgusting.

Imagine a bill similar to Bill 101 being implemented in Ontario or in British Columbia. The people of Quebec and in fact non-English speaking people would be absolutely furious, and rightly so. It is discrimination.

That has been the response of the separatist politicians in Quebec to the non-francophones in that province. Is that care and consideration? Is that showing tolerance? Is that showing understanding? Is that trying to build a united country that is fair to all its members? I think not.

I presented Motion No. 206 because of the muddled, unco-ordinated approach made prior to the referendum by the federal government. Its lack of understanding continues to spiral on the national unity issue. I want to add an element of understanding and define the rules of the terrible game we are playing.

What must we do to keep Canada together? The first thing is the Prime Minister has to understand that the separatist leadership has no interest whatsoever in being a part of Canada. The separatist leadership wants only one thing: a separate country called Quebec. If we recognize that, then we also have to accept the fact that negotiating with the separatists will not keep this country together. The Prime Minister can stand on his head and spit distinctive society clauses all he wants but it will not keep Canada together because the separatist politicians do not want to be in Canada.

• (1805)

What must the Prime Minister do? He has to go directly to the people with a plan for a new federalism. He has to build bridges of tolerance and understanding between the people of Quebec, not the politicians, and the rest of Canada. He has to build bridges of tolerance and understanding between Quebecers themselves.

A few weeks ago I was in Montreal for a national unity rally and I was shocked, saddened and appalled. There is a polarization between the yes and the no sides. These individuals are reacting violently toward each other. Bridges of understanding are not developing.

The Prime Minister must go into Quebec with all members of Parliament who want to keep the country together and bring forth a plan for a new federalism. It must involve a decentralization of powers to the provinces including Quebec. By decentralization I do not mean making a weak federal government, but being intelligent about it. Powers should be given to all the provinces in areas that they can manage more efficiently and cost effectively. We should keep within the federal government in Ottawa the powers that a strong federal government can manage better. That is for the sake of all Canadians.

The Prime Minister has to dispel the myths which have developed between the separatists and people in the rest of Canada. In the last referendum half of the people who voted yes believed they would still have Canadian passports. They believed they could send members of Parliament to this House. They believed they could use the Canadian dollar. They believed they would be part of NAFTA and that business would continue as usual. That is a complete distortion of the truth.

In Mr. Bouchard's speech on television on October 26 he stressed in English that the vote was about sovereignty and the rest of Canada must be prepared to recognize the results. In French he emphasized that the offer of political and economic partnership be made to the rest of Canada. Those are two very different ideas on the same very important topic. This has to be dispelled. The Prime Minister must outline very clearly to the people of Quebec what separation means and dispel the myths coming forth from the separatist politicians.

Mr. Bouchard likes to say that the economic situation in Quebec is going to be better than it is currently with Quebec as part of Canada. That is simply not true. Before the referendum his own financial analyst said that in the event of separation the people of Quebec would suffer dire economic and social consequences. That information was deliberately suppressed by the separatist leadership in Quebec. The Prime Minister must explain in no uncertain terms to the people of Quebec the consequences of separation.

The premier of Quebec likes to say that the people in an independent Quebec would enjoy a situation such as exists in Europe under the Maastricht treaty. The fact is the Maastricht treaty would provide Quebec with less monetary and fiscal control

than what it has today. In fact, I cannot see an independent Quebec taking its monetary and fiscal orders from Ottawa but that is exactly what a Maastricht treaty would provide for a separate Quebec.

• (1810)

I fear if the national unity issue is left up to the politicians, Canada is going to fracture. The Prime Minister has muddled through this issue. He is not prepared to lay it on the line, not only to the people in Quebec but also to the rest of Canada. If he believes he can muddle through this, if that is what his advisers are telling him, he is dead wrong because this country will fracture.

The Prime Minister must deal with the people and work with all other politicians in this House. He must go into the trenches. He cannot stay in Montreal and Quebec City and deal with the separatist media there and expect to get his message across. He has to go eyeball to eyeball, flesh and blood, right into the rural areas of Quebec. He must meet with the people, understand their concerns and get the good ideas from Quebecers. He must address their concerns and their needs to preserve their beautiful language which is an integral and important part of the Canada we all know and love.

It is important to preserve Quebec's distinctiveness and culture. If the Prime Minister gives the responsibilities of language and culture to the province of Quebec, then Quebecers are going to be the masters of their own cultural and linguistic destinies. Whether their language and culture survive will be entirely up to them. Personally, I deeply hope they do because they enrich all of us.

The Prime Minister must also understand that if he is going to put forth ideas that are somehow unequal and are only for the people of Quebec and not for other Canadians, he faces the risk of having other areas in Canada fracture and separate.

British Columbians are absolutely fed up with pandering to Quebec. They want equality for all people. They want Quebec to stay in Canada because from the bottom of their hearts they believe that the culture, language and contributions Quebec and Quebecers have made are invaluable to the definition of our country. Quebec's beautiful language and culture enriches us all.

British Columbians do not want Quebec to stay in Canada as a group with special privileges and special laws and regulations that the rest of Canada does not enjoy. One of the problems we see in the world is that any time one group is given special privileges over another, disunity rather than unity is created.

The Prime Minister will have to show a great deal of statesmanship if he is going to keep this country together. It could be his legacy if he is effective in doing that. He must put a plan together on the national unity issue. I encourage him to look at the Reform

### *Private Members' Business*

20-20 plan which has a plan A and a plan B. It has a sensible plan on the devolution of powers from the federal government and the separation of powers for all the provinces.

We need to bring Canadians together. We are standing at a crossroads. The Prime Minister must lay down the guidelines for secession. I hope he uses this motion to define the terms of secession for the people in Quebec and outside Quebec. He must state the consequences of secession for all Canadians. He must include all MPs in this House. He must define and describe a new federalism. He must dissipate the intolerance that is taking place within Quebec. Mark my words. The intolerance that is brewing now is going to ultimately boil over in violence. That is not Canadian. If he does not realize it, I challenge him to go back on the streets and find out.

I challenge people across the country, inside and outside Quebec, francophone and anglophone, to put themselves in their neighbour's shoes and understand where they come from. Together and united, we will build a stronger future for all of us. We must use our differences with respect and understanding to build a stronger country for all of us.

• (1815)

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, Motion No. 206 proposes that in the opinion of the House the government should establish conditions for secession.

The government has been persuaded that the hon. member introduced this motion with the best of intentions. The prospect of Quebec's separation, while not imminent, is certainly real. However, when he refers to the concept of distinct society as special privileges and refers to violence we fear that he shows the Reform Party's lack of understanding of the issue.

*[Translation]*

This past October 30, a majority of Quebecers said "no" to separation. Some of us hope that Canadians will not be confronted with the spectre of the secession of Quebec. Unfortunately, the Bloc Quebecois and its secessionist allies are the ones who refuse to recognize Quebecers' wishes.

Last month, Premier Bouchard stated in the National Assembly: "If Canada rejects our outstretched hand, if Canada wants to impose vetoes on us, wants to keep us within Confederation against our will, we will withdraw by proclaiming sovereignty unilaterally. We have the right to do so, and we are going to exercise that right". Premier Bouchard did us a favour when he made that statement because he made his true intentions very clear. We must take Mr.

*Private Members' Business*

Bouchard at his word. The Government of Quebec has matched this statement with legal action.

[*English*]

Premier Bouchard did us all a favour when he made that statement because he made his true intentions very clear. We must take Mr. Bouchard at his word. The Government of Quebec has matched those words with legal action.

Quebecer Guy Bertrand is a founding member of the PQ. Mr. Bertrand says he became convinced of the tolerance of Canada and the benefits for Quebecers within Confederation when he realized Canada would allow a separatist party to sit in the House as the loyal opposition. So convinced was he that he decided to take the Government of Quebec to court.

Mr. Bertrand hopes to force the provincial government to explain to Quebecers how Quebec could be taken out of Canada with only a magic wand and to expose this charade for what it is. The Government of Quebec is trying to have Mr. Bertrand's case dismissed.

The provincial government told the Quebec Superior Court that the Constitution of Canada would not apply if Quebec seceded. Canadian courts would have no jurisdiction. That is an extraordinary statement coming from the government of a Canadian province.

Consequently the government understands some of the thinking and shares some of the concerns expressed on these issues in the House and elsewhere. It understands why the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca drafted the motion we are debating today.

However, while the federal government understands and is facing these challenges it is at the same time committed to acting in the best interests of all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

The Government of Canada has made its position very clear. In the throne speech in February, we renewed before Parliament our commitment to rise to the challenge of Quebec secession resolutely and with renewed energy and commitment.

First and foremost, the government has put into place a true program of reform, a program that will be ongoing. Certain measures have, in fact, already been presented by the government and debated in this House, including the distinct society resolution, the regional veto, and the transfer of manpower training to the provinces.

However, given the long term objectives of Premier Bouchard, the federal government also promised that: “—as long as the prospect of another Quebec referendum exists, the Government will exercise its responsibility to ensure that the debate is conducted with all the facts on the table, that the rules of the process

are fair, that the consequences are clear, and Canadians, no matter where they live, will have their say in the future of their country”.

[*English*]

The federal government has shown its resolve in response to a reply to the motion filed by the PQ government in the Bertrand case.

• (1820)

Let me restate what the federal position is not. The federal government does not agree with Mr. Bertrand on many things. The federal government does not wish to interfere with the capacity of the provincial Government of Quebec to call a consultative referendum on any subject, including separation. The Minister of Justice and other have been very clear on this matter before the House and Canadians.

However, before the results of any referendum were used by a secessionist government as a political mandate to leave Canada, at a minimum the federal government would insist the question be clear and the consequences explained to voters. All participants in the debate among Quebecers would have to understand the fundamental consequences of their actions.

Were this mandate ever achieved, Quebec would not have a right to secede unilaterally. There is simply no legal foundation for this under either Canadian or international law. This is not new or a surprise. Quebec's own commissions and inquiries have been consistently told the same thing many times.

Some would argue so what, how can the law keep people in Canada? If the people speak, if the people choose, what is the law if not the will of the people? Would not a law seeking to deny people this fundamental right somehow be anti-democratic? That line of reasoning is deeply flawed. The rule of law is not an obstacle to change but provides a framework for change.

The rule of law would allow secession to take place in an orderly fashion and to preserve important protections for all. If we begin as governments or citizens to discard the rule of law what remains would be chaos where we make up the rules as we go along, where we set aside protections in the law, where at best we would enter into an unknown, and that is not what Canadians want and not action the federal government, any federal government, would ever support.

[*Translation*]

Canada cannot remain united if some of us say clearly, in response to a clear and fair question, that we want to leave Canada. After all, Canada is built on values of compromise and tolerance promoting our national identity.

Since 1867, we have shared the burdens and the joys of nationhood. We have gathered together the fruits of this country, which many describe as the best in the world.

In this same vein of tolerance and compromise, however, Canadians would insist that any secession would have to be by negotiation and not unilateral. This is the objection of the federal government and many Canadians to the route chosen to date by Mr. Bouchard and other secessionists.

Canada can be divided. It is certainly no prison. No one is forced to remain a Canadian or in Canada, but, at the same time, no one should have their rights denied arbitrarily, without due process of law. If Quebec were ever to secede, 30 million Canadians would expect, and no one would demand, that the governments would move beyond their differences, find a common ground and continue to create an environment favourable to all.

[English]

The hon. member's motion touches on some of these themes. It may even use the federal government's statements to date as inspiration, but Reform would go further and faster than the federal government chooses. The federal government has made its approach clear and it stands by those decisions.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Madam Speaker, before speaking directly to Motion M-206, I would like to set the record straight regarding an aberration often heard in this House. It originates with the member who moved Motion M-206, the member for Esquimalt—Juan-de-Fuca. He said something to the effect that nearly only in Canada, a beautiful and democratic country, are sovereignist groups allowed to have a say.

• (1825)

I would like to remind him, just in case he does not know, that in Belgium there is a right wing Flemish party, called Vlaams Blok, which promotes independence for Flanders. Out of 150 members sitting in Parliament, 11 advocate independence. In Italy, the Northern League has sent separatist members to the Parliament. They number 59 out of 630. In Spain, there are three separatist sovereignist parties. Taiwan and the United Kingdom also have sovereignist parties. Canada is not the only country where this is allowed. This is democracy.

If there is something totally undemocratic, it is Motion M-206. If you were to ask me to describe this motion in a few words, I would tell you that it is useless, it lacks intellectual rigour and is provocative.

It is useless, because when you read it, you see it has only one purpose, namely to impose the will of the majority, not of Quebecers, but of Canadians, on Quebecers. This is not the first time we have said this, and I will say it again very calmly, Quebec

### *Private Members' Business*

sovereignty will be decided by Quebecers alone, not by English Canada, not by the rest of Canada. Quebecers will decide.

This motion does not make any sense, especially when everybody uses the expression the "people" of Quebec. Even the Prime Minister, last week, answering a question I had put to him, used the expression the "people" of Quebec. Everyone in this House, except perhaps for a few Reformers and a few Liberals sitting in front of me but who would probably feel more comfortable sitting beside me with Reform members, recognize that Quebecers are a people.

It is obvious that the secessionist unit is comprised of a people meeting international standards, as stated in the motion, but it is also obvious that Quebecers are a people. So this motion is unnecessary in that regard.

This motion lists five criteria, and I will go over each of them. The first criterion is that the unit be recognized as a people. This is unnecessary, as everyone in this House recognizes that we Quebecers are a people. We also showed in the last referendum that we were a responsible people, since we proposed the term "partnership", which is very fashionable these days in the House.

I am not saying that we invented it, but I think it was the first time the term "partnership" was used in this House. The Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister then turned around and used it at every opportunity. All this to tell you that we are a responsible people and that we have already proposed a few things.

The motion says that the government should consider negotiating with any claim. Again, this is unnecessary because, if the hon. member had followed the referendum campaign a little more closely, he would have seen that this is in the standards, in the concrete measures proposed by the Bloc Québécois, the Parti Québécois and all the sovereignists in Quebec. They propose that some things be negotiated to benefit Quebec, of course, but also the rest of Canada. There are major issues to be negotiated.

The third criterion in this motion is also quite ludicrous and unnecessary. I think this motion is wasting the very valuable time of the House. I would also say that, on the basis of the points I raised earlier, this motion lacks intellectual rigour. Indeed, this motion addresses several issues, including democratic rights and international law.

This motion makes a grab for powers vested in legislative assemblies, as—and I think the hon. member did not make any secret about this—its sole purpose is to prevent Quebecers from voting again on their future, or at least to try to put up roadblocks by imposing an endless selection process. All this just for Quebec, to grab powers belonging to the Quebec National Assembly, among others, to try to subvert set rules and to interfere with the political judgment of a people.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1830)

I think that these are extremely important criteria and that trying to legislate and put them down on paper results in the kind of nonsense we have here in Motion M-206.

I also smiled when I read the second point, which says that “the people must have been subject to a denial of political freedom or human rights in a discriminatory manner”.

If I am not mistaken, until there is evidence to the contrary, Canada is a democratic country. I think that everyone agrees to say this is one of our finest values, to which the people of Quebec, Ontario and the other provinces have all contributed. Correct me if I am wrong, but it is the democratic people of Quebec who will achieve sovereignty and, similarly, it is the democratic people of the rest of Canada who will negotiate a partnership with the newly-formed country called Quebec.

It is also to lack intellectual rigour to try, through a motion, to interfere with the judgment passed on the wording of the referendum question. I am referring to here to item 4 of the motion, which states: “a clear and precise question is asked as to whether the population in question wishes to secede from Canada”.

If anything was made clear in the last referendum, this was it. The issue of sovereignty has been discussed extensively, and not just since 1995. I can remember, when I was elected in 1993, making speeches on sovereignty and promoting Quebec's independence; that was part of my mandate. Come on, this is really to ascribe to us intentions we do not have.

The question will be clear. In fact, it was clear. But the important thing is that it is not up to the federal Parliament, to the Ontario Legislative Assembly, or to other provincial legislature to phrase the question. It is up to the Quebec National Assembly, as in the case of Newfoundland. Indeed, referendums are not held only in Quebec. Over the years, some also took place in other provinces. Never did the federal government, or a provincial government, interfere in the process.

In 1948, Newfoundland joined Confederation with 52.34 per cent of voters supporting the idea. Did anyone claim it was not enough? If we can join Canada with 52.34 per cent of voters supporting the idea, we can certainly leave it with the same number. The Avalon peninsula said no to Confederation in a proportion of 67.18 per cent, but eventually joined it. There was no talk of partitioning.

As you can see, this motion lacks intellectual rigour, to say the least. More importantly, it is pure provocation. To say that 66.6 per cent of the population must vote in favour of sovereignty is to provoke Quebecers. In the last federal election, some members in this House got elected with barely 35 per cent of the votes. Do we

question their legitimate right to represent their riding? No, because this is democracy.

When democracy speaks, there is not a parliament, an MP, or a constitution that can oppose the will of the people. This is what democracy is all about.

Motion M-206 goes squarely against this principle. Fortunately, it is not a votable item and we will not see how many Reform members, and perhaps Liberals members, would have been tempted to support it. We would have voted strongly against the motion.

[English]

**Mr. Nick Discepolo (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I had a prepared speech, but after listening to the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca I think I had better throw half of it away because I want to address several of the points he touched on.

I tried desperately during his presentation to extract the positive elements of his intervention.

• (1835)

If we are to solve the Canadian unity problem, it will not be by adopting such a motion. It will be by having dialogue. I would like to have a dialogue with the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

One positive element of his speech, despite the Reform Party's lack of understanding of Quebec's needs and problems, was the language the distinctive culture in Quebec. He touched on the valuable contribution that Quebecers have made to the creation of this country. However, I still have serious doubts because when it came time for the Reform Party to recognize that great language and culture that make Canada unique and the efforts of Prime Minister in response to the passionate plea we made on October 27, the member and his party voted against the government's efforts to recognize Quebec's distinct society and the regional veto.

We are on a dangerous treadmill. This is what I want to point out to the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. When he uses words like intolerance and violence they preoccupy me immensely. The member from the Bloc Quebecois implied the motion is provocative and may induce violence, that is exactly what I fear.

The member also said his province is fed up with pandering to Quebec, again another form of intolerance, another form of showing we are not open to dialogue.

Prior to the referendum premiers were begging Quebecers passionately, saying “we will work hand in hand with you, your aspirations and concerns are our concerns”. However, the member today measured his province by how much we benefit in economic terms from the federation and how Quebec is being pandered to and how people are fed up with always responding to Quebec's demands.

I remind the hon. member we made concessions to accommodate provinces when they joined Confederation. We made a concession for his province of British Columbia. We promised British Columbians: "Join our family and we will build you a national railway". That dream was realized in 1892, contributed to by the many immigrants who came to this country to help build that dream.

I ask the hon. member where would British Columbians be if that national dream had not been realized. Would the prosperity the province realizes today have been realized? I doubt it.

We made concessions for P.E.I., the smallest province of Confederation. We said: "Join our family and we will make sure you are represented in the House of Commons and the Senate and we will build you a fixed link". Quebecers paid for that national railway and for the fixed link. Quebecers did not say "where is our fair share"?

I am disappointed the member is not here. I believe if we are to solve the Canadian unity problem we must show respect for each other and have dialogue and understanding. I ask Reform Party members, who are now suddenly showing up in Quebec, being political opportunists, receiving petitions in my riding and other ridings, that if they are sincere why were they not involved in the unity debate during the entire referendum? Where were they?

They talk about their 20-20 vision. I think this motion is unfounded, very dangerous and very intimidating.

• (1840)

[*Translation*]

Therefore, our government supports co-operation with the provinces and all our partners in order to develop new approaches and find constructive solutions.

The Government of Canada does not intend in the slightest to promote confrontation, as is suggested in this motion, because it could undermine the renewal of federalism and especially our social harmony.

We want to unite Canadians, not divide them. We have launched a process of national reconciliation and federation renewal. We have taken some concrete measures by implementing initiatives to restore the balance within our federation, to reinforce our economic union and enhance our social solidarity and to further define the devolution of powers, just like the hon. member himself wanted us to do.

Canadians outside Quebec are open-minded and try to draw closer to their fellow citizens in Quebec, by recognizing that their differences are what makes our country's strength. If we work together to ensure our federation goes forward and meets the

### *Private Members' Business*

expectations of Canadians, we will have reached our goal without having to hold another referendum on secession.

We believe we can work constructively with the Government of Quebec, given the open-mindedness shown by Premier Lucien Bouchard, as we do with all the other provincial and territorial governments. It is our duty, our responsibility.

The next first ministers conference will deal with restoring the balance within our federation. It will give the federal and provincial governments the opportunity to discuss the priorities Canadians want us to set. This is why the motion put forward by the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca seems inconsistent with our government's action plan. And this is why I do not support this motion and I urge my colleagues not to support it either.

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, Motion M-206 brought forward today by my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca says that the government should establish beforehand five specific conditions with regard to any secessionist claim.

I can understand why this motion is being debated. I can even say that, in a sense, I agree with my colleague from Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca that the unilateral secession of any province is totally unacceptable.

Let me remind the House that the government was quite clear on that. We went to court to defend the rule of law. The federal government's intervention before the Cour supérieure du Québec is the direct result of the motion presented by the Government of Quebec. It claims that the secession of Quebec does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Canadian courts or the Constitution and that it is solely a matter of international law.

The matter is now before the courts and a ruling will be made at the appropriate time. In the meantime, we are concentrating, as we have always done, on issues of interest to all Canadians, namely the economy, employment, growth, the renewal of the federation, equality, social justice as well as national reconciliation, which the Reform Party obviously has no interest in.

Far from creating an environment favourable to national reconciliation, the positions adopted recently by members of the third party underline the fundamental issues that divide them.

When did our colleagues from the Reform Party contribute to the debate with positive arguments, constructive solutions? Instead, they seem to be on the path of division and confrontation.

While conditions for secession seem to be "the" main concern of Reform members, our government has clearly indicated its priorities in the throne speech. We are focusing our efforts on positive action that will prepare Canada for the challenges of the new millennium.

*Private Members' Business*

Economic prosperity, employment, equality, social justice and national reconciliation, these are the issues of concern to Canadians. These are also the priorities established by our government.

● (1845)

During the first half of its mandate, the government took some measures to set economic and budgetary conditions that would foster sustained growth and job creation. It undertook a major administrative reform, reduced the deficit, and took some trade and international investment initiatives.

It is in this context that, since it assumed power, our government has created more than half a million jobs and reduced the unemployment rate by two points, so that, for the first time in five years, it is under 10 per cent.

Thus, our government has made major changes in the past two years and it continues to put forward the measures announced in the throne speech to improve the workings of the Canadian federation. In this regard, let me remind the hon. member of the initiatives on which our government is focusing.

First of all, our government promised to limit its spending power in exclusively provincial areas. Never before has the federal government offered to limit its powers outside formal constitutional negotiations.

Moreover, at the request of its provincial counterparts, the government says that it will not create any shared cost program in sectors under provincial jurisdiction, without the agreement of a majority of provinces. Non participating provinces implementing such a program will be compensated. We believe that, with such co-operation and openness, we will promote Canadian unity.

Secondly, our government is determined to find new avenues for cooperation with provinces to maintain national standards in social programs without imposing conditions and without unilateral implementation. It must be reminded that our social programs guarantee all Canadians access to comparable levels of service no matter where they live. That is what our government's commitment to social solidarity means.

Thirdly, the government took the commitment to define more clearly the responsibilities of the different levels of government. This is done in cooperation with the provinces. We began withdrawing from areas which are more directly the responsibility of the provinces, municipalities and other stakeholders.

In this regard, the proposal put forward last week by our colleague, the human resources development minister, is a concrete example of the fulfilment of a major commitment for our government and for most of the provinces, which had been seeking increased authority over manpower training for a long time. The announcement also signals a new co-operation between both levels of government in the area of manpower training.

Therefore, provinces, if they wish, will be able to have their own programs of employment measures, such as wage subsidies, income supplements, job creation partnerships as well as manpower services such as employment counselling and job placement.

This is a practical example of the ability of federalism to adjust to the claims of its various partners and to the regional needs in the best interests of Canadians everywhere in Canada. We are also continuing with our plans to withdraw from a number of other activities, such as forestry, mining and recreation.

Fourth, the federal government will continue to promote economic union. In order to ensure greater protection for individual and common interests, our government has undertaken to work in concert with the provinces, in order to reduce obstacles to internal trade and manpower mobility. We are also proposing to create, in co-operation with the interested provinces, a Canadian Securities Commission that will facilitate the circulation of capital.

Fifth, the federal government is in favour of including in the Canadian Constitution a regional veto and recognition of the distinct identity of Quebec.

Finally, on the question of conditions of secession, which seem to be the Reform Party's main preoccupation, the government has indicated that it would ensure that the rules regarding the question and the consequences of secession are clear for everyone, which was obviously not the case in the referendum last October 30.

I would like to remind the House that the next first ministers' conference is part of that process for the modernization of the federation. That meeting will be the perfect opportunity to examine ways to improve the workings of our federation and to bring about the changes that all Canadians want.

Here is how our government intends to revitalize the Canadian federation: by proposing some positive answers to the concerns of Canadians, in an atmosphere of co-operation, dialogue and respect. This is also how we should, and we will, implement a more harmonious federation based on a larger consensus.

Therefore, we ask the Reform Party to join in with the federal government, in order that we may work constructively towards the renewal of the federation, as all Canadians want us to do.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. This item is dropped from the Order Paper.

The House stands adjourned until next Monday at 11 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 6.51 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. JIM SILYE

## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

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 .....	Nunatsiaq .....	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.
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 .....	Ind.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	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.
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.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphoné-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.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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, Hon. 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.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.
Harper, Stephen	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
Hoeppner, 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
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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 .....	Ind. 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
Nunziata, John .....	York South — Weston .....	Ontario .....	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D. ....	Labrador .....	Newfoundland .....	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat .....	London — Middlesex .....	Ontario .....	Lib.



Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Quebec	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 and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage	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, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	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	Hamilton East	Ontario	

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.

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE**

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
<b>ALBERTA (26)</b>		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Ref.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Ind.
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.
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)</b>		
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, Hon. 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
<b>NEWFOUNDLAND (7)</b>		
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Lib.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Lib.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
<b>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)</b>		
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiak	Lib.
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
<b>NOVA SCOTIA (11)</b>		
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.
<b>ONTARIO (99)</b>		
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.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Lib.
Bélangier, 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.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	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	Ind. 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	Hamilton East	

#### 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
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Lib.
Discepolo, 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



Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ
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.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ

#### 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
-------------------------	-------	-----





## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Chairman: Joe McGuire**

**Vice-Chairmen: Yvan Bernier  
Derek Wells**

Diane Ablonczy Gerry Byrne	René Canuel Harold Culbert	Ted McWhinney Lawrence D. O'Brien	Mike Scott Harry Verran	(11)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------------	------

### Associate Members

Vic Althouse John Cummins	Ron Fewchuk Fred Mifflin	Jean Payne 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 Jag Bhaduria Bill Blaikie David Chatters	Maud Debien Jack Frazer Beryl Gaffney John Godfrey Herb Grubel	Jean H. Leroux John Loney Ron MacDonald Gurbax Singh Malhi Keith Martin	Ted McWhinney Val Meredith Rey D. Pagtakhan Janko Perić Paddy Torsney
--	--	---	---

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

**Chairman: Bill Graham**

David Iftody	Bob Mills	Philippe Paré	Paddy Torsney	(5)
--------------	-----------	---------------	---------------	-----

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

**Chairman: John English**

Colleen Beaumier	Maud Debien	John Godfrey	(4)
------------------	-------------	--------------	-----

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

**Chairman: Michel Dupuy**

Sarkis Assadourian	Ron MacDonald	Charlie Penson	Benoît Sauvageau	(5)
--------------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	-----

## 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 Dan McTeague	(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

Antoine Dubé  
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  
John O'Reilly  
Bernard Patry

Svend J. Robinson  
Roseanne Skoke  
Rose-Marie Ur

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS

**Chairman:** John O'Reilly

Sharon Hayes  
Réal Ménard

Pat O'Brien  
Bernard Patry

Svend J. Robinson  
Paul Szabo

Rose-Marie Ur  
Joseph Volpe

(9)

## HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

**Chairman:** Maurizio Bevilacqua

**Vice-Chairs:**

Jean Augustine  
Francine Lalonde

Warren Allmand  
Christiane Gagnon  
Daphne Jennings

Dale Johnston  
Ian McClelland  
Larry McCormick

Robert D. Nault  
Pat O'Brien  
George Proud

Geoff Regan  
Anna Terrana  
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy  
Chris Axworthy  
Leon E. Benoit  
Bonnie Brown

Jan Brown  
Gerry Byrne  
John Cannis  
Marlene Cowling

Paul DeVillers  
Wayne Easter  
Jim Gouk  
Herb Grubel

Réal Ménard  
Maria Minna  
Svend J. Robinson  
Andy Scott

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Chair:** Sheila Finestone

**Vice-Chairmen:**

Maurice Bernier  
Andy Scott

Sarkis Assadourian  
Jean Augustine

Sue Barnes  
Daphne Jennings

Russell MacLellan  
John Maloney

Ian McClelland  
Réal Ménard

(11)

### Associate Members

Chris Axworthy  
Robert Bertrand

Sharon Hayes  
Audrey McLaughlin

Philippe Paré  
Svend J. Robinson

Roseanne Skoke  
Myron Thompson

**INDUSTRY****Chairman: David Walker****Vice-Chairmen: Nic Leblanc  
Tony Valeri**Morris Bodnar  
Pierre Brien  
Bonnie BrownEd Harper  
Tony Ianno  
Walt LastewkaPhilip Mayfield  
Réal Ménard  
Ian MurrayWerner Schmidt  
Alex Shepherd  
Roseanne Skoke

(15)

**Associate Members**Peter Adams  
Pierre de Savoye  
Nick Discepola  
Jay HillKaren Kraft Sloan  
Ghislain Lebel  
Peter Milliken  
Andy MitchellJohn Nunziata  
Denis Paradis  
Yves Rocheleau  
John SolomonDarrel Stinson  
Paul Szabo  
Len Taylor**JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS****Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen****Vice-Chairs: Paddy Torsney  
Pierrette Venne**Diane Ablonczy  
Judy Bethel  
Pierre de SavoyePaul DeVillers  
Nick Discepola  
Roger GallawayArt Hanger  
Gordon Kirkby  
François LangloisJohn Maloney  
Jack Ramsay  
Derek Wells

(15)

**Associate Members**Chris Axworthy  
Jag Bhaduria  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Paul Forseth  
Patrick GagnonJim Gouk  
Stephen Harper  
Sharon Hayes  
Jay Hill  
Gar KnutsonDerek Lee  
Val Meredith  
Bob Mills  
George S. RideoutSvend J. Robinson  
Bernard St-Laurent  
Myron Thompson  
Randy White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY****Chairman: Derek Lee****Vice-Chairman: George S. Rideout**

Nick Discepola

Gar Knutson

François Langlois

Val Meredith

(6)

**LIAISON****Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair: Albina Guarnieri**Reg Alcock  
Eleni Bakopanos  
Maurizio Bevilacqua  
Raymond Bonin  
Charles CacciaMary Clancy  
Shaughnessy Cohen  
Sheila Finestone  
Patrick Gagnon  
Michel GuimondGhislain Lebel  
Clifford Lincoln  
Joe McGuire  
Andy Mitchell  
Jim PetersonRoger Simmons  
Lyle Vanclief  
David Walker  
Paul Zed

(21)

**Associate Member**

Jack Frazer

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET****Chairman: Jim Peterson****Vice-Chairman: Paul Zed**Sheila Finestone  
Jack Frazer

Bill Graham

Michel Guimond

Andy Mitchell

(7)



## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Chairman:** Michel Guimond

**Vice-Chairmen:** Denis Paradis  
Andrew Telegdi

Sue Barnes  
Pierre Brien  
Rex Crawford

Ivan Grose  
Leonard Hopkins

Charles Hubbard  
Yves Rocheleau

Jim Silye  
John Williams

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Jag Bhaduria

John Bryden  
Mac Harb

Ed Harper  
René Laurin

Ian McClelland  
Alex Shepherd

## TRANSPORT

**Chairman:** Reg Alcock

**Vice-Chairmen:** André Caron  
Joe Comuzzi

Gerry Byrne  
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk  
Ed Harper

Charles Hubbard  
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes  
Paul Mercier

(11)

### Associate Members

Vic Althouse  
Leon E. Benoit  
Ivan Grose

Dick Harris  
Jake E. Hoepfner  
Ovid L. Jackson

John Maloney  
Philippe Paré

Bernard Patry  
Elsie Wayne

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Joint Chairman:**

**Vice-Chairman:**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc  
Philippe D. Gigantès  
Maurice Riel

Peter Adams  
Roger Gallaway  
Jim Karygiannis  
Philip Mayfield

Paul Mercier  
Pat O'Brien  
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

### Associate Member

Ted White

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Joint Chairmen:** Sen. Jean-Louis Roux  
Patrick Gagnon

**Vice-Chairmen:** Jean-Paul Marchand  
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin  
Marie-P. Poulin

Jean-Claude Rivest  
Louis J. Robichaud

Warren Allmand  
Eugène Bellemare

Cliff Breitzkreuz  
John Godfrey

(12)

### Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye



## SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairmen:** **Sen. P. Derek Lewis**  
**Ghislain Label**

**Vice-Chairman:** **Derek Lee**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Doris M. Anderson  
Michel Cogger  
Normand Grimard  
William M. Kelly

Shirley Maheu  
Pietro Rizzuto  
Nicholas W. Taylor

Gilbert Fillion  
Mac Harb  
Gar Knutson

Dan McTeague  
Tom Wappel  
Ted White

(16)

---

## SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

### A CODE OF CONDUCT

**Joint Chairmen:** **Sen. Donald H. Oliver**  
**Peter Milliken**

**Vice-Chairs:** **Sen. Jean-Robert Gauthier**  
**Suzanne Tremblay**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

W. David Angus  
Peter Bosa  
Consiglio Di Nino  
Mira Spivak  
Peter Stollery

Don Boudria  
Marlene Catterall  
Ken Epp  
Mac Harb  
François Langlois  
René Laurin

John Loney  
Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Carolyn Parrish  
Bob Ringma  
Ray Speaker  
Paul Zed

(21)

---

**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. 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 and Acting Minister of Canadian Heritage
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, June 5, 1996

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Occupational Health and Safety</b>	
Mr. Proud .....	3481
<b>Marriage</b>	
Mr. Thompson .....	3481
<b>National Transportation Week</b>	
Mr. Crête .....	3481
<b>Mining</b>	
Ms. McLaughlin .....	3481
<b>Student Employment</b>	
Mr. Regan .....	3482
<b>Muskoka Air Fair</b>	
Mr. Mitchell .....	3482
<b>Quebec Premier</b>	
Mr. Patry .....	3482
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mrs. Guay .....	3482
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	3483
<b>Via Rail</b>	
Ms. Augustine .....	3483
<b>Newspapers</b>	
Mr. Jordan .....	3483
<b>Research and Development</b>	
Mr. Pomerleau .....	3483
<b>Employment</b>	
Mr. McClelland .....	3484
<b>Fixed Link Project</b>	
Mr. McGuire .....	3484
<b>Reform Party Convention</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	3484
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	3484
<b>ORAL QUESTION PERIOD</b>	
<b>Cuba</b>	
Mr. Gauthier .....	3484
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3485
Mr. Gauthier .....	3485
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3485
Mr. Gauthier .....	3485
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3485
Mr. Sauvageau .....	3485
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3485
Mr. Sauvageau .....	3485
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3485
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Hermanson .....	3485
Mr. Goodale .....	3486

Mr. Hermanson .....	3486
Mr. Goodale .....	3486
Mr. Hermanson .....	3486
Mr. Goodale .....	3486
<b>Information Highway</b>	
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	3487
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3487
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	3487
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3487
<b>Labrador Power</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	3487
Ms. McLellan .....	3487
Mr. Strahl .....	3487
Ms. McLellan .....	3487
<b>Somalia Inquiry</b>	
Mr. Jacob .....	3488
Mr. Collenette .....	3488
Mr. Jacob .....	3488
Mr. Collenette .....	3488
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Mr. McClelland .....	3488
Mr. Young .....	3488
Mr. McClelland .....	3488
Mr. Young .....	3489
<b>Regional Development</b>	
Mrs. Venne .....	3489
Mr. Cauchon .....	3489
Mrs. Venne .....	3489
Mr. Cauchon .....	3489
<b>Indian Affairs</b>	
Mr. Harper (Churchill) .....	3489
Mr. Irwin .....	3489
<b>Employment</b>	
Mr. Thompson .....	3490
Mr. Goodale .....	3490
Mr. Thompson .....	3490
Mr. Goodale .....	3490
<b>Family Trusts</b>	
Mr. Guimond .....	3490
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	3491
Mr. Guimond .....	3491
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	3491
<b>Oath of Citizenship</b>	
Ms. Meredith .....	3491
Mrs. Robillard .....	3491
Ms. Meredith .....	3491
<b>Reproductive Technologies</b>	
Mrs. Picard .....	3491
Mr. Dingwall .....	3491
<b>Nigeria</b>	
Mrs. Gaffney .....	3492
Mr. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	3492
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Williams .....	3492

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3492
<b>Goods and Services Tax</b>	
Mr. Riis .....	3492
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3492
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	3492

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Report of the Chief Electoral Officer</b>	
The Speaker .....	3493
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	3493
<b>Environment Week</b>	
Mr. Marchi .....	3493
Mrs. Guay .....	3494
Mr. Strahl .....	3495
Mr. Taylor .....	3496
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Industry</b>	
Mr. Walker .....	3497
<b>Business of the House</b>	
Mr. Gagliano .....	3497
Motion .....	3497
(Motion agreed to.) .....	3497
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Public Accounts</b>	
Mr. Boudria .....	3497
Motion .....	3497
(Motion agreed to.) .....	3497
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Allmand .....	3497
<b>Impaired Driving</b>	
Mr. Regan .....	3497
<b>Raw Milk Cheese</b>	
Mr. Lebel .....	3497
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	3497
<b>Alcohol Consumption</b>	
Mr. Szabo .....	3498

<b>Endangered Species</b>	
Mr. Kirkby .....	3498
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Kirkby .....	3498
<b>Age of Consent</b>	
Mr. Malhi .....	3498
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	3498
<b>Questions Passed as Orders for Returns</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	3498

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Supply</b>	
<b>Allotted Day—Research and Development Policies</b>	
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	3499
Motion .....	3499
Mr. Ménard .....	3501
Ms. McLellan .....	3503
Mr. Ménard .....	3505
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	3506
Mr. Ménard .....	3507
Mr. Bergeron .....	3507
Mr. Canuel .....	3509
Mr. Harper (Calgary West) .....	3511
Mr. Leroux (Shefford) .....	3513
Mr. Bachand .....	3513
Mr. Mitchell .....	3514
Mr. Bachand .....	3515
Mr. Kirkby .....	3516
Mr. Leroux (Shefford) .....	3518

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Referendums</b>	
Motion .....	3518
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	3518
Mr. DeVillers .....	3521
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	3523
Mr. Discepola .....	3524
Mr. Patry .....	3525
<b>Appendix</b>	



**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**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

---

**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.**