



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 059 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Tuesday, June 11, 1996**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

## OFFICIAL REPORT

Pursuant to order made May 14, 1996, page 2773 of *Hansard*, the address of the President of the United Mexican States is appended to 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

Tuesday, June 11, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### CFB GREENWOOD

**Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row an Aurora crew from CFB Greenwood in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants has won the Fincastle Trophy.

At a recent competition in New Zealand our Canadian contingent beat out crews from Australia, Great Britain and New Zealand in a competition testing the surveillance skills of maritime patrol crews.

As well, the Aurora crew won the Fellowship Trophy, awarded for teamwork and professionalism, and the Maintenance Trophy for professionalism and dedication to duty.

I am extremely proud of the accomplishments of these Canadian Armed Forces members. They are excellent ambassadors for our country. I believe their achievements are representative of the teamwork, professionalism and dedication to excellence Canadian forces are known for both at home and abroad.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### MEXICO

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the visit to Canada of the President of Mexico, Mr. Ernesto Zedillo. I am delighted that Canada and Mexico enjoy such excellent relations. There has been a remarkable increase in economic exchanges under NAFTA, notably those with Quebec.

The two governments need to take advantage of this meeting to reiterate their rejection of the American Helms-Burton bill, which creates a dangerous precedent. What is more, Mexico and Canada must continue to join battle against drug trafficking and to develop effective economic, social and environmental policies to improve the standard of living of our populations.

The Bloc Québécois acknowledges Mexico's efforts to get out of its economic crisis, and we hope the Mexican people will be able to reap the benefit of those efforts as soon as possible.

\* \* \*

[English]

## AGRICULTURE

**Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker:

Farmer David Sawatsky had just won his case,  
The court said: "Hey, wheat board, get out of his face",  
The feds used French law because they say we are bound,  
But Sawatsky stood strong and held his ground.  
But only forty-five minutes is the time that it took,  
For the minister and his cronies to rewrite the book,  
Now back to court the grain farmer must go,  
And fight for his rights to sell the seeds he had sown.  
Again he will try to beat these Goliaths of gaff,  
Give farmers freedom—get out of their path,  
This is the nineties and the Liberals should know,  
That producers want change, so the monopoly must go.  
When will these old Grits give farmers a say,  
Just look to Alberta—they voted for yea.  
"I promise a plebiscite", came from the aggie minister's chops,  
Another broken Liberal promise—maybe he should join Sheila Cops.

\* \* \*

## NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the president of Mexico's address to Parliament has given the Liberals one more chance to sing the praise of the NAFTA, the free trade agreement they were elected to oppose.

Canadians who were suspicious about the NAFTA during the last election still ask who really benefits from the NAFTA. Ordinary Canadians? No, wages have not been falling fast enough for investors so Canadian manufacturing jobs continue to move to low wage Mexico. Just ask the workers cast off at Kenworth in Montreal.

Have ordinary Mexicans benefited? No, their standard of living was decimated after the peso crisis and, as reported today by the Inter-Church Committee on Human Rights in Latin America, human rights abuses continue to plague the political system, and not just in Chiapas.

New Democrats speak for those who want to build a North American prosperity that is widely enjoyed by all the citizens of our countries, not only by the financial markets. At the very least the Canadian government needs to press the Zedillo government to respect human rights. The NAFTA needs an enforceable code of

*S. O. 31*

labour rights and enforceable environmental standards that would hold up a basic standard of responsible corporate citizenship.

\* \* \*

#### THE LATE STEVE NEARY

**Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin—St. George's, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when former Liberal leader Steve Neary died in his sleep last Friday, Newfoundland lost a renowned native son, the poor and the downtrodden lost their most passionate champion, and I lost a close friend.

Steve Neary gave a lifetime to public service. As a labour leader and then as a politician he quickly earned a deserved reputation as a populist and a communicator.

When I first went into politics Steve was one of my mentors. His straight talk, his uncanny ability to get right to the heart of an issue with lightning speed and his disdain for people who take themselves too seriously made me an early convert to his brand of politics.

Steve's unblinking courage, his stubborn persistence, his unwavering loyalty and his non-stop love of life will be his legacy to us.

Steve, we miss you already.

\* \* \*

#### VIA RAIL

**Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kitchener representatives of the local branch of Transport 2000, notably George Bechtel and Mary Pappert.

Yesterday morning I had the pleasure of accepting letters from them which express concern for the maintenance of VIA Rail service to Kitchener and the potential impact its privatization may have in the area. Residents have long held the belief that its rail service is essential to the life of our community.

Clearly the local representatives have demonstrated an important role for ensuring VIA service to the area. Indicative of this was a recent promise from Terry Ivany, president of VIA Rail, assuring us of its continuation, which is excellent news for Kitchener.

While the Government of Canada proceeds with downsizing and streamlining, I am extremely encouraged by the efforts of Kitchener's local branch of Transport 2000. Much of what has been achieved thus far in retaining train service would not have been possible without its help.

Whatever the final outcome on the issue of rail service, I assure our friends at Transport 2000 that our combined efforts in both Kitchener and Ottawa will ensure for the future a viable and effective rail service to the area.

\* \* \*

#### PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS

**Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it was exciting to witness yesterday's presentation by the President of the Treasury Board of 12 awards of excellence to federal employees for their ingenuity, courage and service beyond the call of duty.

Lives were saved and missing children were reunited with their parents. Financial savings were achieved, as well as international renown and market access, forensic application of DNA analysis, merging of human resource and business plans, and partnership to preserve aboriginal heritage.

Ms. Flora Beardy from the Department of Canadian Heritage, a Manitoban, is one of the awardees. Her diligent documentation of the aboriginal history at York Factory, Manitoba gives an aboriginal perspective to the largely European accounts of northern Manitoba history.

● (1405)

Ms. Beardy and the other awardees richly deserve the appreciation of the Canadian citizenry and the gratitude of the House.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### QUEBEC REFERENDUM ACT

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Quebec's directeur général des élections has laid formal charges against certain private corporations and members of the Liberal Party of Canada, for offences against the Quebec Referendum Act on the occasion of the mammoth no rally last October 27. In English Canada, some Liberal MPs are expressing the opinion that freedom of expression is in jeopardy because of the charges laid by the DGE.

I would remind the House that the Quebec legislation does not prevent freedom of expression. On the contrary, in fact. The present debate again raises the question of the justification of limiting third party expenditures during the time leading up to elections, and their impact on the outcome on voting day.

How would English Canada react to a Quebec citizen's spending like there was no tomorrow in order to influence the results of a provincial election? Must it be pointed out that even the Canada Elections Act limits election expenses? This attack by English Canada against a Quebec law is just one more illustration of its double standard.

S. O. 31

[English]

**LIBERAL PARTY**

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has often portrayed the Reform taxpayers budget as slash and burn policy, but this accusation only reflects the government's attempt to mislead Canadians.

The real facts of this matter are these. Hidden in the Canada health and social transfer, the Liberals intend to chop billions in transfers to the provinces over the next four years: a \$3.3 billion cut to health care, a \$1.3 billion cut to education, a \$1.7 billion cut to social services.

Reform's taxpayers budget, however, recommended reductions to health care of only \$800 million; education, \$200 million; social services, \$2.5 billion. That is a total of \$2.8 billion less than the Liberals will cut.

Now you tell me, Mr. Speaker, who is slashing and burning Canada's social programs? It is the Liberals who are putting the country's most cherished and valued social programs in danger.

\* \* \*

**PETER BOSA**

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week it was my privilege to table a report of the Canadian IPU group about its activities at the interparliamentary conference.

[Translation]

I would like to pay tribute today to the leader of our group, Senator Peter Bosa.

[English]

At the Istanbul conference Senator Bosa was presented with the order of merit of Italy, known as the Grande Ufficiale della Repubblica Italiana, awarded by the president of Italy, Luigi Scalfaro.

[Translation]

This honour, similar to our Order of Canada, was awarded to him in recognition of his services in the advancement of multiculturalism.

[English]

Prior to becoming a senator in 1977 Senator Bosa was the chairman of the Consultative Council on Multiculturalism. He is the founder of the chair in Canadian-Italian Studies at York University as well as the Canada-Italy Parliamentary Friendship Group. It is nice to see someone honoured this way.

[Translation]

Our sincere congratulations.

[English]

**YOUTH**

**Mr. Tony Valeri (Lincoln, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1996 I had the pleasure of hosting another workshop in my riding of Lincoln, this one focused on the challenges facing our youth.

The issues of concern to today's youth are the issues of concern to all Canadians, issues like effectively addressing the school to work transition, tackling real barriers to labour market entry and understanding the changing world of work.

The government recognizes that without proper investment in the future of our youth Canada will not enjoy a competitive advantage in the 21st century. Funding of programs that encourage entrepreneurship and proper skills training enhance our ability to compete globally.

As a government we have no greater responsibility than to provide the youth of Canada with a country full of opportunities and to prepare them to compete internationally.

\* \* \*

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian public demands the sentence given to first degree murderers be the sentence served.

The Canadian Police Association, Victims of Violence, the Reform Party and an overwhelming number of Canadians are all on record demanding the complete elimination of section 745, making life mean life.

Half measures making section 745 off limits to serial killers and other multiple murderers but open to those who only kill once is unacceptable. The justice minister is playing politics with this very serious issue.

● (1410)

Allowing some murderers the right to appeal their parole ineligibility while denying it to others demeans the worth of a human life and is an insult to victims and murder victims' families. Anything other than the complete removal of section 745 from the Criminal Code will be unacceptable.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**MARITIME PIPELINE**

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last week, at their meeting last week, the Prime Minister of Canada and the premier of Quebec approved the Maritimes pipeline project.

*S. O. 31*

This important project will finally make this energy available to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and a number of regions in Quebec.

The project is estimated to be worth over \$1 billion, with nearly one quarter of this amount to be invested in Quebec.

Had it not been for the meeting of the two first ministers, the odds are that the route across Quebec planned by the two oil companies exploiting the pool on Sable Island, off the coast of Nova Scotia, would have never been possible.

Here again, we have proof that co-operation between governments provides the best assurance of Quebec's prosperity.

\* \* \*

**HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES**

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of parliamentarians, I would like to congratulate all those graduating from high school across Canada.

[*English*]

Congratulations to all our high school students.

[*Translation*]

Whatever their future, whether they continue their studies or head into the labour market, we wish them every success.

[*English*]

Graduation normally means parties, and we want to alert young people to be careful. Driving to and from parties can be dangerous. Sometimes it is difficult to avoid drinking. If possible, it should be avoided. If that cannot be done there is a program called Safegrad, managed almost totally by students.

[*Translation*]

Safegrad is almost entirely managed by students and aims to reduce the risks of accident by ensuring that alcohol consumption does not become a threat to safety.

To all graduates,

[*English*]

—on behalf of all those who love you a lot—

[*Translation*]

Be careful.

\* \* \*

**GULF CANADA RESOURCES LIMITED**

**Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the president of Gulf Canada Resources

Ltd., J.P. Bryan, said he wanted to send separatists on a boat back to France or confine them to a North American Bantustan.

Mr. Bryan is acting like a Rhodesian full of scorn for Quebecers. Before hiring this U.S. born executive, Gulf Canada should have made sure he had some basic notions of history, manners and democracy.

What is even more troubling is the fact that, instead of condemning such an outburst, 700 executives of the Canadian oil industry applauded. Where have understanding and respect for democracy and freedom of expression gone? Where I come from, we call this intolerance and provocation.

Officials of the company in Quebec ought to condemn Mr. Bryan's antidemocratic and profoundly unacceptable remarks.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES**

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, just when we thought the fisheries minister could not create any more chaos in Canada's fisheries we learn the worst is yet to come.

Advancing its policy of discrimination in the Atlantic food fishery, the government feels stabbing Newfoundland in the back is not enough. Rubbing salt in the wound might make things a little more festive. Not only is every Atlantic province permitted to fish for food except Newfoundland, Tourism Canada is now paying for advertising to attract tourists to those other provinces.

The latest insult is the permitting of an unlimited food fishery for the French islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon where French locals and tourists can fish their little hearts out as close as three miles from Newfoundland's Burin Peninsula.

Once again the province with the greatest cultural and economic dependency on the cod fishery is the province kicked the hardest.

A few years ago a Newfoundland organization called Cod Peace adopted the slogan "In Cod We Trust". Perhaps the House should adopt a similar motion: "For Fred We Show Disgust".

\* \* \*

**MEDICARE**

**Mr. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this weekend Canadians witnessed another flip-flop in Reform Party policy on medicare, but this is nothing new.

The leader of the Reform Party said in September 1993 his party would eliminate universality and then in October 1993 he said Reform is opposed to private health care.

*Oral Questions*

The member for Macleod has said in the House that medicare is bad for everybody. He has also said medicare is important to all Canadians.

• (1415)

On April 22, 1996 the member for Calgary Centre complained in the House that his party's health care policy was being portrayed as a two tier system. However, at its assembly this weekend that is exactly what his party proposed, a two tier system that will give top quality care to the rich and leave a lower quality and less responsive system for everybody else.

Today's article in the Toronto *Star* indicates the Ontario Medical Association fully understands Reform Party policy. It knows Reform is proposing a two tier system. It is time for Reform to come clean with the rest of Canadians.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### MEMBER FOR JONQUIÈRE

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to salute today the presence in this House of the hon. member for Jonquière who is back among us after a three-month absence.

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

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** It is when the going gets tough that the tough get going. This is how we recognize men and women of courage. I would like to acknowledge here the remarkable determination of our colleague from Jonquière and, on behalf of my colleagues from the official opposition, and of all the other members of this House, I am sure, wish him all the best upon his return to the Hill.

---

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

#### FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

The Prime Minister's letter to his provincial counterparts concerning the agenda of the first ministers' conference says this: "We will discuss, among other things, the realignment of the roles and responsibilities of our partnership in areas such as manpower training, federal spending powers, mining, forestry, and so on".

Are we to understand from the Prime Minister's letter that, for the federal government, partnership means that, as in the area of manpower training, Ottawa will set the national standards, guidelines or objectives and monitor the implementation of these standards, while the provinces will have to be content with administering the programs?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government's objective is to clarify as much as possible the division of responsibilities between the various levels of government to ensure that the federal government is highly effective and competent and in a position to help Canadians in its areas of jurisdiction, that the provinces, too, are highly competent and effective in their own areas of jurisdiction, and that there is a very strong partnership between the two levels of government.

The June 20 and 21 conference will give us an opportunity to take a major step in that direction by addressing each of these issues in a concrete and sound manner, always keeping in mind the need to improve government services for all Canadians.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, are we also to understand that, according to this notion of partnership, the federal government will, once again, follow the same model as for manpower training, that is to say, it will withdraw or say it will withdraw from operations and then refuse to pay full compensation to the provinces, forcing them to foot the bill while—let us not forget—it continues to pocket taxpayers' money?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a while ago, the Minister of Human Resources Development, Mr. Young, revealed an offer made by the federal government to all the provinces. This offer proposes a general framework under which each province will be able to set its own policies in its own areas of jurisdiction to better serve its people.

This offer was acclaimed everywhere in Quebec as a great step forward, if not the finishing line for a concrete solution. We can now say that job training is on the right track. We will soon have in Canada one of the most admired parliamentary models.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, we in Quebec were happy to hear that negotiations would be held. There was mention of a starting point. I now realize that, for the minister, the starting point is the finishing line.

• (1420)

This is in keeping with the federalists' faultless logic. They say: "We are at the starting point in initiating negotiations"; they then turn around and say: "No, no, it is the finishing line". Thank you very much; that is quite interesting.

In the federal government's effort to reorganize the federation, does it not intend, in the final analysis, to reproduce the Charlotte-

*Oral Questions*

town accord, since it is very similar? So the Charlottetown accord gets in through the back door, piece by piece. This agreement, need we remind the House, was rejected not only by Quebec but by all of Canada, as it was too much for some and not enough for others.

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as far as manpower training is concerned, a general framework was proposed and very well received across Canada.

I understand this may bother the official opposition, since it does not want to see the Canadian federation work better all the time. On the contrary, Bloc members want to break up the country. That is why we will never have their co-operation in finding concrete solutions that will help Canadians receive better services from their governments.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, also regarding the agenda of the first ministers' conference, the government says it is willing to make proposals to create jobs for young people.

How does the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs explain that, on the one hand, Ottawa says it is withdrawing from the manpower sector, including for youth, and, on the other hand, it is indicating its intention to remain present in this area?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly normal for the Government of Canada to want to maintain a presence in a many areas where the provinces may play a very important role.

To be sure, Canada is made up of provinces whose resources are quite different, and whose programs are not always similar. All we are saying is that we are there to represent the interests of all Canadians, including young Canadians. However, we want to recognize and respect the jurisdiction of the provinces in every case.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, in the letter addressed to its provincial counterparts, the federal government also states its intention to remain present in the social security sector. However, with the Canada social transfer, Ottawa is withdrawing its financial support from that sector. Again, the new federal way of doing things is to establish national standards, while stopping financial contributions to programs, without any compensation.

Will the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs finally recognize that, while he is talking about partnership, his government's true intention is to reduce the role of the provinces to that of mere subcontractors of federal policies?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in Mr. Martin's last budget, it is indicated that—

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** We usually refer to ourselves by our titles rather than our names.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Dion:** I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

The last budget of the Minister of Finance mentioned a minimum amount of \$11.1 billion for the Canada social transfer. We are committed to allowing the provinces to do long term planning as regards their budget. We made this commitment in spite of current economic difficulties. This is a first for a federal government. One would have a hard time finding a similar commitment by a federal government in another federation.

If opposition members looked at other federations, they would realize that Canadian provinces have more power and responsibilities than the German Länders, the Swiss cantons and the American states. Our federation is one of the most decentralized ones in the world, and it allows each province to express its own way of being Canadian. This is what Canada is about.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, first the Constitution was on the agenda for the first ministers meeting in June, then it was off, and now it is back on. Canadians are not sure what to make of this constitutional game of ping-pong the Liberals are playing but it would help if the Prime Minister actually had a plan for national unity. It does seem a little bizarre that they are trying to sandwich serious constitutional negotiations between the morning doughnuts and the afternoon Beaujolais.

Will there be substantive discussions on the Constitution at the first ministers conference, or is this simply a cynical political ploy to avoid doing what has to be done in April 1997?

• (1425)

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thought the letter was crystal clear regarding that subject.

It is not clear whether we have met the commitment under section 49. Our discussions on June 21 would permit us to consider how we might move forward in the search for an amending formula that would find wide approval from Canadians. The purpose is to



*Oral Questions*

be sure that we meet the commitment of section 49. Once this is done, we want a process that will lead us to a better amending formula for all Canadians.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, what is obvious is it seems the Prime Minister is trying to change his well deserved reputation of “don’t just do something but stand there”. It is also painfully obvious that this government will be presenting the premiers with constitutional proposals that have not had any public input.

The Prime Minister’s so-called plans for national unity are supposedly contained within the speech from the throne, but the throne speech also promises public input. If next week’s constitutional negotiations are going to be more than a political photo-op, where is the public input? What happened to the Canadian people?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the agenda is full of good things for Canadians. Whether it is the economic union, the social union, or the rebalancing of the federation, we have a full list of very important topics that the first ministers will discuss seriously. In the end, we will have an improved federation.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the throne speech should be positioned beside a throne where its paper could be of much use.

The Prime Minister promised in his throne speech that Canadians, no matter where they live, will have their say in the future of their country. Apparently that does not extend to such things as the Constitution or the amending formula.

The objections of the premiers of Quebec, Alberta and B.C. are well documented. The Canadian people apparently have been excluded from the constitutional process. The Prime Minister has slipped the Constitution on to the agenda and has hoped that nobody would notice.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Will Canadians get to see the Prime Minister’s constitutional proposals before he presents them to the premiers, or will Canadians simply have to wait while he does it behind closed doors like Brian Mulroney?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the purpose is exactly the reverse. We have an open process to discuss a better amending formula for all Canadians. This is the purpose. The first ministers will decide. We hope to have the collaboration of the hon. member.

[*Translation*]

**SECURITIES**

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, last week in the House the minister gave us to understand that he intended to disregard the unanimous will of the national assembly in pursuit of his plan to create a Canadian securities commission. He said that in so doing he was responding to the request of the business community, when this same community was letting it be known that very day in Quebec City that it did not support his plan.

How can the minister still claim to have the support of the Quebec business community, when the Montreal Stock Exchange, the Mouvement Desjardins, the Barreau du Québec, the Quebec section of the association of securities brokers, numerous firms including Ogilvy Renault, the Investors Group, McCarthy Tétrault, and many others, have said they are against the plan?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what I said, and I repeat it again, is that it is most certainly at the request of several provinces and of the business community, including large companies in Montreal that issue shares, Montreal brokerage firms with national offices, which asked us to look at the situation. We are examining the possibility. It is at the request of the business community, at the request of the provinces.

Furthermore, I would ask the member the following question: If the Canadian business community requests it, if the Montreal business community requests it, should we ignore the fact that it makes very good sense to rationalize the system in Canada in order to be more competitive internationally?

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the official opposition asks the questions and the government is supposed to answer. Until now, the list of those in Quebec who oppose the plan is growing daily.

• (1430)

I would ask him the following question: Will the minister admit that a Canadian securities commission would, in the opinion of many, concentrate all Canada’s financial expertise in Toronto and thus reduce all other financial centres, including Montreal, to mere branch offices of the Toronto head office, without real powers? That is the reality.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pardon me for thinking that perhaps the Bloc’s finance critic had an opinion. But if he is asking questions without having a real opinion, that makes the debate a bit difficult.

*Oral Questions*

I can tell you that there is no question of concentrating everything in one place. The point is to make it possible for the Montreal, Vancouver, Alberta and Toronto stock exchanges to compete on an equal footing with the New York Stock Exchange and the NASDAQ.

With the globalization of world markets, integration is becoming very important in order to give Quebecers and Canadians a solid foundation on which to build. That is what we wish to do, that is the vision for the nineties. We have left the sixties behind.

\* \* \*

[English]

**JUSTICE**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Justice said that he would not pass legislation based on individual cases, yet today we see that he wants to do exactly that by splitting murderers into categories in section 745 changes. Instead of doing what Canadians want, an outright scrapping of section 745, the minister plans to just modify it slightly. Commit two murders and you are out of the running. Commit only one murder and you have a chance at early parole.

What is the difference? Why should any first degree murderer, regardless of the number of people he kills, get early release?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the legislation I will table later today in the House of Commons will propose changes to section 745. The bill will speak for itself.

As to the difference between those who take one life or more than one life, the changes will introduce significant improvements to the section and the way it operates. It will ensure that only the most appropriate and deserving cases are given consideration under the section. It will also respond to concerns from victims groups that they not be required to participate in jury hearings at the sole option of the offender. It will provide a mechanism to ensure that cases that are brought before a jury have a reasonable prospect of success.

If the hon. member is not able to distinguish the difference between those who take more than one life and those who take one life, I say that she is overlooking a fundamental feature. The fact of the matter is that the sentencing policy for murder in this country should reflect a difference between those who take more than one life and those who take only one.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe that the minister would be able to tell a victim: "I am sorry, the murderer who killed your daughter or your son just murdered one person, so it is okay". That is shameful and is exactly the reason it just does not work.

There is no justification for these kinds of changes. The minister said the bill will speak for itself. What about the thousands of victims across the country who are speaking for themselves and calling for an outright abolition and repeal of section 745?

What we are hearing is that one murder is okay and two murders are bad. Murder is murder, no matter how many people are killed and murderers should not get early release, period.

Instead of introducing these arbitrary half measures, why does the justice minister not simply scrap section 745 altogether and make all first degree murderers serve their entire sentence? Why not?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the proposals we will make are based on rational, logical and appropriate distinctions in the law. The taking of any life is not only a tragedy for the victim's family, but it is the most serious crime in the code and it is punished accordingly.

For the last 20 years the Criminal Code sentences for murder have included section 745, have included recourse to a community jury after 15 years. We are going to propose changes that will narrow the availability of that recourse to the most deserving cases and ensure that it is only available in those cases. In addition, we are saying that for those who commit multiple or serial murders, it will not be available at all.

● (1435)

I very much hope the hon. member and her party will join with us in strengthening in the name of victims and in the name of justice the provisions of section 745 of the Criminal Code.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**JUSTICE**

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, during an investigation, Canadian police forces may request information from foreign authorities. The Department of Justice is then responsible for forwarding these inquiries to the foreign authorities.

My question is for the Minister of Justice. Can the minister tell us whether it is standard procedure within his department to send letters to foreign authorities containing clear accusations against a Canadian citizen, when his department has no proof of that individual's guilt?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. member is referring to the process of police investigations.

*Oral Questions*

Police conduct investigations but when any police force in the country wishes to make inquiries of a foreign authority or a foreign government, the practice is to come to the international assistance group of the Department of Justice to communicate that request to the foreign government. In those circumstances, the lawyers and the senior officials of the international assistance group meet with the police and determine that there is a reasonable basis for taking the next step in the investigation, which is to ask a foreign authority for assistance. Once that is done, then the lawyers in the international assistance group work with the police in formulating that request and send it abroad.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us if it is a possibility that his department sends letters containing unproven charges merely to ensure that the foreign authorities will accept the inquiry being submitted to them?

[English]

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is important to emphasize that in this instance and in cases of this kind, we are talking about police investigations. The issue is not whether the person under investigation can be shown to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, as would be the case if they were charged, tried and it was left to a court to decide. That is not the test.

If that were the test very few police investigations would be carried on. At any given moment if the police officer was stopped and asked whether he now had sufficient evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt and the officer said no but he wished to proceed to the next step, if we were to deny that at that point, we would never complete a police investigation.

The issue is not whether guilt can be established beyond a reasonable doubt at that stage; the issue is whether it is reasonable to take the next step in the investigation. That is the approach which is taken by the international assistance group when it has asked the police for help in communicating requests for help to other governments. That is the practice we follow.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' new GST scheme is a perfect example of how taxes, taxes, taxes kill jobs, jobs, jobs.

Ending the notional input credits on used goods is nothing but a sneaky back door method of driving up taxes and prices. Meanwhile dealers employ people to sell used goods, from cars at auctions, to stamps, to furniture, to RVs and boats, and all of those industries are threatened.

Why is the finance minister gutting jobs in the used goods industry by piling job killing GST on GST?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that harmonization leads to greater job creation. That is clear. The member's position is simply nonsensical. Harmonization is the reason the Canadian Manufacturers Association supports it, the reason the Canadian Chamber of Commerce supports it and the reason the Retail Sales Council supports it. The fact is it is the reason the Canadian Federation of Independent Business supports it. Everybody out there wants to create jobs and wants to support harmonization.

When will the minister wake up and smell the roses?

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that is what Canadians are asking.

Taxes, taxes, taxes kill jobs, jobs, jobs. Since the government came to power it has raised taxes \$10.5 billion, mostly through these kinds of sneaky back door schemes.

How does the finance minister reconcile these job killing tax promises with his own government's red book promise to make jobs the number one priority of his government and his own budget promise not to raise taxes?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I gave the member a promotion. I take it back.

● (1440)

If the hon. member wants to talk about jobs, 624,000 new jobs have been created. That is more jobs than France and Germany combined. In the last five months, 130,000 new jobs have been created.

The number of full time jobs is going up month after month. The government has brought in program after program for high technology, for trade. They are all programs for job creation. And every single one of them was opposed by the Reform Party that simply does not know what the modern economy is all about.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BLOOD SUPPLY**

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Despite the lessons learned in the contaminated blood scandal, we discovered on the weekend that a number of hemophiliacs are still having to deal with poor quality blood products. Health Canada, which has the job of ensuring a safe supply, is still not playing its role.

How does the minister explain that Health Canada has again allowed poor quality health products to get through, leaving it up to the hemophiliacs themselves to look after their own safety?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member makes a very serious allegation. I am not aware of the details of the allegation, but if she wishes to provide me with additional detail I would be happy to examine it with my senior officials.

However, if the hon. member does not have the details of what she is suggesting, I think she should apologize to the House and to the officials of the department.

*[Translation]*

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this information comes from a Canadian Press article published on the weekend, which said that some hemophiliacs had reported that the blood products they were using from a particular company were of poor quality.

Since it will take a long time to redesign the blood supply system and since safety standards are currently the minister's responsibility, could the minister propose measures under his jurisdiction that could be implemented immediately and that would protect hemophiliacs until the new supply system is in place?

*[English]*

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says she read this in an article and so informs the House.

All I ask of the hon. member to do is provide me with specific information and I will examine it. If the Minister of Health is going to have to examine each and every allegation or alleged allegation of some individual somewhere in the country, that would be my entire responsibilities as the Minister of Health.

If the hon. member is serious about the allegation she will provide the evidence so that we can take corrective action.

\* \* \*

**REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Mr. Andy Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the secretary of state responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency.

As the government continues to redefine its role in regional economic development, and as the emphasis of ACOA broadens from providing funds to other kinds of support, could the minister tell the House what is being done to enhance Atlantic Canada's opportunities with regard to federal government procurement?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency is a development agency with an excellent record.

Procurement is one of the many roles that it is involved in and it costs very few dollars. This is an area where ACOA will make sure that Atlantic Canadian firms are aware of major federal government contracts and have an opportunity to be involved in them.

ACOA also promotes the capability of Atlantic firms for the international market.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

It is bad enough that the minister came up with a plan that is going to destroy the livelihoods of thousands of B.C. fishermen, but on top of that, this Liberal minister is seeding even more division and anger by creating two commercial fisheries with different rules, different quotas and different privileges. This Liberal government promised equality but it does not practice it.

How does this Liberal government expect Canadians to accept the fact that natives will be permitted to fish commercially in the Alberni Inlet when non-natives will not? Why will this minister not stand up and smell the roses?

● (1445)

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member might be a bit confused when he talks about the two commercial fisheries.

Concerning the first commercial fishery that he degraded, just before coming to the House I was briefed by Mr. Matkin who is the chair of the committee that is doing the licence buy-back. In an hour's briefing Mr. Matkin reported very positively on how the plan was proceeding. I am sure the hon. member is very pleased to hear that this plan is getting more and more support as its success becomes even more apparent.

On the second point, with respect to the aboriginal fishery, the hon. member knows that the priority for salmon is escapement or conservation; aboriginal food, social and ceremonial; and then recreation and commercial fishery. This priority is being followed. It is very much in line with the aboriginal fishery strategy of which I am sure the hon. member is aware, but he must have forgotten during his question.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the minister is listening to his paid advisers and not thinking in realistic terms.

On Friday an injunction to stop this aboriginal commercial fishery was not granted, but the court said very clearly that

*Oral Questions*

fishermen had been prejudiced by the minister's actions and that the fishermen had only the minister to blame for their situation.

Why does the minister not admit that he has totally screwed up the fishing industry on the B.C. coast? Why does he not admit that he has created the most divisive fishing climate in Pacific coast history? Why does the minister not resign if he cannot handle his job?

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the question was but I will try to address the intonation of the hon. member.

My only comment is that I am disappointed and I am surprised. With the new, moderate approach of the Reform Party I was expecting a different kind of question, so I will take his comment under advisement.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**DAY CARE SERVICES**

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

The human resources development minister contends that the resource envelope made available to the provinces for day care services was cut by 60 per cent because of the provinces' lack of interest in his program. But according to Canadian Press, the correspondence the minister received from the provinces said just the opposite.

Where did the funds the federal government was about to invest in day care services in Canada really go?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the proposal put forward by the Government of Canada before last Christmas regarding child care is well known. It was indicated at the time that funds were available, should the provinces want to participate in a national child care program.

I do not wish to contradict Canadian Press, because it would be terrible to get into a debate with Canadian Press at this time about the content of the letters in question.

Not only did the provinces express reservations about a national program in their letters, some going as far as rejecting the idea, but we had the opportunity to meet all our colleagues from coast to coast and not one of them told us: "Yes, we have reached a consensus to go ahead with a national child care program".

That said, our position has always been that we can work in partnership with the provinces to find solutions to the real problems facing those who would like to see a day care system put in place to meet their needs.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Quebec minister responsible for family matters has developed a five-year plan calling for the creation of 22,000 day care spaces over four years. On April 24, she wrote the Minister of Human Resources Development, asking him to transfer to her, with no strings attached, the share of federal funding coming to Quebec.

When does the minister plan to answer Pauline Marois' letter?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the Government of Quebec and other governments change their minds and decide to participate in a national day care program, we are naturally quite prepared to sit down and negotiate with them.

● (1450)

In this particular instance, that is certainly not the case. If it is only a matter of transferring funds with no strings attached, then they will have to speak to someone other than me, because I am not in the habit of sending money anywhere without making sure the interests of Canadian taxpayers are protected.

\* \* \*

[English]

**TAXATION**

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the new seniors' benefit announced by the Minister of Finance is an exercise in duplicity.

In the massive restructuring of the benefits to seniors, the minister has slipped into the fine print a rule that will tax low income seniors at a rate of 50 per cent on income over their seniors' benefit. That is the same rate millionaires and billionaires pay in this country.

Will the minister please explain this massive tax grab on low income seniors.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in a time of shrinking financial resources, especially in a time when the population of seniors is expected to grow, it is important for the government to conserve its resources and basically focus on those who will need the help the most. That is exactly what we have done.

The alternative I suppose would have been what the Reform Party advocated which would have virtually eviscerated, decimated the federal government's support for senior citizens. However, we are not prepared to do that. We are going to ensure that senior citizens are able to retire in dignity.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance says he does not want to eviscerate payments to seniors but when they earn more than \$11,500 they are on a 50 per cent tax rate. That is the fact announced by the Minister of Finance.

*Oral Questions*

Why is he doing that? Why is he penalizing seniors? Who needs the money more, this government or seniors who are struggling to get by?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the retirement system in this country effectively has three pillars: the OAS, the GIS, which as a result of our changes projected ahead we are going to ensure will be there for young Canadians and the Canada pension plan which we will be discussing next week with the provinces in order to make sure it is there for young Canadians. There is the whole scheme of retirement plans and RRSPs which have extensive tax benefits to ensure that a number of the people the hon. member is referring to will have a decent pension.

I remind the hon. member that our changes will take place in the year 2001. Those who are currently 60 years of age or over will be protected whereas the plan that was suggested by the Reform Party would have effectively gutted seniors' pensions immediately.

\* \* \*

**TRADE**

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister for International Trade.

A United Nations international study shows there are significant increases in foreign investment in Canada. What is the government doing so that Canadians continue to benefit from the jobs foreign investment creates?

**Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, new international business investment is at a record level in Canada. It has doubled in the last decade. That means one in ten jobs in this country is as a result of the flow of international investment. In fact, 50 per cent of our total exports, 75 per cent of our manufactured exports, flow out of that international investment.

It is a positive message for Canadians. We want to get more of it. We have a high priority and we have a lot that attracts people to Canada, because we are a gateway into NAFTA, a market of 370 million people. We have the productivity, we have the workforce, the competitive wages. We have the infrastructure, the energy supplies. We have all the things we need, including compatibility of technology through our metric system, to attract people to invest in Canada, not to mention our very solid quality of life.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**HAITIAN POLICE FORCE**

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In answer to a question from the official opposition, the Minister of Foreign Affairs pledged, on March 1st, to ensure "that those who have been trained here in Canada will have full access and opportunity in the Haitian police force".

• (1455)

Three months later, and after a visit from the President of Haiti to Canada and a trip to Haiti by the minister, the situation remains unchanged.

Can the minister tell us why, three months after his commitment in this House, and given that Canada is leading, at its own expense, the UN mission in Haiti, more than 30 police officers trained in Canada are still waiting to be integrated into the Haitian force?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, of those 30 people, 20 have been given employment by the Haitian government in a variety of security activities.

The problem is that the Haitian government does not accept dual nationality. It passed an act of their parliament subsequent to the training of the Canadian Haitians who hold dual passports.

We raised the matter when we were in Haiti and we are trying to resolve it with the Haitian government. In the meantime, of those 30 people, 20 have been hired in security activities.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I remind the minister that Canada invested close to \$2 million in the training of these police officers. The minister just told us that a number of these young officers were hired by the Haitian government. But there remains a number of them, in which thousands and even millions of dollars were invested.

What does the minister intend to do to put the money invested in the training of these police officers to good use, until they are fully integrated into the Haitian force?

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Canadian government, with the active co-operation of many municipalities, such as the Ville de Laval and the community of Montreal, have provided police officers for Haiti and are providing very good training and support. They are a great credit to their country and are of great assistance in the redevelopment of the Haitian civil police service. Those are the kinds of contributions we want to make, to use the experiences of our police forces to help the Haitians develop their national force.

In the meantime we are negotiating with the Haitian government to try and ensure that those who did receive the training have access. Already 20 have been given security jobs. The Haitian

parliament passed an act after the training took place. Now we have to get their parliament to change that act.

I think the hon. member knows the situation. It is not that easy to insist that Haiti pass retroactive legislation when it is struggling to provide for its own development. We will keep working on the file.

\* \* \*

### CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board is currently holding a conference in Saskatoon on adding value to prairie cereal grains. The potential for value added products for grain is great, but in reality the Canadian Wheat Board continues to kill value added by making farmers go through the costly and time consuming exercise of buying back their grain from the board to sell to processors.

Will the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food quit stalling and make changes now to the Canadian Wheat Board that will remove the roadblocks to establishing more milling, malting and other value added processing across the prairies, creating real jobs and real economic growth?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, members of the Reform Party have asked a number of questions in the past, indicating their opposition to the Canadian Wheat Board. Those questions have been answered, but they appear to be impervious to logic.

Let me try another tack. I would like to quote the May 9 edition of the Manitoba *Co-Operator* and particularly remarks made by Mr. Ken Beswick, a former commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board who recently resigned. Mr. Beswick said: "I am in no way saying the board is not an effective marketer. I think that it is among the best in the world at marketing grain. It stands toe to toe with the heavyweights out there in the global environment. And I think from my window at the board I would not advocate the elimination of single desk selling".

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister must not have heard my question. I was talking about some roadblocks and he got off on another topic all together.

His department has announced a magic scheme to encourage value added processing on the prairies by offering to help the agriculture sector create business plans. Well, it is the minister who needs the business plan.

Prairie farmers have to buy their own grain back at Minneapolis spot prices in order to sell to millers and maltsters down the road.

### Oral Questions

Why does the minister not force the Canadian Wheat Board to use its own forecasted final prices as the basis for grain sales to local markets, or better yet, let producers sell outside the board to millers?

• (1500)

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I take from the hon. member's preamble that he has now conceded the basic point about single desk selling.

The hon. gentleman should review the submissions made to the Western Grain Marketing Panel by the Millers and Bakers Association of Canada. It supported the Canadian Wheat Board before the Western Grain Marketing Panel.

It is possible that some new and more flexible ways can be devised in terms of pricing mechanisms pertaining to the Canadian Wheat Board. I will very anxiously await the advice of the Western Grain Marketing Panel at the end of this month. When we have its report we will each be in a better position to make sound decisions for the long term, rather than constantly jumping the gun like the knee-jerk Reformers.

\* \* \*

### FIRST MINISTERS CONFERENCE

**Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister.

June 21 is the first ministers conference. It is also National Aboriginal Day. It is therefore all the more ironic that the leaders of the First Nations have been excluded from the first ministers meeting.

Especially now that the Constitution is on the agenda, I ask the Acting Prime Minister what justification there possibly can be now for excluding those leaders of First Nations.

**Hon. Ron Irwin (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I understand the meeting, there will not be items dealt with specific to aboriginal people.

The Prime Minister sent out a letter yesterday or today inviting the First Nations leadership to a meeting preceding the conference with specific ministers and for a post-conference briefing after the meeting of June 21.

\* \* \*

### MEXICO

**Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Canadians are very interested in the visit of the president of Mexico. Can the minister report to the House what initiatives have

*Routine Proceedings*

been taken to strengthen our relationship with the people and the Government of Mexico?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question.

Today a number of ministers of the government met with their counterparts to put the final touches on a quite complex and broadly based declaration of objectives that will be presented to the Prime Minister and the president tomorrow.

It represents quite a unique undertaking between two countries, with the setting out of a blueprint of action covering a wide variety of topics. It sets out a real work plan for our two countries to get together on a wide variety of topics.

It is something very distinctive and demonstrates a new maturity of our relationship with Mexico.

---

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY PERMANENT ENGINEERING BOARD

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I am pleased to table in both official languages the annual report of the Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board to the governments of the United States and Canada for the period dated October 1, 1994 to September 30, 1995.

\* \* \*

• (1505)

### 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 four petitions.

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 21st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership and associate membership of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 21st report later this day.

\* \* \*

### CRIMINAL CODE

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-45, an act to amend the Criminal Code (judicial review of parole ineligibility) and another act.

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

\* \* \*

### CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

**Mr. Tony Ianno (Trinity—Spadina, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-301, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this private member's bill introduces the opportunity for Elections Canada to create a permanent voters list which I think will enhance the opportunities of saving money and also create the opportunity to reduce the potential time period for the general elections.

In today's age of computerization and the different levels of government, municipal, provincial and federal, that have the opportunity of having the information in their systems already, I think it will enhance the accuracy and ability to use it and reduce the cost for all concerned.

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

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 21st report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, presented to the House earlier this day, be concurred in.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

### PETITIONS

#### BILL C-205

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today I have three petitions to present. The first one is from Victoria, B.C.

These residents object to criminals profiting from their crimes and ask Parliament to enact Bill C-205 as soon as possible.



*Routine Proceedings*

• (1510)

## VETERANS AFFAIRS

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from Canadians from B.C. and Ontario who call on Parliament to consider the advisability of extending benefits of compensation to veterans of the wartime merchant navy equal to those enjoyed by veterans of Canada's World War II armed services.

## TAXATION

**Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the third petition is from residents of B.C. who call on Parliament to refrain from implementing a tax on health and dental benefits and to put on hold any future consideration of such a tax until a complete review of the tax system and how it impacts on the health of Canadians has been undertaken.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased on behalf of the hon. member for Edmonton Southeast to present two petitions today signed mainly by residents of Edmonton Southeast.

The petitioners pray and request that Parliament oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or any other federal legislation that would provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to present three petitions.

The petitioners request that the Canadian Human Rights Act not be amended to include the phrase sexual orientation as a prohibited ground of discrimination or to amend the charter of rights and freedoms to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships.

## TURKEY

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have another petition from Armenians in my riding who request that Parliament change its policy of indifference toward the Armenian genocide and promote efforts to persuade the Republic of Turkey to recognize its crimes against humanity.

## TAXATION

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have before me three petitions.

The first has been signed by 66 people from my riding. It calls on Parliament to refrain from implementing a tax on health and dental benefits and to put on hold any future considerations of such a tax.

## HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the second petition is signed by 199 constituents and requests that Parliament oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights

Act or any other federal legislation which would provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

The petitioners remind me that it has come a little late to this House, but it is in the other place and hopefully this will be considered.

The third petition is signed by 50 Canadians from my riding of Peace River and it has the same request, that the human rights act not be amended.

**Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have three petitions to present on behalf of the constituents of Erie.

The petitioners pray that Parliament oppose any amendments to the Canadian Human Rights Act or any other federal legislation which would provide for the inclusion of the phrase sexual orientation.

## TAXATION

**Mr. John Maloney (Erie, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have another petition which requests that Parliament not increase the federal excise tax on gasoline in the next federal budget.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Question No. 44 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 44—**Mr. Godin:**

Concerning the hovercrafts owned by the Canadian Coast Guard: (a) how many are owned; (b) where are they based; (c) what are their respective descriptions and purposes for which they are used; (d) are there plans to acquire new hovercrafts and, if so, for what purposes and according to what schedule; (e) what is the estimated value of the present hovercrafts; and (f) what is the estimated cost of the planned acquisitions, if any?

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** a) The Canadian Coast Guard has three hovercraft.

b) Two are based at Sea Island near Vancouver and one in Montreal.

c) The Sea Island hovercraft are the SRN6 type which are 48.4 feet long by 25.4 feet wide. Their maximum weight is 24,000 pounds including a cargo capacity of 11,000 pounds. They are used primarily for search and rescue, with one craft being on 30-minute standby, 24 hours per day. The Montreal-based hovercraft is an AP1-88/200 type. It is 80.4 feet long and 35.5 feet wide. Its maximum weight is 105,000 pounds, including a cargo capacity of 30,000 pounds. It is used to maintain navigational aids and break ice in the St. Lawrence River and numerous tributaries, as well as search and rescue.

d) The Canadian Coast Guard has two new hovercraft on order which will be delivered in 1998. One will be assigned to the Laurentian region to replace two obsolete vessels and will be used for maintaining navigational aids, ice breaking and search and

*Government Orders*

rescue. One will be assigned to Pacific region to replace the two existing craft and will be used primarily as a search and rescue craft, as well as for other tasks.

e) The two hovercraft at Sea Island are over 25 years old; therefore, it is not possible to assign a value to them. The Montreal-based hovercraft is valued at approximately \$6 million.

f) The new hovercraft will cost approximately \$13 million each.

[English]

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

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### WITNESS PROTECTION PROGRAM ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of the amendment made by the Senate to Bill C-13, an act to provide for the establishment and operation of a program to enable certain persons to receive protection in relation to certain inquiries, investigations or prosecutions.

**Hon. Douglas Peters (for the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada)** moved:

That the amendment made by the Senate to Bill C-13, an act to provide for the establishment and operation of a program to enable certain persons to receive protection in relation to certain inquiries, investigations or prosecutions, be now read the second time and concurred in.

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the original wording of clause 9(1) of Bill C-13 provided that the commissioner may terminate the protection given to a protectee if, in the opinion of the commissioner, there had been a misrepresentation or a failure on the part of the protectee to disclose information relevant to the admission process or there has been a breach of the protectee's obligations under the protection of the agreement.

The members of the Senate committee had concerns about the word opinion. They felt the word opinion provided the commissioner with too much discretion in the making of the determination on protective services. Instead the committee voted to require the commissioner to have evidence of wrongdoing on the part of the protectee.

• (1515)

The government can support this amendment. The commissioner must base this decision on the facts of the case which would be open to judicial review in any event. In fact under clause 10 of the bill the commissioner must provide his reasons for ending protective services in writing to enable the protectee to understand the basis for this decision.

It was never intended for this serious decision to be made in an arbitrary manner by the government. Using the word evidence instead of the word opinion underlies this objective and therefore is acceptable by our government.

[Translation]

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, for essentially the same reasons, I believe the Senate has passed a very useful amendment, substituting the word "evidence" for the word "opinion", a vague term leaving the commissioner unlimited discretion.

When the commissioner terminates protective services under the Witness Protection Program Act, he must base his opinion on material facts that can ultimately be reviewed by the courts. In a country that believes in the rule of law, this is a notable improvement that deserves support.

I would particularly like to thank my friend, the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm, for all the attention and consideration he gave this issue.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and passed.)

\* \* \*

[English]

### OCEANS ACT

The House resumed from June 10 consideration of Bill C-26, an act respecting the oceans of Canada, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

**The Speaker:** The debate will centre around Group No. 8 which will include Motions Nos. 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 50, 53, 56 and 73. As per agreement in the House yesterday, these will have been deemed moved and seconded. We will now proceed to debate.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-98, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing line 3, on page 16, with the following:

“(a) with the unanimous approval of the members of the standing committee, shall develop and implement policies”.

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-26, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing line 6, on page 16, with the following:

“(b) with the approval of the standing committee, shall recommend and coordinate with other ministers”.

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-26, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing line 29, on page 16, with the following:

“(d) may, with the approval of the standing committee and in consultation with other minis-”.

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-26, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing lines 29 to 36, on page 16, with the following:

“(d) may, in concert with the provincial governments and in consultation with interested persons and bodies and with other ministers, boards and agencies of the Government of Canada, establish, with respect for the rights and legislative jurisdiction of the provinces, marine environmental”.

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-26, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing line 19, on page 17, with the following:

“(b) may enter into agreements with the provincial governments, with any”.

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-26, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing line 27, on page 17, with the following:

“Treasury Board, after the House of Commons has adopted a resolution confirming the recommendations of the standing committee approving the making of grants and contributions; and”.

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-26, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing line 28, on page 17, with the following:

“(e) may, with the unanimous approval of the members of the standing committee, make recoverable expenditures on”.

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-26, in Clause 35, be amended by replacing line 32, on page 18, with the following:

“regulations, with the approval of the provinces affected and of the standing committee,”.

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-26, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing line 43, on page 18, with the following:

“recommendation of the Minister and after obtaining the approval of the provinces affected, may make”.

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-26, in Clause 36, be amended by adding after line 12, on page 19, the following:

“(4) At the request of the standing committee or of a province that is affected by an order made under this section, the Governor in Council shall revoke the order.”

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-26, in Clause 43, be amended by replacing line 24, on page 28, with the following:

“(i) conduct or cooperate with the provinces and with persons”.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to go ahead immediately; the afternoon may be a bit longer.

● (1520)

I want to be sure I have understood you correctly. The motions are deemed to have been approved, but does that mean that there will be a vote on each one?

Before beginning my 10-minute speech, I would like to be sure I have understood. Last night, it was agreed with members across the way that it was not necessary to call a vote on each one since it was agreed a recorded division would be called on these motions. According to what was agreed, the vote on the first motion will be applied to the others and we will have to live with it.

**The Speaker:** Dear colleague, the agreement reached yesterday will apply today. We have the unanimous consent of the House, and that is how we will proceed. Does that answer your question?

**Mr. Bernier (Gaspé):** Mr. Speaker, for those who followed yesterday's proceedings, motions in Group No. 8 have more or less the same purpose as those in Groups Nos. 6 and 7, in that the goal of the Bloc Québécois, the official opposition, is to draw the government's attention to the fact that the integrated ocean management strategy it wants to put in place must be implemented in co-operation with its partners.

This time around, the partners are the provinces that make up Canada. Each of these motions is aimed at reminding legislators that the provinces must be involved.

I even added another notion in these amendments, mainly in Motions Nos. 36, 37 and 40. These three motions revolve around the same idea: allowing the minister or the government to be a little more open. I would like them to get the co-operation of and a form of approval from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans.

Of course, most members of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans are from the government party. The opposition is not likely to hijack this bill or to throw a wrench into the process. This would allow the government to become more open, as it tries to establish a partnership through the integrated ocean management strategy.

Most members of the standing committee belong to the government party, but the official opposition and the third party are also

*Government Orders*

represented. We even have independent and Conservative members; we are very open. The committee is doing its work in the least partisan way possible.

I think that allowing members of this House to first become familiar with the issues in committee would help the government become more open. Second, I always come back to building bridges with the partners, the provinces. This would produce some consistency and everyone would be less surprised.

The main problem in management of things like that is to always ensure that our partners are informed at the same time we are.

• (1525)

If we manage to maintain this trust and this communication, my experience as an administrator tells me that 90 per cent of the problems will be solved before they actually surface.

There are also many other motions. For example, Motions Nos. 44 and 45, which deal with part II of the act. We proposed many motions, but these primarily seek to explain the letter and the spirit of the act.

However, since we are discussing several issues, I wish to point out, for the benefit of the members here and the people watching us at home, that Motions Nos. 44 and 45 relate to the minister's powers. The act provides that the minister may enter into agreements and it lists the groups with which the minister can reach such agreements, to implement the management strategy.

When I read this provision, I realized that the main partners, namely the provinces, are not included in the list. So, like a good team player, I am telling the government that it would be a good idea to include, through Motion No. 44, the possibility of entering into agreements with the provinces, since they are the main partners in the process.

As for Motion No. 45, it provides, as regards the minister's powers, that the minister may make grants to organizations and groups, based on the terms and conditions approved by the Treasury Board. Again, since this is something which must be done with the greatest possible spirit of co-operation and with the greatest possible transparency, I am adding to the transparency of the process by specifying that it must be done following the committee's recommendations.

This motion gives the government the opportunity to raise awareness among the hon. members of the various parties represented in this House. But once again, it would not stand in the way of the government, since it still has a majority within the standing committee.

As for Motions Nos. 50 and 53, I am coming back to them in the same spirit as earlier. I am asking that the minister seek approval, and the approval of the provinces affected in particular.

When a decision is made to implement an integrated management strategy in a given area or to act in concert, the key stakeholders, that is to say the provinces, should have a say in the matter. These motions reflect this notion. I have tried—and we have worked at it within the standing committee last year—to sell the notion of partnership. I tried to explain the spirit in which this kind of bill ought to be drafted.

I must confess, however, that I apparently did not succeed in getting the idea across. Yet, the former fisheries minister, Brian Tobin, made it clear to me in committee—and we could go back to the proceedings if necessary—that he wanted this bill to be implemented in co-operation, in partnership with the provinces. That is why I feel perfectly free to raise all this again today. Every time I hear that the minister may or shall act in co-operation and how he should go about it, I make sure to repeat to this House that the provinces must be identified as key stakeholders.

To wrap up and conclude, the main goal is to enable the federal government to show the transparency necessary to ensure the integrated management strategies that will have to be put in place will work well.

I will call your attention, if I may, to Motion No. 56. If the department, the minister and the governor in council look at it closely, they will see how far they can take this spirit of partnership.

• (1530)

There are three paragraphs in this clause of the bill and I would like to add a fourth one. Following consultations with the provinces, or a province, the federal government could revoke an order it issued when factors affecting the environment or the community have not been taken into account, since the provinces are closer to the issues than is the federal government. While we are here in Ottawa, provincial governments are closer to the communities.

Again, the recent crab fishery dispute in New Brunswick and in Quebec is a good example. It is the Quebec and New Brunswick fisheries ministers who took immediate action with plant workers.

I will let the fisheries minister answer in due time but, as you can see, it is necessary to include the provinces when talking about integrated ocean management. The provinces concerned are located right along the coasts; they are aware of the issues and they can react accordingly. In some cases, they can warn the federal fisheries minister, thus saving Canadian and Quebec taxpayers money. In other words, let us call on those who are concerned and involved to make sure the strategy is truly effective.

I am now going to sit down, but I will certainly rise again when we discuss the next group of motions.

[English]

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a point of order before we get into debate.

Because these motions are grouped together—and in this group there are nine or ten—I am not clear on how we are going to deal with them when we vote. Are we going to vote on each one separately or are we going to vote on the group? There are some motions here that we would like to support and some that we cannot support.

I seek your guidance, Mr. Speaker. Can you advise me on how these will be dealt with?

**The Speaker:** The voting pattern was agreed on yesterday and it is in front of you now. Is it clear or do you need further clarification?

**Mr. Scott (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me now. I appreciate your assistance.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member's 10 minutes will begin at this point.

**Mr. Scott (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I will need to utilize my whole time.

My party will be supporting Motions Nos. 36 through 46 and Motion No. 73 because they seek to give the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans more power to review legislation. They also require the government to report to the standing committee on the effectiveness of the legislation.

The motions also seek to increase the government's obligation to consult with the provinces. Essentially that is a good thing.

We cannot support several motions in this grouping, namely Motion Nos. 50, 53 and 56, simply because their intent is to try to interject provincial jurisdiction where we see a clear federal responsibility.

• (1535)

I mentioned this in my remarks yesterday when we were talking about these motions. The federal government has jurisdiction and sovereignty over Canada's marine waters. I fail to see, and it is difficult for anybody to see, how those marine waters can be divided into provincial jurisdictions.

I come from British Columbia. One of the main reasons I chose to run for office and become involved in federal politics was my feeling that the federal government had become too powerful, that it had interceded and injected itself into many areas where it had no legitimate place.

I can understand the frustrations of many people, including people from Quebec. I understand the motivation of my colleague, the member for Gaspé, who has been working with us on the standing committee and who has moved these motions, as to why he would like to see the federal government back away from many areas where it is currently involved.

When it comes to Canada's marine waters, the federal government has jurisdiction and responsibility. Many aspects of our

### *Government Orders*

marine waters are international and interprovincial in nature. There can be only one lead player in this. It must be the federal government.

In summary, Reform members will be supporting the motions in this grouping that seek to increase the obligation of the federal government to consult with the provinces and that seek to require the federal government to report to the standing committee on a regular basis and make the standing committee more relevant.

We cannot support those motions that attempt to increase provincial jurisdiction.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Madam Speaker, there are 11 motions under Group No. 8 now before us, all presented by the Bloc Québécois, and more specifically by my colleague, the hon. member for Gaspé. Ten concern the part dealing with ocean management strategy and one, the part dealing with the minister's powers. You will see from the motions presented by the member for Gaspé that we are dealing with two very distinct subjects that we would like to see corrected in this bill.

The first is that we find—and we have said so repeatedly in this debate—that the Liberal government has left the provinces out of consultations. Among other things, the provinces are compared to a municipal government, Indian reserves, and other persons and bodies. In the ten amendments to the part dealing with the ocean management strategy, it is extremely important that the government of each province participate.

The final amendment, the eleventh in Group No. 8, focuses specifically on the minister's powers, which we would like to limit as much as possible in order to have considerably more transparency.

So that everyone understands, including hon. members who may not have read or did not bother reading the bill, I add that the act respecting the oceans of Canada is very important and affects many ridings. There are those who might initially think the bill does not affect some ridings, such as my riding of Berthier—Montcalm, at all. But to take the example of my riding, given that the St. Lawrence River flows right through it, there will be an effect on tariffs for pleasure boats and so on. It is therefore a bill that concerns everyone associated in any way with the St. Lawrence and its ports.

• (1540)

Starting with Motion No. 36, we find that its intention is to amend clause 32 to read as follows:

“32. For the purpose of the implementation of integrated management plans, the Minister

(a) with the unanimous approval of the members of the standing committee, shall develop and implement policies and programs with respect to matters assigned by law to the Minister;”

*Government Orders*

The intent of this amendment is to correct a shortcoming, an aberration in the bill. We wish to involve the MPs who sit on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans.

I am sure that you recall that one of the Liberal Party's commitments in the famous red book was to improve the perception of MPs, to raise the prestige of what MPs do. How better to do this than to involve the MPs who have accepted parliamentary duties, such as sitting on the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans?

The amendment proposed by the member for Gaspé helps the government attain its objectives and meet its campaign promises, which it has had difficulty doing. The hon. member for Gaspé wishes to assist the government in raising the profile of the work of the MPs by empowering the MPs sitting on this committee to approve extremely important elements of the integrated ocean management strategy.

Who can be better placed than the MPs on that standing committee, who receive witnesses and have the opportunity to question specialists, to present positive elements in a bill like this?

That is fine. The minister is advised by officials and bureaucrats in skyscrapers. Sometimes I wonder if they have ever seen such a bill and whether they can tell a panfish from a catfish. These people are advising the minister on a bill as important as this one.

The members who have heard witnesses, done research, studied the ins and outs of such a bill could move the debate along and provide protection to those needing it, that is, those affected by the Oceans Act.

Another extremely important amendment, and I am sure that with all the transparency the Liberal government wants for its administration it will vote in favour of this motion, which is Motion No. 37, introduced by the member for Gaspé. It amends sub-clause (b) of clause 32 to read as follows:

“(b) with the approval of the standing committee, shall recommend and co-ordinate with other ministers, boards and agencies of the Government of Canada the implementation of policies—”

This is exactly the intent of Motion No. 37.

Motions Nos. 40 and 41 will change sub-clause (d) of clause 32, which appears in part II entitled “Oceans Management Strategy”, one of the most important sections of this bill. With the proposed amendments, paragraph (d) would read as follows:

“may, with the approval of the standing committee in concert with the provincial governments and in consultation with interested persons and bodies and with other ministers, boards and agencies of the Government of Canada, establish, with respect for the rights and legislative jurisdiction of the provinces, marine environmental quality guidelines, objectives and criteria respecting estuaries, coastal waters and marine waters.”

That is true partnership. That is what I call really consulting, listening, participating and inviting colleagues and partners to

participate. The federal government, the provincial governments affected as well as federal departments—because more than one department may be affected—and interested persons and bodies are all called upon to participate in a partnership to ensure the best possible regulations are developed.

• (1545)

This is the sole purpose of Motions Nos. 40 and 41. Motion No. 44, which amends clause 33, seeks to do the same by including the provincial governments in the decision making process, since the issues often come under their jurisdiction and directly affect them.

The purpose of Motion No. 45 is exactly the same. This motion, which affects paragraph (d), will certainly be passed, given that it only makes sense and improves the bill. I am convinced that the minister, who is listening carefully to my comments, will ask his government to support this motion.

I will end on that note, since I do not have time to discuss all the motions. However, I wish to point out that, if Motion No. 45 is passed, the provision will read as follows: “(d) may make grants and contributions on terms and conditions approved by the Treasury Board, after the House of Commons has adopted a resolution confirming the recommendations of the standing committee approving the making of grants and contributions”.

As members can see, this motion seeks to ensure the participation of the members of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, and also the members of this House, who were given a mandate by their constituents to represent them and make sure that the legislation passed by this House is as good as can possibly be.

So, the ultimate goal is very simple: it is to promote transparency, to ensure greater provincial government participation, and to take away from the minister some of the powers he is giving himself with this act, something that could eventually be very dangerous.

[English]

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, once again it is a pleasure to address the Canada Oceans Act and in particular Motions Nos. 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 50, 53, 56 and 73.

The act, as members know, is the product of a number of deliberations and consultations, including the standing committee on the subject, which has a special competence and a special expertise in matters having to do with the oceans.

I would stress again that the work of the House on this act and the work of the standing committee should not be turned into a fishing expedition to elaborate casual ideas on structural institutional changes in government or on the separation of powers or federal-provincial relations. Neither the oceans act itself nor

*Government Orders*

frankly the work of the standing committee is competent to bear that sort of discussion. There are other committees and other arenas. While I admire the enthusiasm with which some of the members opposite have addressed themselves to these issues and the interstices of discussions of the oceans act, it is simply the wrong place and the wrong time.

The motions in this group would serve to fetter the minister's ability to exercise his mandate to act decisively on matters within his general mandate and responsibility for the oceans.

Some of the motions propose to change accepted parliamentary procedure by requiring the approval of the standing committee to conduct ministerial business. That would be an unprecedented step in terms of parliamentary practice. Frankly, while we are prepared as a government to discuss general plans for the improvement of Parliament, it should be done within a committee charged with that purpose. There are several to which I could suggest members of the opposition address themselves.

The leadership role of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is laid out in part II, the oceans management strategy, which describes his role and responsibilities.

Motion No. 36 by the Bloc proposes that the minister receive unanimous approval of a standing committee before developing or implementing policies and programs within his mandate. This is an unprecedented attempt to fetter the minister completely in the exercise of his mandate. It is contrary to accepted parliamentary practice. We would have to change the system. We are prepared to discuss that, but surely not as a footnote to the discussion of the oceans act itself. This is a constitutional issue that deserves another arena and a more specialized expertise on the part of its members. Motion No. 36 should be rejected therefore.

• (1550)

Motion No. 37 proposes the minister receive approval from the standing committee before he undertakes the role as co-ordinator within the federal government of policies and programs respecting coastal marine waters. Once again it flies in the face of accepted parliamentary practice. It is an idea that is interesting in itself but there are appropriate organs of Parliament that can consider this on the basis of the expert competence of the members of those committees. Motion No. 37 in this context should be rejected.

Motions Nos. 40 and 41 by the Bloc propose two different amendments to the same line in the bill. We are not really sure what the Bloc wants on this.

Motion No. 40 proposes once again that the minister receive approval from the standing committee to exercise his mandate, this time for the establishment of marine environmental quality guidelines, objectives and criteria. This would unduly restrict the

minister in exercising his mandate and is contrary to parliamentary practice.

Motion No. 41 proposes the minister obtain agreement from the provinces in establishing marine environmental quality guidelines, objectives and criteria. This is something that is within federal purview. While the provinces must and will be part of the collaborative effort, the constitutional responsibility for this is with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. It cannot be delegated or transferred in the interstices of the oceans act. It is the wrong arena. Motion No. 41 must be rejected.

Part II of the act also provides a number of other mechanisms for the minister to use in order to perform his duties and functions.

Motion No. 44 by the Bloc asks that one add mention of the provincial governments in the provision for entering into agreements. It is redundant as the clause already provides for the minister to enter into agreements with the provinces. Motion No. 44 should be rejected as redundant.

Motion No. 45 again attempts to fetter the minister's abilities, this time his ability to make grants and contributions. The Bloc proposes the minister, before making a grant or contribution, have the House adopt a resolution concerning a recommendation by the standing committee.

There are already rules developed by Treasury Board governing the making of grants and contributions. It is a huge additional purpose, quite unnecessary, a change in parliamentary practice, and the wrong arena and wrong forum in which to attempt it. We do not make constitutional changes of this sort by indirection without substantial discussion. For these reasons Motion No. 45 should be rejected.

On Motion No. 46, it is the same theme. The minister must have the unanimous approval of the standing committee for making recoverable expenditures on behalf of any ministry, board or agency of the government. This unduly fetters the minister and is contrary to accepted parliamentary practice. I recommend rejection.

During its review, the standing committee greatly strengthened the provisions relating to marine protected areas. To many Canadians these are some of the most important clauses of the Canada Oceans Act. Motions Nos. 50, 53 and 56 relate to clauses dealing with the regulations making powers of the minister with respect to marine protected areas. In a situation where a marine resource or habitat is at risk, the government would be able to take action immediately.

The Bloc in Motions Nos. 50, 53 and 56 seeks to amend clauses 35 and 36 concerning marine protected areas and would require the governor in council to obtain approval from affected provinces and from a standing committee before issuing regulations. This would also apply to emergency marine protected areas. These motions

*Government Orders*

would negate the whole purpose of this section of the act which is to provide for the implementation of emergency marine protected areas relatively quickly when circumstances warrant it. They would put the marine resources in jeopardy. The Bloc would rather veto the minister's ability to fulfil his mandate and create a very cumbersome administrative process. Why?

Further, in Motion No. 73 the Bloc feels it necessary once again to specify that the minister may work with the provinces. We believe in co-operating with the provinces. We do co-operate with the provinces. It is totally unnecessary however to specify provinces in this section and in fact it is redundant to do so. Motion No. 73 provides no value added to this bill. It does nothing to clarify the text. It along with Motions Nos. 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 50, 53 and 56 should be rejected.

[Translation]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I was here last night for the first part of the debate, as was the member for Vancouver Quadra, who had several comments on each group of motions presented by my colleague, the member for Gaspé.

• (1555)

I note today that he is no wiser for having slept on it, for he is still singing the same tune.

First, when they talk about co-operation with the provinces, consulting the provinces, the member, whose constitutional expertise is recognized by everyone, takes a very legal approach, while the proposals by the member for Gaspé boil down to this: Why always speak of the Constitution, which was written in 1867, when things have changed, many areas have changed, the fishery has changed? There is something of interest here, which is co-operation by the greatest possible number of partners. Co-operation and consultation.

Approval is not always necessary. It is up to the minister, as recognized by international law, and we accept that. But the member for Gaspé is trying to suggest to the legislators that the minister be placed under a slightly greater obligation to consult, to be more open to those partners wishing to co-operate. Since last night, the member for Gaspé has been holding out his hand in co-operation.

Yesterday, he spoke primarily about the provinces; today, he is adding another aspect. He is a member of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, and people reacted to his speeches. People said: "Yes, in fact, the member for Gaspé co-operated very closely with other members of the fisheries and oceans committee". This is recognized by everybody.

But when we get to the House and consider the motions, the reaction is always the same: "No, no, we cannot do that. We cannot consult the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans because it

would take powers away from the minister, it is not supposed to happen that way, it is not consistent with parliamentary practices, it is not part of the parliamentary tradition, it is not provided for under current parliamentary rules".

When I hear this, I cannot help but remain stunned and surprised. The Chair and its officers ruled that the motions moved by the member for Gaspé were in order, which means they can be debated. But the member for Vancouver Quadra has a different interpretation, saying: "No, we should not debate these things in here, this is not the right place".

I am not as experienced as the member for Vancouver Quadra, but I would like him to tell me where the right place would be, if this is not it. We are here in the federal Parliament, in the House of Commons, to pass pieces of legislation. Where are we supposed to debate them?

The member for Chambly said: "Are we always supposed to debate constitutional issues in the Chateau Laurier, at night?", thus reminding us of the night of the long knives. Is this the place? If it is not the Chateau Laurier, it might be another hotel, just tell us which one. He never tells us where we can discuss this. Moreover, he tells us that it is not in the standing committee. It is not in the House, it is not in committee, it is not with the provinces. But where on earth can people help the minister carry on his responsibilities, and form partnerships with him?

There has been consultation on the Coast Guard, but we will get back to this later. The minister consults people, but we know full well he only does as he pleases. He can do it, he is the boss.

What we are asking him to do is to mention in the bill that a spirit of consultation and co-operation is needed, but he refuses to do so. I am surprised that such motions do not get more support from the other side of the House.

Then the member for Berthier—Montcalm spoke with his usual eloquence and sincere optimism. And what happened right after his speech? We were told a blunt no, as always, on legal grounds. It is not allowed, it cannot be done here, this is not the proper forum. But we are never told where, when or how.

• (1600)

Those with a long experience in this House should help newcomers and say: "If it cannot be done here, it must be done in this other place". And when I say other place, I am not talking about the "other place", as the Senate is called, because it would seem that is not the place where things are done either. It is not where you find the most dynamic and innovative ideas.

From what I understand, that place is more of an extinguisher, a delaying force. Most of the time, it exercises a power to suspend things. Young and dynamic members, such as the member for Gaspé, make very interesting proposals, but what do they do? They



reply that this is not the right place and these are not the right motions.

In conclusion let me say, as the member for Berthier—Montcalm said earlier, that we will have to think about the meaning of the words written in the Liberal program where they mentioned reforming—maybe not the type of reform the Reform Party wants—the parliamentary system of Canada in order to increase the contribution of members of the federal Parliament, who were duly elected to represent their constituents.

We present motions, considered as admissible by the Chair, but we are told this is not in the Constitution and this is not place to do it. Let me finish with the following thought.

I tried to share the optimism of my colleague, the member for Berthier—Montcalm, but the reaction of the member for Vancouver Quadra brings us back to reality; this federalism is stuck in glue. Stand-pattism is threatening us all, in that area as in others.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** As agreed, Motions Nos. 36, 44, 45, 50, 53 and 73 are deemed to have been put and recorded divisions are deemed to have been requested and deferred.

The first question is on Motion No. 36. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 44. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

### *Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 45. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 50. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 53. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 73. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

We will now proceed to Group No. 9 of motions, which includes Motions Nos. 54, 55, 69, 71 and 92.

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 54

That Bill C-26, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 1 and 2, on page 19, with the following:

“of the opinion that a fishery resource is or is likely to be at risk to the extent that”.

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-26, in Clause 36, be amended

(a) in the English version, by replacing line 2, on page 19, with the following:

“habitat is or is likely to be at risk to the extent that”; and

(b) in the French version, by replacing lines 3 to 5, on page 19, with the following:

“incompatible avec quelque accord sur des revendications territoriales ratifié, mis en vigueur et déclaré valide par une loi fédérale.”

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ)** moved:

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-26, in Clause 41, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 3, on page 27, with the following:

“(c) navigation safety, including the regulation of the construction, inspection, equipment and operation of boats;”.

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-26, in Clause 42, be amended by replacing lines 24 and 25, on page 27, with the following:

“ing to fisheries resources;”.

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-26, in Clause 107, be amended by replacing line 36, on page 49, with the following:

“establish a protected area for fishery resources in any area of”.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the motions in Group No. 9. I admit this makes a lot of paper to deal with. This must be tiresome for the people at home who are watching, and I know it is a little onerous for the hon. members who are less familiar with this type of bill.

I will talk about Motions Nos. 54, 71 and 92. I will deal with them in three separate sections. What I am trying to make the government understand with these motions, the message I am trying to convey, always with the goal of avoiding the problems we may have with this bill in the future, is to determine the areas where there could be problems, where there might be conflicting areas.

This is a good opportunity for doing so, since the Parliamentary Secretary of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, who is also the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, had legal or constitutional experience before coming to the House. In fact, he uses it a lot to repeat this may not be the right place to change the things I am trying to change, as the hon. member for Lévis pointed out so brilliantly.

• (1605)

I want to remind the member for Vancouver Quadra that, of course, according to the first Constitution, fisheries were a federal jurisdiction, but at that time, there was something we did not know much about and that is environmental problems. It was not even part of our vocabulary. When definitions are too all-encompassing, when the words used to describe the things to be managed are a little too vague, it can create problems in some cases.

I am no constitutional expert, but in order to avoid conflicts on environmental matters for instance, I prefer asking the government to use terms such “fishery resources”, that is the content of the ocean, rather than “marine resources”, a vaster concept.

Why do I wish to make such a distinction? Well, this is still a new concept and, since I do not think this is the intent of the bill, I would not like to see the federal government grabbing the opportunity to spread its jurisdiction over other spheres of activity, besides the main one which is fisheries management.

*Government Orders*

Indeed, we are now talking about ocean management. However, I doubt that there has been enough discussions between the main partners—the provinces and the federal government—between ministers, and between provincial and federal officials, to agree on wording. According to the information at my disposal, there are different definitions of those words, different interpretations. It is important to stress this fact.

For those who have just joined us, I also want to remind them that last year, in committee, the former fisheries minister, Brian Tobin, recognized that he and Sheila Copps, the then Minister of the Environment, were like yin and yang. What about it? Surely, this did not mean that there was a clash of personalities between these two people. They had been working together long before I arrived.

Must I conclude that their own officials did not have the same perception of things? This is why I draw the minister's attention to the necessity of being cautious, of choosing a less controversial term. Once there has been agreement on the first term, we can go on to the second.

During the time I have left—and it is a source of concern and frustration to be limited to 10 minutes at report stage—I would like to address the other motions, Motions Nos. 69 and 55.

Motion No. 69 seeks to draw the department's attention to the safety of pleasure craft. Since he is responsible for safety, I would like the minister to extend his definition to include the safety of anything that navigates and not to limit himself to one kind of floating object, that is pleasure craft. I would like safety of commercial vessels to be taken into consideration—something which should have been done when the Coast Guard and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans were merged. The same minister recently set user fees for commercial vessels. I would like to also see him look after their commercial safety.

• (1610)

As for Motion No. 55, this is one presented by the government. I will close with this one just to prove my good faith. I can live with what is proposed in this motion. Its purpose is to ensure that there is no incompatibility with native land claims that have already been ratified, would be ratified, or might be declared valid by a federal statute. That is totally sensible and I can live with that.

In other words, if I am capable of acknowledging that the Liberals across the way are capable of some good things, I would like some non-partisan acknowledgment from time to time that we, too, are capable of good things. And if we are capable of acknowledging that care must be taken with respect to aboriginal treaties, the same spirit ought to be reflected in the letter of the act in view of all that was said in respect of motions in Group No. 8 concerning the provinces.

[English]

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, in speaking to these motions, we in the Reform Party can support the Bloc in its move to have the federal government responsible for safety, including navigation, as outlined by my colleague from Gaspé. We are also in support of the Liberal amendment.

We cannot support Motions Nos. 71 and 92, as they seek to increase the jurisdiction of the provinces in areas where we do not think it is appropriate.

The idea of limiting the minister's powers to marine protected areas, to fisheries alone, is not a move in the right direction. Canada's marine protected areas are about much more than fish. We have very eclectic marine wildlife in all parts of the country. The marine protected areas must be there to ensure not only the protection of fisheries but the protection of other aquatic and marine life found in Canada's marine waters.

We will be supporting the first motion but we cannot support the last two motions in this grouping.

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to resume discussion of the oceans act. I am addressing in particular Motions Nos. 54, 55, 69, 71 and 92.

I have been impressed with the sincerity and quality of the arguments made by the hon. member for Gaspé. If I have made comments during the course of this very long debate on the choice of arenas for the solution to particular problems, it is because our constitutional system, any good constitutional system, rests on respect for constitutional roles and missions of different organs, including in this case parliamentary committees.

Some of the proposals the hon. member makes in the interstices of discussion of the oceans act go to relations between the different institutions of government. The submission of the minister to decisions of the governor in council following on decisions by standing committees is an interesting proposal. It has memories of the United States congressional committees and their attitude to the presidency, although the nearer model would be la convention, that interesting example of government by assembly one had in the early 1790s. There is nothing to say against this proposal as a pure proposal. I would simply say that neither the fourth nor the fifth French republics have followed it. It is not our system. It may well be that in the discussion of fundamental constitutional change we should get into that. But this is not the proper arena for it.

• (1615)

I would suggest to the hon. member that he might ask his party to consider putting him up for the committee on procedure and House affairs, which is a de facto constitutional committee and addresses structural problems of this sort. Having been invited as an expert

*Government Orders*

witness before this committee recently, I can testify to the very high intellectual quality of all the hon. members from all parties who were represented there.

Some of the other suggestions on federal-provincial relations are interesting and topical. A first ministers conference is coming up. One of the provincial premiers has already raised marine issues as a topic for discussion. These are issues that could be discussed there with some value for us all.

Getting back to the specific issues before us and addressing the points concerned, I note the responsibility of Canada to conserve and protect the vast marine ecosystems off our three coasts for present and future generations. We recognize the increasing stresses on our ocean environments, particularly our coastal areas.

The standing committee of which the member for Gaspé was a valuable and hard working member heard from Canadians from all coasts.

In Bill C-26, marine protected areas are described as areas of the sea designated for the conservation, protection of endangered or threatened marine species and their unique habitats, commercial, non-commercial fishery resources, including marine mammals and their habitats and any other marine resource or habitat that is necessary to fulfil the mandate.

To many Canadians this is one of the most important clauses of the Canada oceans act. It will be a milestone in Canada's oceans history.

In addition to this clause, Bill C-26 contains regulation making powers with respect to the marine protected areas described above. It prescribes measures for creating these areas in emergency situations.

In a situation where a marine resource or habitat is at risk or likely to be at risk, we will take action immediately. This is part of the precautionary approach described in the preamble to the act, erring on the side of caution.

Government Motion No. 55 seeks to correct the transcription error in this section to allow for the protection of marine resources or habitats that are or likely to be at risk rather than as it is currently written, which does not provide for protection of marine resources or habitats that are at risk. This motion also makes the French and English texts of the bill consistent in this section.

On the other hand, in our view, the Bloc in Motion No. 54 seeks to limit the establishment of emergency marine protected areas to the protection of fisheries resources only. This in our view flies in the face of the ecosystem approach. There is more in Canada's oceans than just those species we consume and many of those species and ecosystems require protection too. Therefore, in our view, Motion No. 54 should be rejected.

The Bloc attempts to impose similar limitations in Motion No. 92, where it is proposed to amend Environment Canada's Canada Wildlife Act to apply only to fisheries resources.

We find this unacceptable for the obvious reason that the Canada Wildlife Act is legislation to protect the wildlife of this nation, not just fisheries resources. Therefore, we recommend rejection of Motion No. 92.

On a similar theme, Motion No. 71 by the Bloc proposes to restrict the minister's mandate for research to fisheries resources only. The bill commits to an ecosystem approach to managing our oceans. Ocean ecosystems consist of all the fisheries resources. To restrict the minister's mandate for research to only fisheries condemns us to ignorance of natural processes at work in our oceans.

This is not the intent of the legislation. In fact, Motion No. 71 is totally contrary to the ecosystem approach proposed in the legislation and supported by Canadians. We recommend rejection of the motion.

On another matter, Motion No. 69 by the Bloc proposes to expand the powers of the minister to include the regulation of construction, inspection, equipment and operation of all boats. This clause currently only refers to pleasure craft.

• (1620)

While I am sure the minister is flattered by the Bloc's confidence, the responsibility for regulation of construction, inspection, equipment and operation of commercial vessels remains within the mandate of another minister, the Minister of Transport. As such, Motion No. 69 should be defeated and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans should remain responsible only for pleasure craft.

In summary, I recommend that an effort be continued to protect the marine resources of Canada's three oceans for generations to come. Members of this House should reject the Bloc Motions Nos. 54, 71 and 92 and support the government technical amendments in Motion No. 55.

Furthermore, I urge that Motion No. 69 be rejected. It proposes to expand the responsibilities of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, as I already said, for marine safety, to commercial ships which is clearly the responsibility of the Minister of Transport.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the motions proposed by the member for Gaspé are particularly relevant in this regard. First, I wanted to check the meaning of halieutic resources—I knew what it meant, but I wanted to be sure. *Le Petit Robert* says that halieutic resources refers to anything involving fisheries.

We can see the concern of the member for Gaspé is the role formerly played by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, that is,

a concern about fishing. I find that entirely reasonable, because we can see with the new Oceans Act that the jurisdiction of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is now much broader.

We could look for example, at Motion No. 69, which concerns clause 41. This clause is very explicit. It talks about Coast Guard services; services for the safe, economical and efficient movement of ships; aids to navigation systems and services; marine communications and traffic management services; ice breaking and ice management services; channel maintenance services and the marine component of the federal search and rescue program.

This really gives us a sense of the aim of the law, which is to significantly change the role of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. I am not saying we should not try to make changes. As a matter of fact, in my previous speech I was mentioning that I wanted changes and that changes are often a necessity because things evolve.

With regard to the Coast Guard, personally—this is not the Bloc's position as such—I have some trouble seeing how this is going to be transferred from the transport department to the department which, from now on, will be the oceans department, as this will be a new field of jurisdiction.

Speaking of the fields of jurisdiction of various departments, certain colleagues, especially opposite, mentioned environmental concerns, but there is a Department of the Environment, which is called to play a very important role. It seems to me we should have had more time to think this through, more consultation before going ahead with such major changes, because transferring responsibility for the whole thing is like giving responsibility over the ecosystem, the environment; it is giving authority over many fields which used to come under the environment department.

I wonder about this. Of course, I did not follow the committee proceedings as closely as the member for Gaspé, who is on the committee, because I sit on other ones, but the member for Gaspé mentioned them very often and told us about his concerns. Coming from an area where there is a lot of fishing, he has shown on many occasions how well he knows the issue. There is an old saying to the effect that you should not bite more than you can chew.

• (1625)

I am concerned about the minister who will have to play a great many different roles which might be interrelated but could sometimes clash, especially if, for example, he becomes responsible for other departments. This is why it is so important to have a mechanism for the consultation of, and the joint action with, not only other federal departments but also the other partners, the provinces. Consider all the resources associated with oceans; the member for Chambly reminded us yesterday that it can mean such things as the flotilla which ran aground at Pointe-aux-Anglais where the shipwreck now has a definite heritage value.

### *Government Orders*

Clearly the issue is not a simple one. Sometimes, when trying to clarify things, we can complicate them by generating contradictions between the operations of different departments.

My purpose is not to officially oppose that aspect of the bill, but rather to remind the government to consider thoroughly all the possible impacts of such changes in transfers, particularly in the case of the Coast Guard.

[*English*]

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on the amendments put forward by the hon. member for Gaspé. I am not going to support these amendments.

Coming from the same area as the hon. member, it is perfectly right and legitimate that he raise these amendments to this legislation.

The clerks at the table make a judgment on whether these amendments are legal. That is why we have a law clerk. In fact, I was once a law clerk in a provincial legislature. That is why we have an assistant clerk, a chief clerk. They make those decisions.

I can also understand why the hon. member in some of his amendments talks the way he does about the ecosystem and about the great dissatisfaction he and his fishermen have with the way the federal government has treated the ecosystem over the years.

The great Gaspé area puts out a brochure for June that says: "Fishing from the wharves". That is for saltwater fish. Just imagine, fishing from the wharves. And under that it says: "In various sections of the Gaspé for this year". There is listed which wharves are the best wharves for fishing cod.

We cannot fish cod in Newfoundland and Labrador because of the moratorium. However, the federal government allows fishing from the wharves in the Gaspé for cod, mackerel, sea trout and so on. It is a great fishing area. The best spawning area in the world for mackerel is the Gaspé coast. What has happened over the years?

I can understand the hon. member. Over the years the federal government had given licences to Norway, Sweden and Denmark to fish every year at this time as the mackerel are coming in to spawn in that great spawning area in the gulf. What these vessels did was block the spawning path of the mackerel as it came in in one big line. Believe me, that is not too long ago.

In fact we still have foreign licences inside 200-miles. I am surprised that the opposition has not introduced an amendment to end it for all time.

What happened to the squid that once frequented the Gaspé peninsula and the eastern coast of Canada?

*Government Orders*

• (1630)

The hon. member talks about the ecosystem, the squid that used to go into the gulf, the squid that were the food of the cod, the flatfish and every other type of groundfish. The squid are born around Florida. They come up the coastline of Canada, go into the gulf, go way up around the east coast of Canada, come back down in one year to Florida and die. They know where to go, do they not? They go down to Florida in that one year cycle, reproduce and then die. Ever since I can recall the federal government has judged squid to be underutilized. Therefore it has granted the licences for the great interception of the squid on their way up around the east coast of Canada into the Gulf of the St. Lawrence and around the Gaspé Peninsula.

I can understand what the hon. member is talking about when he talks about the federal government's mismanaging the resource historically. Historically there is certainly a case to be made for the federal government's total and utter mismanagement of the fisheries. There is no doubt about it. However, in the meantime I will not support the hon. member's amendment. I do not want him to get excited.

The unfortunate part of the management of the fishery that sometimes fisheries and oceans does not understand is the fact that fish swim. Fish actually swim.

**An hon. member:** Politicians talk, the fish swim.

**Mr. Baker:** No, the politicians make the lines in the ocean. They draw these lines and say here will be the regulation over on this side of the line and here is another regulation over on this side of the line. It is as if there are police officers at the bottom of the ocean who come up with stop signs and the fish are actually stopping somewhere in mid-ocean and turn around.

Therefore I can understand what the hon. member is talking about when he talks about the ecosystem that should apply to the fishery as it is not presently applying. Let me elaborate on the ecosystem and what is considered under these amendments.

If we look at the respect governments in Canada have for the ecosystem and the effects that government action has on the ecosystem we see today that while our fishermen sit at home, just outside the 200 mile zone, on what we call the Flemish Cap, which the hon. member for Gaspé is very familiar with, we have the foreign nations that continue to fish every single resource there.

I can understand the hon. member's point when he says there should be more consultation than there presently is. The only problem, something we have to think about as parliamentarians, is that when one gives the authority to the local area to have an input sometimes what comes out the other end is not desirable. There has been case after case of that.

In other words, when we tell the province of Quebec it can manage a certain part of the fishing resource, as the federal government has done, which has not been so for the other provinces although they have moved over the past 20 years historically, and then we tell Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and Newfoundland the same thing, what we have is a hodge-podge of regulations. We have a non-respect for the very thing the hon. member is promoting, the ecosystem.

**An hon. member:** And very confused fish.

**Mr. Baker:** Yes, and even when we go to the fishermen.

Today my phone calls concern fathoms. When fishermen set a net under 400 fathoms in the Atlantic Ocean today for turbot—a familiar word—they must have by regulation a net size of seven and a half inches. Unfortunately our fishermen do not have that size nets. Above 400 fathoms it is five and half inches.

• (1635)

Last year the federal government agreed to change that regulation size. There are hundreds of fishermen saying "how can we continue to fish today, our fish plants will close?" On checking why the regulation was changed, I discovered the regulation was changed by a conservation committee, set up by the hon. John Crosbie when he was minister of fisheries and oceans, that consulted with the fishermen and the environmentalists and came up with a regulation that cannot work. Now here am I lobbying today the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to change the very thing he had used his consultation process to get from the local fisher persons.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Mackenzie, human rights; the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton, lacrosse.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise on Bill C-26. In fact, I think some work has already been done with my colleague from Gaspé at second reading, and we are now dealing with a group of rather important motions.

I will deal in greater detail with the environmental aspect, which is my area of concern, and the effect of this bill on the Department of the Environment. This new bill gives the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans some powers that already belong to the Minister of the Environment. This is a further example of overlap between departments, and this is not the first time there are tensions between the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Department of the Environment. Once again, we have the yin and the yang.

*Government Orders*

The bill seems to create a sectoral Department of the Environment. It is like a Department of the Coastal Environment, if you will. If each department did the same thing, the Department of Transport would include something called Environment Transport, the Department of Industry, something called Environment Industry, and all government departments would have powers over environmental protection and conservation.

If this is the direction the government wants to take, all it needs to do is abolish the Department of the Environment. The government's approach to the environment is to centralize powers in Ottawa because of the national interest and of the globalization of environmental problems. Of course, Bill C-26 matches this approach.

I will quote a few clauses. Clauses 28 to 36 of the bill are those pertaining to the development of a strategy for the management of estuarine, coastal and marine ecosystems. This part does not apply to lakes and rivers. The management of these ecosystems is for the most part under provincial jurisdiction. I think the provinces are well aware of that, and deal with the environment. If there is overlap, not only with the Department of the Environment, but also with areas of provincial jurisdiction, the government is seizing some excessive powers.

It is impossible to control a department in this way. The government cannot meddle in jurisdictions that do not belong to it. Once again, this will simply create confusion between the provinces, which will not be able to reach a consensus, preferring to defend their own particular interests, which is quite normal, while the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will never manage to harmonize all this. This is another bill that will be impossible to implement and administer.

• (1640)

I now want to move on to clauses 31, 32 and 33, which give the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans the power to develop and implement a national strategy for managing the ecosystems in estuaries, coastal waters and marine waters. This strategy involves implementing plans for the management of activities, establishing management or consulting organizations, developing various programs, setting environmental standards, collecting and analyzing scientific data on the ecosystems in question. That is quite a lot.

It must be noted that several of the activities I just mentioned are already being carried out by the Department of the Environment. Once again, the government is duplicating existing services, as though it could afford such duplication.

Nowhere in this bill is the minister required to come to an agreement with other federal departments or with the provinces. In most cases, he can, if he so desires, request the co-operation of other authorities. But only if he so desires. Once again, introducing

such bills without harmonizing activities with those of other federal departments, the provinces and other levels of government is unacceptable.

The fact that the minister is not required to work in co-operation with officials from Environment Canada in particular and other federal departments in general is incomprehensible and unacceptable. At a time when jobs are being cut and when public spending is supposed to be reduced, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is creating duplication within the federal government.

Moreover, the new powers, duties and functions assigned to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans are not exclusively his, as they do not affect in any way the existing powers, duties and functions of other ministers and stakeholders. This means that competition and overlap may well develop in terms of applicable standards and amendments, as well as priorities and special measures.

It is incomprehensible and unacceptable that the minister not be required to work together with the provinces, when the provinces are directly affected by marine environment management. Over the years, Environment Canada has had to do so, through bodies such as the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment, which is more or less satisfactory. Is the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans contemplating going the same route?

It is a special situation where 10 environment ministers are working together with the aboriginals. Trying to reach an agreement on harmonization with 10 people around the table never works. This has prompted the Minister of the Environment to try to enter into a bilateral agreement with each province, since environmental priorities vary from one province to the next depending on the industries operating in the province. Will the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans do the same?

It does not always work well. I can tell you that, sometimes, it takes years just to settle one matter. Take for example greenhouse effect gas. We saw what happened. At the Rio summit, before all the other countries represented, the Canadian government made a commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions but realized, after consulting the provinces, that it would not be possible.

Moreover, it imposed standards unilaterally. The provinces were unable to meet these standards. As a result, come the year 2002, instead of having reduced greenhouse gas emissions, we will be facing another international summit where we will have to admit it did not work. We must watch out.

It is incomprehensible and unacceptable for the provinces to be treated, in this bill, like any other stakeholder, be it interests groups, municipalities, or industries. To do so is to show a glaring lack of respect for the provinces and it just does not make sense. It seems to me that a province has much greater powers than an interest group, a municipality or an industry. Provinces should be

*Government Orders*

on an equal footing with the federal government, not at a lower level.

The environment is not one of the exclusive jurisdictions assigned to one level of government under the Constitution. It is what is called an ancillary jurisdiction, arising from those jurisdictions specifically mentioned in the Canadian Constitution.

• (1645)

Theoretically, the Department of the Environment is responsible for this ancillary jurisdiction, together with each of the departments concerned.

Before 1985, the Quebec government, which has jurisdiction over local and territorial matters, played a major role with respect to the environment, occupying most of the jurisdictional area. At the time, in accordance with the Constitution, the federal government was content to get involved in areas complementing its jurisdiction.

After 1985, the federal started to get involved in environmental issues. It did so mainly through its spending power and through new powers it received from the courts. From then on, many instances of overlap and duplications appeared. This situation has been steadily growing since the election of the present Liberal government, which is doing its best to centralize the decision making process in Ottawa.

To the Quebec government, Bill C-26 is another step toward centralization. In 1988, the Supreme Court of Canada, in a four to three decision, divested the provinces of the management of the ocean environment and of its territory and turned it over to the federal government. Under Bill C-26, the federal government is trying to get the maximum out of this decision. Because of this centralizing tendency, Quebec fears that the federal government is attempting, in the middle or long term, to claim management of oceans and their resources.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** According to the agreement, Motions Nos. 54, 55, 69 and 71 are deemed to have been put to a vote and the recorded divisions are deemed to have been requested and deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 54. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members ha-ving risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 55. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 69. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 71. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.



**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

We now move on to Group No. 10, Motion No. 65.

[English]

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-26 be amended by adding after line 43, on page 25, the following new Clause:

“39.12 (1) In addition to the procedures set out in the Criminal Code for commencing a proceeding, proceedings in respect of any offence prescribed by the regulations may be commenced by an enforcement officer

(a) completing a ticket that consists of a summons portion and an information portion;

(b) delivering the summons portion to the accused or mailing it to the accused at the accused's latest known address; and

(c) filing the information portion with a court of competent jurisdiction before the summons portion has been delivered or mailed or as soon as is practicable afterward.

(2) The summons and information portions of the ticket must

(a) set out a description of the offence and the time and place of its alleged commission;

(b) include a statement, signed by the enforcement officer who completes the ticket, that the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that the accused committed the offence;

(c) set out the amount of the fine prescribed by the regulations for the offence and the manner in which and period within which it may be paid;

(d) include a statement that if the accused pays the fine within the period set out in the ticket, a conviction will be entered and recorded against the accused; and

(e) include a statement that if the accused wishes to plead not guilty or for any other reason fails to pay the fine within the period set out in the ticket, the accused must appear in the court on the day and at the time set out in the ticket.

(3) Where a thing is seized under this Act and proceedings relating to it are commenced by way of the ticketing procedure, the enforcement officer who completes the ticket shall give written notice to the accused that, if the accused pays the fine prescribed by the regulations within the period set out in the ticket, the thing, or any proceeds of its disposition, will be immediately forfeited to Her Majesty.

(4) Where an accused to whom the summons portion of a ticket is delivered or mailed pays the prescribed fine within the period set out in the ticket,

### *Government Orders*

(a) the payment constitutes a plea of guilty to the offence and a conviction must be entered against the accused and no further action may be taken against the accused in respect of that offence; and

(b) notwithstanding section 39.3, any thing seized from the accused under this Act that relates to the offence, or any proceeds of its disposition, are forfeited to

(i) Her Majesty in right of Canada, if the thing was seized by an enforcement officer employed in the public service of Canada, or

(ii) Her Majesty in right of a province, if the thing was seized by an enforcement officer employed by the government of that province.

(5) The Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing

(a) offences in respect of which this section applies and the manner in which the offences are to be described in tickets; and

(b) the amount of the fine for a prescribed offence, but the amount may not exceed \$2,000.”

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to participate again in debate on the oceans act. Specifically I will be addressing government Motion No. 65.

The fisheries and oceans fleet and that assigned to the coast guard became one during last year's turbot war when the red vessels of the coast guard and the grey vessels of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans performed admirably as a team to enforce Canada's commitment to protect straddling stocks and highly migratory fish from foreign predatory overfishing.

In its March 1995 report on the state of the world fisheries the FAO, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, highlighted problems of control and pointed toward solutions.

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

Enforcement is an important issue when dealing with ocean management. Poaching, dumping and other illegal activities compromise the future of our oceans and of their resources. Over the years Canadians have been confronted with challenges not only to our jurisdiction but to resource conservation and protection measures we exercise within our maritime areas.

Many witnesses appearing before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, including the Pacific Fishermen's Alliance, requested clarification on strengthening of the enforcement provisions of the oceans act with the explicit wording to describe the

*Government Orders*

role of the enforcement officers and the nature of and punishment for offences.

The enforcement provisions have been strengthened through the legislative process. The original bill text submitted to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans only provided a cross-reference to relevant enforcement and compliance provisions of the Canada Wildlife Act.

To improve the clarity of the bill and to make the act user friendly, the standing committee decided that sections 11 to 11.5 and 13 to 19 of the Canada Wildlife Act should be reproduced in the Canada Oceans Act. Unfortunately I hate to mention that although the king can do no wrong sometimes errors are made in the federal government. The last section was omitted when the sections were transcribed.

• (1650)

This section outlines the procedure to be followed in the event of contravention of the act, including the issuance of tickets, notice of forfeiture and payment of fines. This section, which should be clause 39(12), is critical to the application of penalties and fines outlined in the oceans act since it provides authority and guidance for ticketing procedures and authority for the governor in council to make regulations prescribing offences and fines with respect to ticketable offences.

Provision for ticketing provides an efficient and cost effective way of enforcing provisions of the Canada Oceans Act. It allows for speedy disposition of certain offences and avoids lengthy and costly court proceedings.

I therefore recommend that hon. members support Motion No. 65. It is put forward by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to eliminate ambiguity, to resolve any potential misinterpretation of the enforcement clauses by adding clause 39(12) which was inadvertently omitted from the committee report and for which I offer the apologies of the federal government.

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we concur with Motion No. 65. We believe the minister and the enforcement officers need the power under legislation to enforce the act and to ensure that Canada's marine areas are protected to the fullest extent.

The member for Gander—Grand Falls raised an interesting point in his earlier intervention which I will follow up on. It is very counterproductive to have regulations with respect to the requirement of Canadians to obey the law and not to violate the sections of the act we are dealing with.

What happens when Canadians are held to one standard and foreign nationals are held to a completely different standard? I

concur with the member's observations with respect to the food fishing that is taking place right now in Atlantic Canada.

For Newfoundlanders it is an offence to go out and catch fish to feed their families. Three miles away in St. Pierre and Miquelon not only is it not an offence, but they are bringing in tourists to catch the same fish. It is ludicrous. If Newfoundlanders have the temerity to go more than three miles off coast and into the waters around St. Pierre and Miquelon, they can catch fish as well without facing the fear of being apprehended, arrested or charged by DFO officers.

We agree with the intent and that there has to be adequate enforcement regulations and legislation within the act. However we question where the government is going when there is one set of standards for people in Newfoundland, another set of standards for people in Gaspé, a different set of standards for people in Nova Scotia, and another one for tourists coming from Europe to fish and to visit St. Pierre and Miquelon.

It is very difficult for Canadians to feel good about the act and to feel that it will do what they would like to see it do when they see this ongoing double standard taking place.

Hopefully with pressure the minister will recognize the failure of the policy he is currently following and will back away from it. Certainly that is the intent we will be pursuing over the next days and weeks.

• (1655)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I will address Motion No. 65. This motion is rather technical in nature and I agree with the parliamentary secretary that it deals with an issue which may have been overlooked at the time.

Be that as it may, I am not trying to hurt the feelings of the government, but if it cannot agree now on how to establish a partnership, and if the provinces cannot be included in the process from the outset, how could I support it when it says: "Here is how we will hand out the penalties and fines"? The government should know I will ask my party to vote against Motion No. 65.

I would like to go back to the comments that were just made by the member for Skeena and to those made earlier by the member for Gander—Grand Falls. When he talked about managing the resource, the member for Skeena seemed to say that various applications of the act, or different forms of penalties, would be used, depending on whether an offence is committed on the Gaspé coast, the coast of Newfoundland, or the coast of Nova Scotia.

We must first know what is going on locally. Is a fishery open? If not, why? Earlier, the member for Gander—Grand Falls made a brilliant speech on the migrating ability of the fish found along our coasts. He is right to mention the species that arrive first. There is a

reason for this. For example, squid start south and travel up the coastline, all the way to the gulf, before going back down south to die. Nice place to die, as the member said.

It is the migration of these species that attracts other species. I understand why the member wanted to stress the importance of this fact. This migration process is what attracts other species. The cod will chase these species. This is what is called the food chain. The big ones go after the small ones. In the case of the whale, it really eats much smaller species. It comes into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, around Anticosti Island, in the estuary, to eat shrimp. It is important to realize there is a migration process going on.

Some isolated phenomena also occur as part of that food chain. The member for Gander—Grand Falls is well aware of what I am alluding to. We are talking about two main species. I will talk about the cod in the Gulf of the St. Lawrence. There are two main stocks, referred to as 4RS cod and 3Pn cod, that is the one along the north shore in Quebec and the one along the western coast of Newfoundland.

There is cod in the southern part of the gulf. There are mainly two stocks. When indicating that cod sport fishing was still practised over the past few years in the Gaspé Peninsula, the hon. member should mention that it was mainly the stock in that zone, in the southern part of the gulf, that was being caught.

Where he comes from, it is a different stock. What is happening with that stock, how it is faring? As we know, we sometimes see cod of a good size and nice density in a certain bay, but biologists warn us, saying that this is perhaps a reserve and that it should be preserved.

What I am interested in seeing the hon. member do is bring about the disclosure of information for the benefit of the local population. Are the biologists telling the truth? Fishermen and people living in local communities have as much difficulty as we do finding out who is telling the truth on this matter, because it is very difficult to follow.

It even happens at times that biologists do not agree among themselves and that everything they have told us so far—and the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls is right about that—did not turn out as they had predicted. Some things have been left to deteriorate.

• (1700)

This is all very important, and that is why I would like the support of the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls.

People like Mr. Wells, not Mr. Wells, but his predecessor, play a very important role. They created quite an uproar on the issue of

### *Government Orders*

foreign fishing. It all started with his predecessor. Mr. Wells also took some measures. Without all this fuss, would the Parliament of Canada have done everything it did to stop or slow down foreign overfishing? I do not think so. My experience in politics may be limited, but I do know that you have to hit the nail over and over again, once you have identified it, in order to drive it in.

The message has to be understood by the people. That explains why it took three premiers of Newfoundland to try, in their legislative assembly, here, in Ottawa, and through the national media, to make the people of Canada understand that there was a problem off Newfoundland. That problem had no impact at all in the prairie provinces. Someone had to drive it in.

The motions I put forward may need to be rewritten or redrafted, but it is important to realize that they stress the need for the provinces to be consulted first. After all, it was the provinces that formed Canada, so they must have a say for Canada to stand tall and proud. Do you not find it funny that these words were spoken by a sovereignist? The message I want to get through is that for Canada to stand tall and proud, it must really accept the partnership concept.

I do not come here with a sledgehammer ready to hit nor do I hide anything. No. Everyone can see that I am empty-handed. I speak clearly of a definite phenomenon.

As we know, there is a migration. Therefore, it is important that we all discuss it and that the province of Newfoundland get the means to act as soon as it gets a signal: Cod is less abundant today? What happened? Because it takes time for the message to get here, in Ottawa. Newfoundland needs to have the means to immediately call a meeting. The minister responsible for the integrated management partnership will have to be made aware of the situation. It will be there in black and white.

That way, Newfoundland will also be able to call Quebec. It will be able to say: "Let us stop quarrelling about other things, call the Quebec government and tell it we have to do this or that". The Quebec Minister of Fisheries will answer: "You are right. I am glad you told me. OK. We will go to Ottawa together. I want to hear what you have to say to the Canadian Minister of Fisheries". This is real partnership. This is working together.

As I said a while ago, I am aware of the migration process. When Quebec and British Columbia demanded that fisheries management be transferred to the provinces at the Victoria conference in November 1994—and this may be what the hon. member for Gander—Grand Falls was afraid of—we never ever asked to manage the fish stocks separately. What we asked for was the right to manage the share of the province, i.e. the right to manage the licences relating to the 25 or 30 per cent of the resources that could be allocated to Quebec or New Brunswick, that could be caught in their own fisheries and that they could themselves share out among their communities, but always in accordance with the basic conservation strategy.

*Government Orders*

I realize that time flies, and I still have a lot of things to explain. I do not know if we can ask for the House's consent, but I would like to clarify this issue, with the agreement of the House. We could try to examine the kind of true partnership that is required.

Surely, the member for Gander—Grand Falls will stand up in a moment to tell us a bit more. But procedure at report stage does not allow us to look at the issue in greater depth.

In conclusion, you can ask the House if it gives its consent; meanwhile, I will sit down and wait for your ruling.

• (1705)

[*English*]

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious problem in fisheries management and that is France. It was only a short time ago that France was given control over that great stretch of ocean that goes out about 150 miles in a straight line. It is a big corridor and France controls it. All the migration the hon. member is talking about, because of the control France has, would all be for naught. How could we manage a fishery when we have the entire doorway to the gulf cut off by France? It is an interesting question.

We do not have any control over those things. We should have control over them but we do not. The Canadian government should have done it the right way but it did not. When France was given that territory, the Government of Canada should have apologized to the people of Canada.

What we can control are the spawning grounds. As the hon. member says, there are a lot of mackerel spawning grounds. They are the best in the world. Control over the spawning grounds does not require provincial input or input from anybody else. All it requires is a bit of common sense. As the hon. member knows, the mackerel now in the second week of June are coming in from the Atlantic Ocean to the Gulf of St. Lawrence to spawn. They usually start at the end of May.

Chasing them are the blue fin tuna. Who has the highest quota for blue fin tuna in eastern Canada?

**Mr. Scott (Skeena):** The Japanese.

**Mr. Baker:** The hon. member for Skeena said the Japanese. Could that be correct?

What is the quota for Quebec? Thirty-five tonnes of blue fin. The Japanese have a bycatch of 180 tonnes in Canadian waters. A decent sized blue fin is worth \$20,000 or \$30,000. That is what is paid for one fish.

Historically we have belonged to the International Tuna Commission which involves three countries: the United States, Japan and Canada. Once a year there is a little get-together. They usually decide that Canada will get the lowest quota of the three. The fattest blue fin tuna are the ones chasing the mackerel into the hon. member's riding.

The Japanese have marvellous boats with helicopters on them. They are incredible vessels. The quotas are given according to the number of vessels. That might run into 10 to 14 vessels. By international agreement they have unlimited quotas for skipjack, albacore, yellow fin and all of the different tuna. We cannot catch them. It would be illegal for someone from Canada to catch them. The Japanese have a bycatch of 180 tonnes and a Canadian province only has a quota of 35 tonnes.

• (1710)

On top of that, the feeder boats come in behind them. They load up on yellow fin, albacore, skipjack, all these tuna, a bit of swordfish is permitted as well, 10 per cent bycatch for these others, and then a bycatch of a 180 tonnes of blue fin, then they go back to Japan. Surely we do not need provincial intervention to see the wisdom of cancelling those quotas.

Also chasing the mackerel is the porbeagle shark. Restaurants in Quebec City or Vancouver sell shark fin soup for \$200 and \$300 a bowl. Those shark fins come from the porbeagle shark off the coast of Newfoundland. As they head in they follow the continental shelf chasing those very mackerel which are going into the hon. member's riding to spawn. The fins are cut off. Five hundred tonnes for a vessel from Denmark, from the Faroe Islands. In fact the vessel's name is the *Bakker*.

Far more things can be done that do not require the help or even the suggestion of the provinces, that would maintain the federal government as the manager of the entire fishing resource, as many members have pointed out, as the hon. member for Skeena has just said, as part of the ocean's ecosystem. Members of Parliament should be promoting those things in the House every day.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the member for Gander—Grand Falls and the member for Gaspé who are now having an extremely interesting debate that demonstrates their knowledge of fishery resources. This is a refreshing change from constitutional issues.

One thing concerns me when I read Motion No. 65. This is not in the original bill, it is an addition to it, an addition comprising some twenty paragraphs. In the three years I have been here, I have rarely seen such a technical and precise motion. I would like to draw the House's attention to it.

*Government Orders*

For example, when the motion says:

- (a) completing a ticket that consists of a summons portion and an information portion;

this is quite precise language on the subject of tickets and the manner in which they must be completed. The motion goes on:

- (b) delivering the summons portion to the accused or mailing it to the accused at the accused's latest known address; and  
 (c) filing the information portion with a court of competent jurisdiction before the summons portion has been delivered or mailed or as soon as is practicable afterward.

I believe this is obvious. I have rarely seen such wording in a bill.

Subclause (2) then reads:

- (2) The summons and information portions of the ticket must  
 (a) set out a description of the offence and the time and place of its alleged commission;  
 (b) include a statement, signed by the enforcement officer who completes the ticket, that the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that the accused committed the offence.

To me, that seems obvious. When an officer decides to complete a ticket it is because he believes that someone committed an offence. I do not see why that should be included in the bill. That reminds me of the time when someone in the municipal council where I was a councillor proposed a bylaw saying that it was forbidden to steal books from the library. We had to argue for five minutes to have him understand that it was not necessary because everybody already knew it was forbidden to steal.

The motion continues:

- (c) set out the amount of the fine prescribed by the regulations for the offence and the manner in which and period within which it may be paid;  
 (d) include a statement that if the accused pays the fine within the period set out in the ticket, a conviction will be entered and recorded against the accused.

That too seems obvious to me.

• (1715)

I continue:

- (e) include a statement that if the accused wishes to plead not guilty or for any other reason fails to pay the fine within the period set out in the ticket, the accused must appear in the court on the day and at the time set out in the ticket.

Since when is an accused not required to appear before the court?

Then subclause (3) states:

- (3) Where a thing is seized under this Act and proceedings relating to it are commenced by way of the ticketing procedure, the enforcement officer who completes the ticket shall give written notice to the accused that, if the accused pays the fine prescribed by the regulations within the period set out in the ticket, the thing, or any proceeds of its disposition, will be immediately forfeited to Her Majesty.

Namely, the Queen. I do not think this will go as far as England, but it does not matter.

- (4) Where an accused to whom the summons portion of a ticket is delivered or mailed pays the prescribed fine within the period set out in the ticket,

- (a) the payment constitutes a plea of guilty to the offence and a conviction must be entered against the accused and no further action may be taken against the accused in respect of that offence; and  
 (b) notwithstanding section 39.3, any thing seized from the accused under this Act that relates to the offence, or any proceeds of its disposition, are forfeited to (i) Her Majesty in right of Canada, if the thing was seized by an enforcement officer employed in the public service of Canada, or

and this is what concerns the member for Gaspé when he says that when it is time to collect fines, the provinces have a role to play

- (ii) Her Majesty in right of a province, if the thing was seized by an enforcement officer employed by the government of that province.

Why would the federal government want to give so many details in a piece of legislation? It is really unusual in an act, as opposed to a regulation, to be so specific, unless the federal government wants to have fines collected by provincial civil servants.

This is the new role the federal government wants to hand over to provincial governments. The federal government is doing its planning from Ottawa and it is having trouble. I listen to the member for Gander—Grand Falls. People think that Ottawa can predict all the migrations the member described just now, and I saw him get the member for Gaspé going all over again. I was saying to myself they even know the exact time, the very week. He even says that today the bluefin tuna are going after mackerel. Obviously they have this level of knowledge because they are close to the resource.

This is the concrete proof that this resource should be administered as close as possible not just to the people, but to the fish, the bluefin tuna and the mackerel. I am amazed at such knowledge. In Ottawa, they want to plan things from their turf, and when it comes to writing up tickets, they tell us exactly how. I do not see in the bill a level of detail as astonishing as what we have just heard from the member for Gander—Grand Falls.

I say to myself that it makes no sense to look at the administration of fish resources like this, to talk about regulations, and I could go on. This is the point I am trying to make. I ask the question. I wonder if this is why the federal government wants to deal with the provinces and does not include them in policy planning and development consultations. However, it wants them to have the role of collecting fines. But where is the concern with saving fish and fish resources, when the sort of thing the members are telling us about goes on while the resource is disappearing? While the bluefin tuna is devouring the mackerel, we are sitting here worrying about the form used for fines.

*Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** According to the agreement, for Group No. 10, the question on Motion No. 65 is deemed to have been put and a division thereon requested and deferred.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those in favour will please say ye.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more that five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The recorded division on the motion stands deferred.

We will now proceed to Group No. 11, which includes Motions Nos. 67, 68 and 70.

• (1720)

[*English*]

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.)** moved:

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-26, in Clause 40, be amended by replacing lines 13 to 15, on page 26, with the following:

“rine resources and the provision of coast guard and hydrographic services to ensure the facilita-”.

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-26, in Clause 41, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 19 and 20, on page 26, with the following:

“41. (1) As the Minister responsible for coast guard services, the powers, duties and”;

(b) in the French version, by replacing line 7, on page 27, with the following:

“l'intervention environnementale;” and

(c) in the French version, by replacing line 14, on page 27, with the following:

“à (iv) sont dispensés de la manière la plus économique et la plus judicieuse possible.”

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.)** moved:

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-26, in Clause 41, be amended by replacing lines 10 to 12, on page 27, with the following:

“(2) In accordance to the stipulations contained in subsection 47(2), clause 48.1 and subsection 49(2), services under subparagraphs 41(1)(a)(i) to (iv) shall be provided in the most cost effective manner possible. The level and scope of such services, as well as the manner of their delivery, shall be defined in full, ongoing, consultation with all beneficiaries.”

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure again to re-enter this marathon debate at Motions Nos. 67, 68 and 70, of which Nos. 67 and 69 are government motions.

The amendments proposed in this group of motions pertain to clauses 40 and 41 of part III of the bill. That, as we all know, describes the powers, duties and functions of the minister. These powers, duties and functions are over and above those already ascribed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans by other legislation.

The standing committee has done an admirable job in strengthening this bill, as have all hon. members. When clause 41 was modified by the committee to present the coast guard and hydrographic services as two of the many responsibilities of the minister of fisheries, a corresponding change was not made to clause 40, which also refers to these services.

Government Motions Nos. 67 and 68 propose minor technical amendments to clauses 40 and 41 to ensure uniformity of terminology throughout the bill's text and to clarify the language. This is very important.

I know all members will join with me in supporting Motions Nos. 67 and 68, which maintain the quality and strength in this long awaited legislation.

However, Motion No. 70, proposed by the Reform Party, is not a minor amendment. In our view it would result in a significant additional administrative burden and would add substantially to the cost of doing business.

Motion No. 70 seeks to expand on the clause of the bill that commits to delivering coast guard services in a cost effective manner. The Reform Party motion proposes to restrict the application of this clause by referring to a number of additional amendments whereby the level and scope of coast guard services and the method of delivery should be defined in ongoing consultation with all beneficiaries.

Surely that is going a little too far. At a time when we are concerned with reducing government spending, increasing the effectiveness of our interactions with Canadians, this amendment seems offensive and meaningless. What could possibly be meant by all beneficiaries of coast guard services? Surely that is cloud concept.

The concept of ongoing consultations on how and why a minister might deliver his mandate is at best onerous. At worst it is a tremendous strain on the treasury. We all know how hard the finance minister is working to reduce the deficit.

Bill C-26 is committed to the consultative approach and the minister will consult. The government must be allowed to get on with the business of governing to do its job as outlined in the legislation.

Motion No. 70 in our view only serves to add another layer of administration and bureaucracy to the cost of delivery of coast guard services.

I should reiterate that this section of the bill lays out the minister's powers, duties and functions within the bill. These are clear. It is also clear that in order for business to be conducted in a reasonably efficient manner we must let those to whom we have assigned responsibility exercise that responsibility.

It is time we let the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans get on with the job of managing the oceans and we should give him the means to do so. Motion No. 70 in our view tries to limit the minister's ability to exercise his mandate and we suggest it should be rejected.

Motions Nos. 67 and 68, in contrast, are minor technical amendments which will improve the clarity and consistency of the bill. We recommend their acceptance by all hon. members.

• (1725)

**Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, in Motion No. 70 we want to ensure that services provided by the minister shall be provided in the most cost effective manner possible. The level and scope of such services as well as the manner of their delivery shall be defined in full ongoing consultation with all beneficiaries.

After listening to the parliamentary secretary's intervention I fail to see how anybody could find this offensive. I think it is offensive to those people who will be required to pay fees for services to be required to do so without consultation. When the coast guard last year announced it was to impose a fee for service that is exactly what happened. We heard a hue and cry from one end of the country to the other as a result.

The coast guard initially maintained it was in consultation with shippers and ports across Canada. I know there are members present today who were sitting on the standing committee, the member for Gaspé and the parliamentary secretary, who heard testimony from witnesses from Halifax, from the port of Montreal, from the port of St. John's, from the port of Vancouver. They told the standing committee they had not been properly consulted.

Let us put this into perspective. We are not talking about a small amount of money. In the current year the coast guard, effective June 1 of this year, is intending to collect \$20 million from shippers across Canada and from ports. It intends to escalate that to \$40 million in 1997, \$40 million in 1998 and \$60 million in 1999.

We have with this legislation a window of opportunity. We have the opportunity to ensure the minister and the department cannot

### *Government Orders*

unilaterally impose fees for services without consultation and without being able to justify that the services they are providing are actually required by the people who will pay for them, that they are being delivered in a cost effective and that they are being delivered in consultation with those people who will have to pay the bill.

Let me lay out the scenario as it took place in 1995-96. Largely due to the fact that the Treasury Board has told the coast guard its budget is to be reduced, it will have to get by with less money or will have to raise more money on its own, the coast guard decided it would raise an additional \$20 million in 1996.

It came up with a plan that would have seen a national rate imposed right across the country. It did not relate the imposition of this user fee to any services it was actually providing. Until very recently we have not been able to get much information out of the coast guard as to how much the services it is providing actually cost because the coast guard has not been able to identify them. It has not been able to identify until very recently what services are actually required.

One good thing that has come out of the round of consultations, which is largely the result of the work of the standing committee its members who have insisted there be a great deal more fairness injected into the equation, is that we now have ports on the west coast which have agreed finally that the coast guard is starting to go in the right direction in terms of how it will impose these fees.

Therefore we view this legislation as a window of opportunity to ensure there is accountability, to ensure the minister and the department cannot impose fees without consultation and without being able to justify they are delivering the services the end users are getting in a cost effective manner.

The only thing I find offensive is the suggestion the minister ought to have this power without any accountability whatsoever.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### **COPYRIGHT ACT**

The House resumed from June 4, 1996, consideration of the motion that Bill C-32, an act to amend the Copyright Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** It being 5:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion for second reading of Bill C-32, an act to amend the Copyright Act.

Call in the members.

(Motion agreed to on the following division):

## Government Orders

## (Division No. 100)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams  
Althouse  
Anderson  
Assad  
Asselin  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)  
Baker  
Bélaïr  
Bélisle  
Bellemare  
Bernier (Gaspé)  
Bertrand  
Bhaduria  
Bodnar  
Boudria  
Brushett  
Byrne  
Campbell  
Caron  
Chamberlain  
Chrétien (Frontenac)  
Cohen  
Collins  
Crête  
Cullen  
Davivault  
Debien  
DeVillers  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duceppe  
Dumas  
Easter  
English  
Finestone  
Flis  
Fry  
Gagliano  
Gagnon (Québec)  
Gauthier  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Grose  
Guay  
Harb  
Harvard  
Ianno  
Irwin  
Jacob  
Karygiannis  
Kirkby  
Kraft Sloan  
Landry  
Lastewka  
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)  
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)  
Lee  
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)  
Lincoln  
Loubier  
MacDonald  
Malhi  
Marchand  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLaughlin  
McTeague  
Ménard  
Mifflin  
Mitchell  
Murray  
Nunez  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Parrish  
Payne  
Peters  
Picard (Drummond)  
Plamondon  
Reed

Alcock  
Anawak  
Arseneault  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)  
Bachand  
Bakopanos  
Bélangier  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)  
Bevilacqua  
Blaikie  
Bonin  
Brown (Oakville—Milton)  
Bryden  
Calder  
Canuel  
Catterall  
Chan  
Clancy  
Collenette  
Crawford  
Culbert  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Jong  
Deshaies  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Dubé  
Duhamel  
Dupuy  
Eggleton  
Fewchuk  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gaffney  
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)  
Galloway  
Gerrard  
Godin  
Graham  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Harper (Churchill)  
Hopkins  
Iftody  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Knutson  
Lalonde  
Langlois  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Leblanc (Longueuil)  
Lefebvre  
Leroux (Shefford)  
Loney  
MacAulay  
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)  
Maloney  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
McCormick  
McKinnon  
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)  
McWhinney  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Murphy  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)  
Pagtakhan  
Paré  
Patry  
Peric  
Peterson  
Pillitteri  
Pomerleau  
Regan

Rideout  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)  
Shepherd  
Simmons  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
Terrana  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Tremblay (Rosemont)  
Valeri  
Venne  
Whelan  
Young

Robichaud  
Rocheleau  
Sauvageau  
Serré  
Sheridan  
Speller  
Steckle  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Volpe  
Wood  
Zed—190

## NAYS

## Members

Abbott  
Benoit  
Duncan  
Frazer  
Grubel  
Harris  
Hayes  
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)  
Johnston  
Mayfield  
Meredith  
Penson  
Riis  
Scott (Skeena)  
Solberg  
Speaker  
Strahl  
Wayne

Ablonczy  
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)  
Epp  
Gouk  
Hanger  
Hart  
Hermanson  
Hoepfner  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Ramsay  
Ringma  
Silye  
Solomon  
Stinson  
Taylor  
Williams—36

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine  
Brien  
de Savoye  
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)  
Richardson

Beaumier  
Cauchon  
Fillion  
Marleau  
St-Laurent

• (1755)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare the motion carried. This bill is therefore referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

(Motion agreed to, and bill referred to a committee.)

\* \* \*

## CRIMINAL LAW IMPROVEMENT ACT, 1996

The House resumed, from June 10, consideration of the motion that Bill C-17, an act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other acts, be read for the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion for second reading of Bill C-17, an act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other acts.

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe the House would give its unanimous consent that the vote on the



previous motion be applied to the motion presently before the House, the Liberal members voting yea.

**Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral:** Madam Speaker, the members of the official opposition will vote yea.

[*English*]

**Mr. Strahl:** Madam Speaker, the Reform Party members present will be voting no unless instructed by their constituents to do otherwise.

**Mr. Solomon:** Madam Speaker, all New Democrats in the House this evening will be voting no on this matter.

**Mrs. Wayne:** Madam Speaker, all PCs in the House tonight will be voting in favour.

**Mr. Bhaduria:** Madam Speaker, I will be voting for the motion.

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

(*Division No. 101*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bachand
Baker	Bakopanos
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Byrne
Calder	Campbell
Canuel	Caron
Catterall	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Crawford	Crête
Culbert	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Dubé
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Dupuy
Easter	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gaffney
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gagnon (Québec)	Galloway
Gauthier	Gerrard
Godfrey	Godin
Goodale	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harper (Churchill)
Harvard	Hopkins
Ianno	Iftody
Irwin	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin

Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Lefebvre
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Shefford)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Marchand	Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien (London—Middlesex)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Paré	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Telegdi	Terrana
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Volpe	Wayne
Whelan	Wood
Young	Zed—186

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	de Jong
Duncan	Epp
Frazer	Gouk
Grubel	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Hayes	Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Johnston	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)
McLaughlin	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Penson
Ramsay	Riis
Ringma	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Solomon	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Taylor	Williams—40

PAIRED MEMBERS

Augustine	Beaumier
Brien	Cauchon
de Savoye	Fillion
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Marleau
Richardson	St-Laurent

*Private Members' Business*

• (1800)

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I declare the motion carried.

This bill is therefore referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.)** moved that Bill C-212, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (audit), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak today on my private member's Bill C-212, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act with respect to audits. The bill proposes to require that accounts and records of the Canadian Wheat Board be audited annually by the Auditor General of Canada. Currently the audit is conducted by the private sector firm of Deloitte & Touche which was chosen by the wheat board.

The bill will not represent an extra cost to the taxpayer since the cost of the audit could be transferred to the auditor general's office from the Canadian Wheat Board. It is almost unbelievable the auditor general has to sign the wheat board audit without so much as a glimpse at the actual figures. There is no way he can verify the debt load or the operating costs.

I will give some background on the role of the auditor general in holding government institutions accountable.

The auditor general has given Canadians some very interesting reading. The horrors and the ridiculous can be overwhelming to a taxpayer's mind. The people's right to control how their taxes are spent is one of the cornerstones of democratic government. Canadian taxpayers are telling their elected representatives that they want the best possible value for the tax dollars they send to the federal government.

The auditor general has gained the respect of Canadians and has been instrumental in pinpointing waste and mismanagement to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Over the years a process has developed. The government submits to the House of Commons its spending plans for each department; reports on the past year's activities; and provides the public accounts that show all federal spending, borrowing and taxing. One more link in the accountability process is required: an independent assessment of that information.

Members of Parliament need this impartial evaluation so they can effectively question or criticize the government on its performance. This is where the auditor general provides a valuable service. This service would be effective in looking at all operations of the Canadian Wheat Board to make it more accountable. Farmers would not have to doubt whether these figures are actual or manufactured, especially if the information act would apply to the CWB.

• (1805)

The job of the auditor general is to help find out if value is being obtained by the federal government. The auditor general conducts independent audits and examinations and encourages accountability and improvements in government operations. Citizens will only have confidence in their government institutions if they believe that their tax dollars are spent wisely and effectively. Confidence in our national government depends upon clear and timely accountability by the government and its crown corporations and proper accounting methods.

I will touch on the Canadian Wheat Board situation. The board has sole jurisdiction for marketing western Canadian wheat and barley. This monopoly position results in a financial summary that features some astronomical figures: not millions or hundreds of millions but billions of dollars. It makes one wonder why a government would allow some private accounting firm to audit these books and not even have the right to double check figures at its discretion.

In 1993-94 the board's assets were \$8.86 billion and loans from the private sector were \$7.78 billion. There was no mention of what the loans were for or what term they carried. Board revenues were \$3.87 billion and the surplus in operation was listed as \$669.5 million.

The current Canadian Wheat Board Act allows the wheat board to appoint a firm of chartered accountants for the purpose of auditing records and accounts and certifying reports of the board. There were 49 crown corporations in Canada in 1994-95. The wheat board is one of seven corporations exempted from part X of the Financial Administrations Act which allows for a private auditor rather than the auditor general. Even among these exempted crown corporations only the Canadian Wheat Board and the Bank of Canada do not have the auditor general audit their accounts and records.

The Office of the Auditor General could be more effective because it can maintain its objectivity when conducting audits. It is not subject to any restrictions that may occur when a private firm audits a government agency.

*Private Members' Business*

For example, private auditors usually include a disclaimer to the effect that they can only ensure the accuracy of the audit based on the information they were given. Private auditors simply do not have the authority to ensure they have all the necessary information. Moreover the auditor general reports directly to the House of Commons, not to the agency or the crown corporation in question.

Bill C-212 will also require that the board submit a report to the minister each month that would detail its purchases and sales for the month, as well as the quantities of grain held by it. The report would be certified by the Auditor General of Canada.

If the auditor general has a monthly opportunity to certify the report, the overall grain transportation system could be made more efficient. Grain car shortages could be avoided because the grain trade would know what the future commitments were. Similar bottlenecks in the system could be smoothed out if we knew that the monthly operations of the board were closely tracked by the auditor general.

Right now in western Canada there is a debate raging about the role of the Canadian Wheat Board. I do not think there has been a time in the history of the board when its future has been the subject of so much discussion.

Back in the 1993 election campaign the agriculture minister and the Prime Minister promised a plebiscite on the marketing of wheat and barley through the Canadian Board Board. It would now appear they have completely backed away from their promise of allowing producers to decide the issue. Broken Liberal promises seem to be the order of the day and more bountiful than the days of the month. When will this finally stop? Not as long as there is a Liberal government.

• (1810)

To add to the farmers' frustration over the broken promise of a plebiscite is the justified perception that the wheat board is an organization shrouded in secrecy. The wheat board is one of the most secretive government agencies in Canada. It is a crown agency the government set up to exclusively handle the sale of wheat and barley for western Canada. While the government does not fund the board it does guarantee its debt.

Another current concern about the board is that it is not subject to the Access to Information Act. I propose to change this fact in another private member's bill. Hopefully at some time the bill will be drawn and the House can deliberate its merits.

The exemption ties into Bill C-212 however. By being exempt from the Access to Information Act, the board does not have to answer individual requests for information on how it is being run.

If the auditor general did the annual audit of the board surely there would be more information available to the public eye.

Farmers pick up the tab for the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board. They should be able to find whether or not their money is being spent wisely but they cannot. A recent cause for concern has been the rapid increase in administration expenses at the wheat board. They have risen dramatically from \$26.8 million for fiscal year 1987 to \$35.3 million in 1992 and to \$41.3 million in 1994. This was an increase of 54 per cent in seven years.

While the cost had a hefty increase, the amount of wheat and barley produced in western Canada did not increase accordingly. In 1987 there were 37.6 million tonnes and in 1992 there were 37.9 million tonnes. That is an increase of only 1 per cent. When it comes to jacking up costs obviously the wheat board is in a class by itself.

Unfortunately the bill is paid by grain farmers. They have watched the steady increase in costs with absolutely no option to review them to see where their money was being spent. This is a real injustice. It makes one wonder whether farmers grow wheat and barley just to keep the Canadian Wheat Board functioning or whether the wheat board should have to answer to farmers instead of farmers to the wheat board.

In November 1994 I asked the board to give a breakdown of information on pension plans and wages for Canadian Wheat Board commissioners and staff. Regarding the pension plans I requested a breakdown of employer versus government contributions and the age at which the commissioners and staff were eligible to receive pension benefits. My request was denied by Agriculture Canada on the basis that the Canadian Wheat Board does not fall under the terms of the Access to Information Act.

Numerous other farmers and taxpayer organizations have tried to find this information but they have also been stonewalled because of the wheat board secrecy. The only person it has to answer to is the agriculture minister.

Does the agriculture minister own the wheat that farmers grow or should the farmers have entitlement to the products they produce?

A private researcher revealed that the board or the minister had given severance packages of about \$300,000 to former commissioners. They also received privileges such as eight-week vacations per year. At the time this information was made available I was still waiting for an answer to my request.

The government quickly scaled back the packages after an uproar in the farming community but only for the new commissioners. Since the commissioners are not accountable to farmers they were seemingly able to fill their pockets at will.

*Private Members' Business*

The Liberal government has failed to correct this injustice. This is a damning reminder of the gold plated MP pension plan all over again.

• (1815)

It is important to note the minister of agriculture is responsible for the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board. Should he not also be accountable to farmers? Why is he trying to restrict farmers from earning the same return for their labour as the wheat board commissioners?

Without farmers there is no need for Canadian Wheat Board commissioners or an agriculture minister. The whole incident has led to producer scepticism and a loss of confidence in the board.

For over two years farmers have provided me with documents that suggested irregularities within the wheat board. Since January 1995, I have held four news conferences and have twice asked for an RCMP investigation into these irregularities.

I have also asked that the justice minister order a judicial inquiry into the \$180 million loss barley producers suffered this past year according to the claims made by former wheat board commissioner Ken Beswick.

I have received information through the access to information office that confirms an RCMP inspector asked two RCMP detachments to start investigating farmer complaints.

When he was informed that customs officials at the port of Snowflake, Manitoba confirmed farmer suspicions of irregularities, he failed to communicate this to me. Instead he took it upon himself to declare there was no evidence of criminal intent and seemingly altered document dates, throwing further suspicion on the whole process.

During this period customs and revenue inspectors in conjunction with RCMP have brought charges against farmers for allegedly violating the Customs Act.

Two trials have received a lot of media attention in my constituency of Lisgar—Marquette involving David Sawatzky and Norman Desrochers.

In the David Sawatzky case, Judge Arnold Connor ruled that Sawatzky had not broken the Customs Act but probably violated the Canadian Wheat Board Act. Sawatzky was eventually acquitted of his charges.

I have two photo copies of sworn affidavits by farmers that an RCMP constable involved in prosecuting Sawatzky gave false information to access computer files at U.S. customs offices to start a criminal investigation. How far will the wheat board officials go to protect the secrecy of this operation?

It also shows how rigid the board is. Many polls have been conducted that show farmers want changes and more say in the

wheat board's operations. A recent poll in Saskatchewan shows that 83 per cent of the responding farmers wanted more control of the Canadian Wheat Board. This sentiment has obviously been expressed in other prairie provinces as well.

These are examples of why farmers are calling for change. That is why I introduced Bill C-212. The demand for a more open and accountable board is clear.

Giving the auditor general the ability to do an audit would represent a good first step. Unfortunately we have a minister and government that embrace the status quo at the expense of ignoring constructive change.

Before I turn the debate over to my colleague, I ask the House for unanimous consent to support this bill and make it votable.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in the debate on Bill C-212, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

This bill would amend the act so as to require an annual audit of the accounts and books of the Canadian Wheat Board by the Office of the Auditor General of Canada.

• (1820)

The government fully supports financial responsibility in all its departments and agencies, however, this bill raises many questions that warrant careful and thorough consideration. The government must strike a fair balance between financial responsibility and the smooth operation of its various agencies and departments.

The first question raised by the bill is that of responsibility, or more precisely the proposal that the board be audited annually by the Auditor General of Canada.

At first glance, this seems a wise proposal, but it should be pointed out that the Canadian Wheat Board already has all of its financial operations audited in depth annually.

The results of this audit by a firm of independent and highly reputed consultants are published each year in the board's annual report and financial statement.

A summary of this report is sent by mail each year to all those who have a board producers' permit book, and the full report, available on request from the Board, is tabled once a year in the House and the Senate.

In addition to this annual audit, an internal audit committee, comprising, among others, a representative of the board's advisory

committee, elected by the members, supervises the ongoing audit, division by division, of the board's expenditures.

Through the information it releases in its annual report, the Canadian Wheat Board provides more financial information on its operations than many major private grain companies.

At a time when the federal government is trying to eliminate overlap and duplication, and put government back on the right track, the proposal to further audit the board annually seems to add a useless extra step, which would be duplicating established practices and result in a waste of time, and money of course.

The board is constantly seeking to improve its planning, management and operations. To this effect, it has on occasions asked for outside advice, leading to recommended changes.

A review conducted in 1992 by the management consulting firm, Deloitte and Touche, pointed out a number of things to be changed. I have the honour to inform the House that, since the publication of the review report, the board has proceeded with the recommendations it contained.

The board has adopted a corporate vision and mission as well as a set of strategic goals. It has put in place a budget process, a business planning process, a reporting system, and a new performance appraisal system.

We should also take into account the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board is operating in a highly competitive environment. Private grain companies, whether in Canada, the United States, Europe or Australia, are very reluctant to release the slightest bit of information that might give an edge to their competitors.

Their main goal, as is the case for the Canadian Wheat Board, is to maximize profits on behalf of their customers. In the case we are concerned with, the customers are the men and women who grow wheat and barley in western Canada.

• (1825)

For all the reasons I just explained, the government cannot, for the time being, support the subject matter of this bill.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétiens (Frontenac, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-212, introduced at first reading stage on March 1 by the hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette. This bill, whose purpose is to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act, contains interesting provisions, which, unfortunately, we will not be able to debate in this House.

Indeed, it has been agreed to make this bill a non votable item, when in fact it has substantial impacts on western Canadian grain producers. In this context, my desire to speak on the subject

### *Private Members' Business*

reflects my constant concern to ensure the fair and effective representation of producers and the Canadian farm industry as a whole.

The primary objective of this bill is to change the procedure used to audit the Canadian Wheat Board's financial statements. At present, this administrative operation is carried out by the private accounting firm Deloitte and Touche. The bill introduced by the hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette would see this responsibility transferred to the Auditor General of Canada.

At first, we may wonder what the use is of setting the whole legislative process in motion for a simple matter of administrative jurisdiction. But there are much more important considerations involved than it might seem at first glance. The sophistication of this proposal could considerably improve the internal working of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Whether we are dealing with the management of human resources, the control of administrative expenditures, or even the implementation of resolutions relating to promotional activities, an audit by the auditor general would uncover some details that inevitably escape the attention of private sector experts.

It is not necessary to stress that the Canadian Wheat Board is, first and foremost, a parapublic agency in charge of maximizing profits for Canadian grain producers. As with other government agencies, it would be normal and essential for the government to have a say in the administration and operation of this parapublic body.

Of course, those opposed to this reform will raise simple arguments like the fact that, as a commercial venture, the Canadian Wheat Board has some room to manoeuvre that amounts to a right to use discretion. I understand full well this aspect of the issue, and I wish to point out that I fully endorse this principle.

I want to stress that this bill is not aimed at giving the government the right to interfere in the private affairs of wheat producers. On the contrary, the auditor general could provide monitoring services going well beyond a simple financial audit by a private firm.

• (1830)

The annual tabling of the auditor general's report is a major event allowing the government and all taxpayers to see how public affairs are managed.

By shedding light on the operation of government agencies through rigorous, in-depth analyses, the auditor general puts himself in a good position to make recommendations aimed at optimizing the operation and structure of these agencies. This would benefit the CWB, as its relatively large structure as well as the broad impact of its actions inevitably hide some shortcomings that outside auditors like Deloitte & Touche cannot see.

*Private Members' Business*

I do not want to leave any doubt as to the quality of the work done by these specialized firms. Quite the contrary. My point has more to do with the basic principles of performance and efficiency, in an era of budget cuts. So, the auditor general would submit a detailed report to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, in which a series of recommendations would be included to improve CWB's initiatives in all its fields of activities.

I am not trying to convince the House to make the CWB accountable to Parliament. It already is. However, this bill would make it more accountable to wheat producers, who depend on the soundness of the board's decisions. In fact, I could tell you about several western producers who, every day, have to put up with constraints imposed by the CWB regarding the marketing of their crop.

The complex internal procedures of the board generate widespread slowdowns in the negotiation of tariffs and the marketing of crops. This type of problem is not noticeable to private independent auditors, for the simple reason that it is beyond the scope of their mandate. However, getting the auditor general involved could remedy the situation, for the benefit of all Canadian producers.

Before concluding, I remind members of this House that the bill is not a votable item. This means that rejecting it could result in the shelving of a measure that would benefit the whole industry. There is a relatively strong consensus and we must show that we can legislate without being guided only by partisan considerations.

In conclusion, Bill C-212, moved by a Reform Party member, proposes a measure which would not cost anything to this government, which could promote transparency, and which would at least give western grain producers the guarantee that the Canadian Wheat Board is well managed.

[English]

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette for introducing Bill C-212, an act to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act. It would require the board to be audited annually by the auditor general.

• (1835)

I am sure members are aware that the Canadian Wheat Board is a marketing board whose primary responsibility is to serve the producers whose products it sells. In fact, the producers have no way of knowing how well the board is performing. The only people who have any indication of the performance record of the board is its internal auditing firm and the minister of agriculture, who may or may not choose to reveal that information to the producers the board serves.

The hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette has talked about the need to open up the books of the Canadian Wheat Board to the

auditor general so that he can report to Parliament and thereby report back to the producers that the board serves. I agree with the hon. member.

The member for Frontenac suggested that a performance evaluation would also be a wise undertaking by the auditor general. Perhaps that could be done on occasion as well as the annual audit of the books of the Canadian Wheat Board.

There was an performance analysis of the Canadian Wheat Board done by its auditors, Deloitte & Touche. This was instituted in 1992. Perhaps some would argue that we do not need to have the auditor general look at the efficiencies of the Canadian Wheat Board because its auditors are doing it.

The problem is that this report should have been presented to the minister of agriculture. If it was, the minister did not make the report public. It either gathered dust at the Canadian Wheat Board or the Privy Council. It was never released to farmers or the Canadian public. It became a secret document which contained much good information and was only recently unveiled to the public when copies were made available to me and other concerned people.

Does this report contain some top secret, classified information? Not at all. It contains information on the performance of the board, how well it is serving producers, whether or not it is doing a good job. Certainly the auditor general could perform such an evaluation on a regular basis and that would serve Canadians and farmers in the prairie region very well.

Let us look at the internal performance audit done by Deloitte & Touche of the Canadian Wheat Board. It discovered many areas of significant deficiency. This was all hushed up, kept secret. Farmers were not aware of the audit and the results.

On page 18 of the Deloitte & Touche performance evaluation, it states that there is no evidence of an ongoing formal corporate strategic plan or process. That is quite an allegation.

We asked the chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, Mr. Hehn, about that. He said: "Oh, well, we have dealt with all the concerns that were raised by the Deloitte & Touche audit. They have all been looked after". How do we know? It is all secret. It is all kept under wraps.

As far as the corporate structure of the board is concerned, it has not changed. There are still five commissioners appointed by the Privy Council, probably under the direction of the minister of agriculture or whoever pulls the minister's chain. Currently there are three commissioners running the board; one retired some time ago and another one recently stepped down because he could not agree with some things the board was doing. So presently three commissioners who were appointed by the minister of agriculture are running the Canadian Wheat Board and keeping everything secret.

The chief commissioner of the board said that they have adequately handled all the recommendations in the Deloitte & Touche audit. He has yet to convince me that he can answer the charge that there is no evidence of an ongoing formal corporate strategic plan or process, as was the criticism on page 18.

I quote again from page 19 of the report, regarding operational management and planning:

Departmental planning resulting in annual operational plans generally does not exist. Some departmental area plans have been submitted to the board with no feedback or approval. Budgeting and forecasting of expenses do not exist. This includes administrative expenses (excluding salaries) and annual operating expenditures (storage, interest and demurrage, etc) representing annual expenditures of approximately \$200 million.

• (1840)

This is not small change. The board or senior management approves most or all of the administrative expenditures, individually, as incurred. That is what happens when the operation does not have a public audit. It is inefficient and there is no way of determining whether a problem has been rectified if one has been identified.

With respect to accountability, page 20 of the report reads:

Specific performance targets or expectations are not set and communicated for the senior operating management team or for senior managers. Senior management job descriptions are out of date, incomplete or non-existent. There is no formal performance appraisal process for senior management which reinforces accountability for meeting objectives.

At page 21 of the report there is a rather strong indictment of the structure of the Canadian Wheat Board. It reads:

The structure as designed (1930s) with five equal Commissioners and more than six direct or indirect reports does not promote efficient and effective delivery and accountability for the 1990s.

As members know, the corporate structure of the Canadian Wheat Board is still the same. That problem has not been rectified. It is still a 1930s model which does not serve western grain farmers well in the 1990s.

That was corporate governance. Now I will turn, in the Deloitte & Touche audit, to finance and accounting management. Regarding corporate planning and budgeting, at page 67 it reads:

A formal budgeting process does not exist for the Finance and Accounting expenditures department. There is no overall responsibility assigned to Finance for establishing and administering a corporate budgeting process. Salary expenditures are approved at the beginning of the year.

Obviously the hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette has very good reason to bring forward a private member's bill which would call for an annual audit of the Canadian Wheat Board by the auditor general. There has been no budgeting. There has been no accountability. There has been no responsibility assigned to finance for

### *Private Members' Business*

establishing and administering a corporate budgeting process. This is serious stuff.

Furthermore, we know that the commissioners' salaries have been kept secret. It has been leaked that they have extremely high salaries. We also know that they have a very cushy benefit package. We were astonished to find out that their severance package is around a quarter of a million dollars. Farmers' dollars are going to finance the commissioners and the farmers had no idea that such a plan existed for the commissioners of the Canadian Wheat Board. We need an audit to be done by the auditor general to expose these things.

Regarding the board's strategy and business direction, on page 78 of the audit it reads:

A formal corporate strategy does not exist for review and input to an MISD (Management Information Services Division) strategy. No formal assessment of business needs or direction was conducted as part of ISP project. Some information is known about the direction of the business but has not been used to evaluate the current system.

Page 78 continues under the heading "Identify Issues and Operations" by stating:

Information systems issues and opportunities were identified but were not based on an assessment of the current systems. As such, any opportunities with the current systems have been overlooked.

I have talked about corporate governance. I have talked about finance and accounting management and about strategy. I would like to go on to talk about the sales and marketing of the Canadian Wheat Board.

On page 31 of the Deloitte & Touche audit it states that no formal strategic marketing plan exists. This is the Canadian Wheat Board. It is supposed to be marketing farmers' grain. The internal audit said that no formal strategic marketing plan exists and this report was put on the shelf and kept away from the eyes of the producers whom the board is to serve.

Under the heading "Marketing Organization" on page 32 the report reads:

The marketing function lacks focus and co-ordination due to a lack of direction from a corporate governance point of view, the absence of an effective marketing plan, and separated departments within the organizational structure.

At page 35 the report reads:

Agents emphasize that relationships with the CWB are not sound/positive business relationships. Accredited export agents indicated that they are not being utilized as effectively as they might be in sales opportunities in niche markets and geographic markets where CWB market knowledge is limited and resources limited.

• (1845)

We are now getting into performance evaluation. I will conclude with the following point. The report on transportation states: "Several costs associated with transportation in grain movement

*Private Members' Business*

are primarily influenced by Canadian Wheat Board operations. However, there are no budgets or standards of performance for these such as storage and demurrage costs". We are talking about the sale of hopper cars in western Canada and whether they should be sold to the producers or to the railroads and who should allocate the cars.

If we would have had a proper evaluation of the Canadian Wheat Board by the auditor general it would have helped us to make wiser decisions about those cars. However, we have had that information kept from us and it has hurt the industry. It has increased the mistrust of farmers in the Canadian Wheat Board. Certainly this bill would solve that problem.

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to add my voice to the second reading debate on Bill C-212, an act put forward by the hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act.

The government does not support the bill. The government's opposition to the bill is based on a significant number of factors and very important considerations.

One such factor the government bases its decision on to oppose the bill is the timing. The bill proposes to make a major change to the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board without any discussion or consultation with farmers across the country.

The hon. member who makes this motion comes from a party which says it listens to what the people have to say, which says it seeks input before making decisions to change legislation, which says it will do what its constituents want.

Once again we see, as evidenced by this high handed, pre-emptory proposal, an attempt to change in a very significant and serious manner legislation without proper consultation with farmers, organizations and people across the country whose lives depend on farming; to change the Canadian Wheat Board in a fundamental way without any discussion or consultation with farmers.

This merely shows the hypocrisy with which the Reform Party put forward this idea: listen to the constituents until they do not agree with you and then go ahead and do what you want. This is Reform Party policy to a tee.

The federal government has a process in place where it is now engaged in a prairie-wide consultation with grain producers, grain companies and other organizations that have a direct interest in the future shape of western Canada's grain marketing system.

This is the approach that is always taken by this government. We listen to the organizations that will be affected in order to hear what they have to say. We listen to what farmers, grain companies and

corporations involved in the farming industry have to say. We listen to what all stakeholders have to say with respect to the Canadian Wheat Board before deciding on change.

Once we have gathered all the input, we then consider what direction the Canadian Wheat Board will take in the future. This process is in place right now.

Without addressing the specific pros and cons of the bill, the government feels any decisions taken on either the Canadian Wheat Board or the grain marketing system must await the final outcome of this process. This is a process which has been started. Obviously it makes sense that we allow this process to continue, that we allow the committee to make its report to the minister before making a decision.

• (1850)

Certainly it would seem strange if we set out a process to review concerns and issues with respect to the wheat board. We set that process in place and then make changes before the process is even complete. That does not make any sense. Then again, I suppose what does make sense is that it would be suggested by the Reform Party.

The whole issue about grain marketing and the role of the Canadian Wheat Board has been the subject of very intense debate across the prairies for the last three or four years.

The difficulty with this debate has been that it has tended to take place in a rather ad hoc fashion with no co-ordination or focus. That is why the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food last year established the panel that I have talked about, the committee that I have talked about, the Western Grain Marketing Panel.

The panel is composed of a chairman and eight individuals who represent virtually every perspective on grain marketing from one end of the spectrum to the other. That is certainly a fair approach.

We want input to be heard by people who represent all points of view. Proceeding in that manner, the report of the committee will have a significant amount of credibility.

Late last year the panel distributed copies of a tabloid style information package to all western grain producers. This ensured that every farmer in western Canada had complete access to all the relevant facts and figures that relate to grain marketing.

In January the panel conducted a series of town hall information meetings across the prairies. These sessions gave grain producers the opportunity to bring forward their perspectives and opinions, to advance their best arguments and to engage in a logical, face to face dialogue about all the pros and cons of the issue of grain marketing.



The panel has now completed its third phase, hearing more than 80 formal submissions from a wide variety of farm groups and industry. These sessions took place across western Canada. They took place in Winnipeg, Edmonton, Regina.

The Reform Party made a presentation before the panel on March 18. Now it wants to pre-empt the process its members participated in. This does not make any sense at all. As I said before, the only thing that makes sense about something not making sense is that it is proposed by the Reform Party. I take this to mean its participation in the process is that its members agree with the validity of it. I congratulate them for joining in and participating, like they should.

Now I encourage them to let the process take its course, come forward with its conclusions and when the minister makes his decisions, to support the minister in his decisions, which no doubt will be the best for the western grain farmer.

With all the consultations, examinations and cross-examinations, everyone with an interest in western Canada's grain marketing system has had their say on the issue.

As we debate this motion in the House today, the panel is preparing to write its report, which will be submitted to the minister in June. It is from this report, its observations and conclusions based on the input of producers and other stakeholders that the government will look for constructive suggestions on how to move forward.

If the government agreed now to make such a major change to the Canadian Wheat Board before it had received the report we would be dishonouring a commitment we made to the grain producers across the country that no major change would be made without consulting them.

That is something the government will not do, even though the Reform Party seems very keen on doing it. It seems evident by the precise nature of this motion that once again it betrays the motive of the Reform Party, which simply is to utterly destroy the Canadian Wheat Board.

The grain industry is a very competitive industry. Every little shred of information that a competitor can possibly get is of value. Certainly we want to ensure a proper balance between accountability to those it serves and protecting the competitive edge of the Canadian Wheat Board as it is marketing its grain worldwide.

• (1855)

Here we have hon. members from the Reform Party reading from a document that is four years old and setting out criticisms contained in that document when the wheat board has moved on those issues and has improved how it does its business. It has an audit. There is no sense duplicating efforts by having another audit take place which would have—

*Private Members' Business*

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me this evening to add my remarks to those made by my hon. colleagues on what we view is a very important bill put forward by my hon. colleague from Lisgar—Marquette, Bill C-212.

What is this really all about? That is the question we have to ask ourselves. This is about accountability. It is that simple.

I have one word for the hon. member who just spoke, the hon. member from Prince Albert—Churchill River, and that is hogwash. He knows it. What is he afraid of? What is the government afraid of in making the Canadian Wheat Board accountable and allowing the Auditor General of Canada to look at the books and perform an annual audit on the Canadian Wheat Board? What is so wrong? What would happen that is so bad?

The hon. member for Prince Albert—Churchill River talked about timing. He said the Reform Party should wait until the process is complete. We have been waiting for three years for the government to act in relation to the Canadian Wheat Board. Farmers have been waiting.

The member for Prince Albert—Churchill River was never a farmer, though I spent 20 years in the agricultural sector, farming, as did the hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette, and as did about five or six other members of the Reform Party caucus. We have some inkling of what farmers are going through. Quite frankly, they are sick and tired of a government that is dragging its feet on this issue of holding the Canadian Wheat Board accountable to the people paying the bills.

I was quite shocked when my hon. colleague was revealing some of the numbers and how the budget for the Canadian Wheat Board for administration costs has increased so dramatically over the last number of years. He read that it was over \$26 million in 1987, \$35 million in 1992, jumping to over \$41 million in 1994, with no real accountability. Why would the auditor general not be allowed to audit those figures and reveal what that increase encompasses?

My hon. colleague from Kindersley-Lloydminster in his brief remarks questioned some of the issues that would be contained in those costs such as salaries and severance packages. It reminds me of another issue of accountability or lack of accountability, the whole issue of MP pensions. My hon. colleague from Lisgar—Marquette mentioned that in his speech.

I find it more than ironic to hear once again the government saying "do not worry about what we are doing, do as we say, not as we do", as the government does with pension reform. It is talking about making cuts to Canadians' CPP pensions while it feeds at the trough of the MP pension plan.

### Government Orders

The member for Prince Albert—Churchill River was speaking about the need to consult farmers in this process. That is almost laughable. Is this the same party that during the campaign promised a plebiscite on whether it should be single or dual marketing? Where is the plebiscite after three years?

• (1900)

The hon. member talks about consulting and now he is busy heckling. It would be interesting if he is so verbose in his consultations with farmers.

**An hon. member:** Where is the accountability of this government?

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette outlined examples that clearly explained why it is imperative that the Canadian Wheat Board be put under the jurisdiction of the auditor general. The wheat board should also be subject to the Access to Information Act. Farmers are asking: “Why all the secrecy?” Reform members of Parliament are asking: “Why all the secrecy?” Why cannot this board be held accountable to the people that are paying the bills, the farmers?

As the hon. member opposite mentioned, there has been a lot of dissent. In my riding of Prince George—Peace River, farmers are divided on what to do with the wheat board. It is universal across the west that farmers are divided. However, there is one thing they are not divided on, and that is holding the board accountable.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members’ Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

Group No. 11 comprises three motions. I will just run over them, since we were interrupted for a vote and for private members’ business.

The member for Vancouver Quadra referred to Motions Nos. 67 and 68 proposed by the Liberal Party. I have problems living with what the government proposes in Motions Nos. 67 and 68. I say to the House I intend to vote against them.

As for Motion No. 70 proposed by the Reform member for Skeena, I am pleased to see that, even though we form the official opposition and the hon. member for Skeena and myself represent ridings at the opposite ends of the country, one in Vancouver and the other in Gaspé, the nose of Quebec, we can still reach a similar view on how to administer the Coast Guard.

I would like to read the final part of his motion, which states:

—provided in the most cost effective manner possible.

The hon. member for Skeena takes advantage of the opportunity to add what he means by this. He says:

“The level and scope of such services, as well as the manner of their delivery, shall be defined in full, ongoing, consultation with all beneficiaries.”

And what does this mean? Who are the beneficiaries? The objective of the Coast Guard, through its new fee charging powers, is to get money out of the users. They went from hearing to hearing, trying to make us understand in committee the new Coast Guard charges for navigational aids, trying to get through our thick skulls the idea of user fees.

• (1905)

A real user pays principle implies canvassing those using our services to find out the type of service they really want. Those paying for the service are also entitled to have their say. They want to know from the government whether the service offered is at the lowest possible cost, whether it could be offered another way and whether privatization is a possibility. All this in the context of the socio-economic and human impact on those who have to deal with the rationalization.

Regardless, as for the need for this motion, as we will see later in Group No. 12, that ideas will blend. The principle is to have the government not collect money just for the sake of collecting it and not to lay principles on the table and then ignore them later.

[Translation]

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### OCEANS ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-26, an act respecting the oceans of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of motions in Group No. 11.

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Skeena had the floor, but perhaps I could start right away and he can use his remaining five minutes shortly, if he wishes.

We have now reached motions in Group No. 11 at report stage of Bill C-26, an act respecting the oceans of Canada.

The government says: “We want to collect money, we are short”. The Bloc Québécois also advocated deficit reduction in the latest election campaign. However, the difference lies in achieving the objective. And here I am delighted to see that even people at the other end of the country, who call themselves reformers, can appreciate good common sense.

*Government Orders*

So, I still have to try to convince one of the three groups in the House. I realize the job is a bit difficult, but part of our work in Parliament is to try to find the words to help them understand the thing.

What can I say? I spent three weeks in hearings, from 9 in the morning to 9 at night. People would come and express their opinions. This too is hard to take: there were consultations, but it did not change a thing, and the legislation was not yet in force.

Imagine what would happen if we did not include right away in this bill the principle that there must be consultation, that users must be able to say what level of service would be appropriate and what level of spending they feel capable of taking on. To negotiate this change it is contemplating, this change it has to make to face the music and reduce its deficit, the Canadian government needs the help of the industry. It needs to establish what I would call partnership ties. I will reaffirm this basic principle over and over again.

In previous motions, we dealt with the notion of partnership in the context of the integrated management strategy that needed to be developed. In these motions, I specified that Canada's partners were the provinces, which make up Canada. In the case at hand, they are service users. These services are sometimes used by the provinces, but most of the time, they are used by industries and businesses.

As such, these should be our focus of attention. It is with them in mind that the consultation and feedback process should be put in place. But nowhere in this bill do I see this notion expressed. I cannot detect this kind of spirit in there. I cannot detect a hint of this notion either. What shall we make of it, especially when we see the minister press on with his new tariff structure after three quarters of those in the industry came before the committee to tell us loud and clear and in black and white that they did not want this new tariff structure for navigational aids, for commercial shipping? How far will they go if we let them? That was my first point.

• (1910)

Second, still on the same topic, the coast guard's new fee schedule for navigation aids was set for purely financial reasons. The Minister of Finance gave an order. Even though the coast guard appeared not to have a choice, it did have one. It could have continued to cut spending. If it wanted to collect more revenue, it could have considered what the people had to say about this.

Talking about a \$20 million financial objective is a mathematical trick, as commercial shipping activities are not spread over 12 months. Rather, the targeted level of activity must be compressed into the commercial shipping period. Consequently, the objective for this summer should be set at \$26 million or \$28 million to take this into account.

Furthermore, still on this topic, what is not mentioned is who will administer all this. How will these accounts be collected? At this point, no one knows. The funniest thing in all this is that these orders were not published for 30 days in the *Canada Gazette*, as it customary for any order of the governor in council.

This item in Part II slipped through almost unnoticed on a Friday afternoon. The industry was flabbergasted. They are still wondering how all this will be administered and what the administrative costs will be. I have already heard that the person who will administer this new fee schedule will receive a 5 per cent commission to bill the people concerned.

The bill has not been passed yet, but the regulations on the new fee schedule have just been put in place. There was mention of \$20 million, then \$28 million because of the short collection period, and they have just added 5 per cent. There is nothing reassuring in all this. We do not see how this shows respect for those who will use this service. I think it is very important to instil such respect and entrench it in this bill.

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-26, and more particularly on Motions Nos. 67 and 68, concerning the oceans of Canada.

I congratulate the hon. member for Gaspé for his excellent work regarding this issue. The bill seeks to recognize Canada's jurisdiction over its maritime zones, and to define the legislative framework required to establish a national oceans management strategy.

Bill C-26 also seeks to define federal responsibilities regarding ocean management, something which it fails to do. Part I recognizes, at the national level, Canada's jurisdiction over its maritime zones, as defined by the UN convention on the law of the sea. This part incorporates provisions of the Canadian Laws Offshore Application Act and of the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act. It is therefore a repetition of existing legal provisions. Consequently, I wonder about appropriateness of this part of the bill which, in my opinion, is not necessary.

Let us not forget that, with coastlines stretching for some 244,000 kilometres, Canada is among the first countries in the world in that regard. These coasts are, to a large extent, along islands in the Pacific, Atlantic and Arctic oceans. This is in addition to the 9,500 kilometres of coastline along the Great Lakes.

In 1970, Canada affirmed its jurisdiction over a territorial sea of 12 nautical miles. On January 1, 1977, the fishing zone was extended to 200 nautical miles.

• (1915)

I take this opportunity to mention the dispute that opposed Spain to Canada. It is an episode which I followed closely, since I am the

*Government Orders*

only member of this Parliament who is of Spanish origin. The dispute was about the turbot along the coast of Newfoundland.

A settlement was reached between Canada and the European Union, but Spain is not entirely pleased with it. There are currently two lawsuits before the courts: one by the Spanish government, before the International Court of Justice, in The Hague. The other, of a private nature, is by the owner or the captain of the *Estai*.

So, Spain is contesting the acts, the regulations and the measures taken by Canada, maintaining that Canada has no right to seize boats outside its territorial waters, and claiming compensation. The case is before the International Court of Justice in The Hague, but in the meantime Canada does not want to recognize that court's jurisdiction. The case is now at the preliminary stage concerning the jurisdiction of this international court.

In my view, this is an important problem. Canada should recognize the jurisdiction of this tribunal so that it may hear the case as to the substance. I think that this would greatly improve relations between Canada and Spain, between Canada and the European Union. I ask the Canadian government to review its position and to recognize the jurisdiction of this international tribunal.

Part II of Bill C-26 seeks to establish a national oceans management strategy. However, the legislative framework is poorly defined and federal responsibilities are not spelled out. This paves the way for interference by the federal government in sectors that do not come under its jurisdiction. I am thinking here of the protection of wildlife and habitats, as well as water, where Quebec has the greater jurisdiction.

Furthermore, clause 29 refers to provincial governments merely in terms of collaboration, on the same level as aboriginal organizations, coastal communities and other persons and bodies affected by the issue.

It is therefore reasonable to believe that this part of the bill may give rise to a number of conflicts between Ottawa and the provinces, as well as with the various stakeholders in the communities concerned. I would like the bill to involve the provinces more, to see them fully involved in the decision making process leading to the creation of a national ocean management strategy. This would make it possible to clarify the responsibilities of all partners involved.

For the foregoing reasons, I cannot support this bill as presented to us today, and I am even less able to support it because of the motions under consideration at this time. The number of motions to this bill in the committee and in the House suggests it is fairly controversial, moreover. I would also like to point out that I support the various motions proposed by the Bloc Québécois, particularly those from my colleague from Gaspé. These motions offer more clarity by redefining the relationships and powers between the federal government and the provinces. In my opinion,

they will ensure a greater respect of provincial jurisdictions by Ottawa.

I also support the motions on fee mechanisms for Coast Guard services, particularly navigational aids and ice breaking. The objectives of these motions are, among other things, to make the fee mechanisms more equitable and to force the ministers to collaborate with the industry and the provinces before imposing fees or raising them. These amendments will prevent the minister for acting unilaterally, with no concern for public hearings, as he has done in the past.

• (1920)

The fees in this bill are unevenly distributed among the various Canadian ports. It will cost as much for a ship arriving off the Atlantic to unload in Sept-Îles as it will in Thunder Bay, 3,700 kilometres further up the St. Lawrence. Another example: a Canadian shipowner registering his vessel abroad will pay one seventh the amount paid by the person registering his vessel in Canada.

These two examples indicate that the scale of charges in Bill C-26 is problematic. The bill contains a number of inequities. It will considerably reduce the competitiveness of Quebec and Canadian ports. This is why I think these clauses should be reviewed.

In this regard, I would like to point out that the Quebec transport minister, Jacques Brassard, the mayors of the principal cities along the St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence Ship Operators Association, and the mayor of Rivière-du-Loup all vigorously oppose this bill for the reasons I have just given. They demand a moratorium on Bill C-26. I agree and think the motions put forward by the Bloc Québécois should be considered.

[English]

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to Bill C-26 and the motions in group No. 11.

Motion No. 70 deals with how to pay for some very important factors of fisheries and oceans. One of these is the coast guard. It is of particular importance in my riding of Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, which has a large coastline and where thousands of boaters are on the water in inclement weather and need coast guard services. These days the coast guard is under tight fiscal constraints and is finding it increasingly difficult to provide those necessary services in our waters.

We in the Reform Party believe in the principle of Motion No. 70 which states that services by the coast guard are most effectively paid for on a user fee basis. That is common sense. Why should somebody who is not using the service pay for it?

Another ancillary problem I have in my riding, which I would ask the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to look at, is what is happening to the volunteer rescue services on our coasts. They are

having an increasingly difficult time paying for the important services they provide, given the length of coastline and the limited number of coast guard. Often they are the first response team to arrive at situations where people's lives are at stake.

In Sooke, British Columbia in my riding, it is of particular importance. The people there save dozens of lives every year, yet that service may close down. I ask the minister to look at one of the solutions that has been discussed in my community. Perhaps a surcharge could be established on moorage fees that could be used locally to provide the funds necessary to maintain search and rescue services in the community. Bear in mind this is a cost effective way of doing it because the people who man the search and rescue service are essentially volunteers and the moneys they use go into the infrastructure they need; the rigid hull zodiacs, fuel, training, et cetera.

I would ask the minister to look at that and remind him of the desperate need of these volunteer departments across the country for funds. Some way has to be found to enable these rescue services to fund themselves. I know there is no more money in the pot to do this. There are alternatives and I would suggest he look at them.

Motion No. 71 is very important and Reform opposes it. It seeks to limit the minister's marine protection areas to fisheries alone. We oppose it because the protection of the fish extends to their habitat. The creatures that live in the sea depend on their habitat in order to survive. Therefore preservation of the species without preservation of the habitat makes no sense. They are two parts of the same whole, and it is absolutely essential that habitat be protected.

• (1925)

I mention again my riding of Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca. One of the problems, particularly with forestry, is the large amount of degradation of habitat up and down the coast. As a result, many species are being devastated, particularly salmon and crustaceans such as shellfish.

This is not solely a problem of poaching or overutilization, but a problem of habitat destruction. Regardless of what species one is looking at, whether on land or in the ocean, the primary reason these species are coming down in numbers and why species around the world are threatened is habitat destruction.

I hope that the minister will rethink Motion No. 71 and in the future extend this to involve not only the fisheries, but also the habitat. He only needs to look at the salmon fishery on the west coast to see the devastation that habitat destruction has wrought.

A constructive way of improving this is to go to the people who actually destroyed the habitat in the first place. Many of the companies on the west coast, particularly some of the forestry companies, are primarily responsible for the destruction of this

### *Government Orders*

habitat and have got off scot-free. The minister should work with these groups and try to have a co-operative arrangement with them to try to improve the habitat and get it back to where it was before it was destroyed. It can be a mutually beneficial situation that can improve the communities and the commercial sector.

Motion No. 73 deals with research. We support this, because research, not only in fisheries but in other aspects of our industrial and environmental complex is quite fundamental.

I would like the minister to look at a couple of areas. There have been a number of criticisms from other countries. I will take one specific example. It deals with aquaculture.

As members know, Canada used to lead the world in aquaculture. We do not lead the world any more. Chile does. Why? It is in part because we have failed to be aggressive in the utilization of our resources. We used to be on the cutting edge of aquaculture, including research, but we are not there any more.

We were handed an opportunity to continue to be leaders and also to take our position as the number one country in the world in aquaculture, with who else but Iceland? Iceland has approached this government, and previous governments, to make co-operative interventions in the science of aquaculture in ways in which we can maximize the resources within our oceans in a sustainable fashion.

The people in Iceland came to Canada on many occasions with open arms, with good ideas and basically were told to go away, that Canadians were not interested. That does a huge disservice to our fisheries and to the people whose livelihood is dependent on fisheries and oceans. This country has a huge opportunity in fisheries and in aquaculture and we need to capitalize on that.

Part of the way we can capitalize is to invest in research and development, primarily through co-operative arrangements with the private sector. There is no new money, but money could be found in the private sector. The government can take a leadership role in this important area. It will lead to greater employment in our country.

In short, the Reform Party supports Bill C-26, the oceans act. Some of the motions we are going to support were not in Group No. 11. I would ask, with the constructive criticisms that the minister has heard today, that he takes them home with him and looks at them carefully to build a better bill.

• (1930)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is about to unilaterally impose on the marine industry user fees for Coast Guard services, notably for navigational aids and icebreaking operations. Clauses 41 and 47 to

*Government Orders*

52 of Bill C-26 give the fisheries minister the power to impose these user fees.

Several amendments to these clauses have been moved by the Bloc Québécois, by my colleague the member for Gaspé, who went to a lot of trouble to try to find a way of co-operating with the government. As I was saying, several amendments to these clauses have been tabled for the following purposes: to make the principle of user fees more equitable, to force the minister to co-operate with the industry and the provinces before imposing or increasing the fees. These changes will prevent the minister from acting unilaterally, without taking public consultation into account, as he did with respect to the user fees that he wants to impose in June 1996.

Public hearings were held by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans. All witnesses who appeared before the committee deplored the decision and consultation process of the Coast Guard, in particular the fact that the minister went ahead with the user fees without first making an economic impact assessment of this measure on the marine industry and on industrial sectors relying on shipping.

Moreover, 75 per cent of the witnesses asked the minister to declare a moratorium on the imposition of fees pending the result of impact studies commissioned by the fisheries department for next fall. The witnesses also suggested that the minister co-operate with the marine industry in carrying out these economic impact studies. Finally, there was a clear consensus against the minister's proposal, which was considered unacceptable by concerned parties in the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, notably by the Ontario and Quebec governments.

Of course, disregarding all those recommendations and objections, the minister seems to be determined to apply his fees without even thinking of their potentially devastating consequences on employment in the marine industry, which is a highly developed economic sector in Quebec.

Another major problem is the drop in competitiveness of ports in the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes compared with American ports. On the one hand, ships passing through the St. Lawrence and the seaway to reach the United States will not pay for Coast Guard services if they do not stop in Canadian ports. That is a serious threat to the competitiveness of the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes ports.

On the other hand, the user pay principle advocated by the minister is not consistently applied. In several instances, in Sept-Îles and Port-Cartier among other places, users will pay up to \$5 million every year for only one buoy. And finally, the fees the minister intends to apply are only the tip of the iceberg since they cover only navigational aids. Harbour and seaway dredging and icebreaking in the seaway are other targeted services for the imposition of fees.

These other fees might be much higher than those for navigational aids and we have every right to be concerned about the survival and competitiveness of the St. Lawrence harbours, especially the port of Montreal and several ports in the regions.

I would also like to take this opportunity to say a couple of words on what it will do to a riding like mine. As you all know, Laurentides is a riding where boating and water sports are very important to the survival of tourism.

There are between 500 and 800 lakes in my riding, so you can well imagine the impact fees on pleasure craft will have on the economy of an area like mine. We have not heard all the details yet, but there is talk of imposing a fee on pedalboats and sailboards. I do not know where they will put the licence plate, but I am sure they will think of something.

There is talk of having rowboats and canoes come under the law, can you imagine what it might do to a tourism industry like the one in my riding?

• (1935)

Imagine the small and medium size businesses that make a living renting this kind of equipment for the season, for the summer; they will have to pay these fees. Will it be on a yearly basis, or every five years? I still do not know how it will work. We might be in for some nasty surprises. Will the fees be phased in? All this to collect a few million dollars to put in the finance minister's coffers. This is an outrage.

Moreover, let us keep in mind how much it will cost to collect these fees. How will we go about finding the owners of all these pedalboats, sailboards, rowboats, canoes? This is practically impossible, unmanageable. In the end, the ordinary taxpayer will have to pay once again. Once again he will have to bear the burden of the federal government's financial problems.

We will oppose that fiercely. Coalitions are being formed right now in my riding and elsewhere to press the government into not adopting such a fee schedule. The Bloc Québécois will continue its action against this bill in the hope that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will find another way to fill his coffer. There would be so many other ways.

Let me go on to another issue, waste dumped into the sea. Do you know there is a fixed rate for the right to dump waste in the sea? It means I can have five truckloads of waste, buy a license and dump all of it into the sea with that one license alone. I can throw as much waste as I want. These people are the ones you should go after. We should make them pay the true price for their waste. It is amazing what savings could be made that way and the environment would be better protected.

*Government Orders*

When I see the decisions being taken in order to collect \$14 million and the number of public servants that will take, I am concerned. They will have to create a new division at Fisheries and Oceans. I can assure you the government will not get the co-operation of all the provinces. It is not the provinces nor the municipalities that will be collecting those fees. It will cost a fortune. It will cost more to implement the fee schedule than to leave things the way they are.

I encourage my colleagues to continue the debate on these motions. I will fully support any opposition to charging fees for ships and boats.

**Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to comment on the motions Group No.11, on Bill C-26, a group of motions concerning the schedule of charges. Hearings were held and 75 per cent of the interested parties came to tell the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans that he should suspend the application of his new fee schedule until general economic impact studies had been carried out.

I am very familiar with the St. Lawrence River region, in particular the lower north shore. I worked for 15 years for Iron Ore in Sept-Îles. When I left the company, in the mid seventies, it had annual exports of 15 to 29 million tonnes of iron ore that were loaded on 300,000 tonne supercargoes.

Of course, the cost of iron ore was not excessively high, it was 1 cent per tonne. However, Iron Ore employed thousands of people through its two entities, the mining company and its subsidiary Quebec North Shore and Labrador Railway, and in this way it sustained the whole economy of north shore, an economy that was working well.

Let us come back to the measure advocated by the minister. He does not seem to realize what impact a fee increase would have on users on St. Lawrence River. In the port of Sept-Îles and Port-Cartier for example, this would mean \$5 million for each buoy.

• (1940)

That is hard to understand. Even though the government wants an exorbitant price for a buoy, I am sure the mining companies, Iron Ore Corp., Wabush Mines and Quebec Cartier Mining in Port-Cartier could all afford hundreds of buoys. But the current price of \$5 million a year for installing a buoy they do not need is too high. The big ocean going cargoes all use satellite positioning. They do not need the minister's small buoys that are much more useful for windsurfers than these supercargoes.

That is somewhat reminiscent of the highwaymen of the last century. They would hide behind a bush, wait until someone came by and, on whatever pretext they could think up—La Fontaine was good at doing that in his fables—they would jump on him and rob

him. They would relieve him of all his belongings. That is what the government is doing.

You know, this ultimately has an impact. I am sure the mining company, Iron Ore, does not even ship 10 million tonnes a year, while from 1970 to 1975, it shipped almost 20 million tonnes. It employed between 10,000 and 12,000 people in its best years. At the present time, it employs about 2,000. But the others are all taxpayers who do not pay taxes any more, because they no longer have a job.

That is what happened. That explains the \$600 billion deficit. The Liberals sometimes remind me of the man who will not feed his cow yet wants it to give more milk. After a while, it does not work any more. You cannot kill the canary and ask it to have chicks. You must think logically and realize that policies such as these are bad for the economy of Quebec in general and the north shore in particular.

However, the minister is going about this in a haphazard manner. He does not have a buoy, and it shows. He is going around, rudderless, and has decided to hike user fees. You know, we already pay taxes in our society. Life is not free in this society. As far as individuals are concerned, the minister can always say they sometimes get sick, receive hospital care, unemployment insurance or welfare. Sometimes, they travel and we open the roads for them.

However, mining or paper companies pay taxes, but do not get sick very often. When they get sick, they shut down. The same goes for mining companies. They cannot receive welfare when things go wrong. They pay taxes to begin with, like all of us, as well as a surtax in accordance with the user pay principle. It says it is nonsense.

There are deep water ports, in Halifax, Vancouver and Victoria for example, where buoys are not required. These users get off lightly, as they use services without paying since they do not have buoys.

I think that \$5 million per year, just to have a buoy at the mouth of the bay in Sept-Îles and Port-Cartier, is excessive. The minister should take notice because this is the kind of thing that happens little by little, insidiously. Before you know it, the number of workers has gone down from 2,000 to 1,500, then from 1,500 to 1,000 and from 1,000 to 300. When the minister finally wakes up, he says that he does not understand, that the people in that region have not been paying taxes. How could they, when they are out of work?

Over time, small things have added up and they are now having a disastrous effect on the regional economy, if not on the whole province. But that, the minister does not care two hoots about. I am still directing my remarks, through the Chair, to the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, who does not seem the slightest bit perturbed by what I am saying, but this member, whom I salute,

*Government Orders*

should try again to make the fisheries minister see reason to ensure that adequate regulations are in place.

How competitive will be our ports, as compared to those in the northern U.S. states? Take for instance a transatlantic liner coming from Europe. It goes in the St. Lawrence River estuary, makes its way up the river, bypassing Saint-Lambert, ends up in the Great Lakes and heads straight for Pittsburgh.

• (1945)

It pays nothing, even though it used the channel, the water and the St. Lawrence. It pays for the locks in Saint-Lambert, but it is getting the rest free. On the other hand, the small coastal trade carrier on the North Shore, or on both shores of the St. Lawrence will be hit hard.

We mentioned earlier the carrier crossing the Atlantic and unloading its cargo in Sept-Îles; it costs a fortune, whereas the carrier unloading in Thunder Bay has nothing to pay even though it went 3,700 kilometres further down a waterway maintained by Canada. Sometimes, as far as this upkeep is concerned, one wonders if Canada has not bitten off more than it can chew. If it cannot afford to look after such a large country, why does it not leave a part of it to Quebecers? We could take care of it and manage it, if Canada cannot do it.

I know this is not easy, but we will not get out of the situation by adopting such measures, nor by acting like highwaymen. Companies do talk to each other. They realize that ore is not expensive on the North Shore, but they must pay an additional cost. Moreover, they are being squeezed dry with navigation costs after having invested billions in a region that was not really developed before they came. Once they are grabbed by the throat, fees are raised any which way. They respect their commitments on iron ore tonnage, but as far as using ports and wharves is concerned, the sky is the limit. They are asked \$5 million for one buoy. Really, this is nonsense.

Has the government yielded to the pressure of the lobby representing eastern interests? These people from down east, from Halifax and Newfoundland, have a great influence on the government. When military bases are closed in that region, the government gives them \$17 million. By comparison, when a base was closed in Quebec, our province only got \$1 million. In any case, given their small number here, MPs from the maritimes are particularly effective. Everything generally turns against Quebec. This bill is yet another illustration of that.

Through the Chair, I ask the member for Vancouver Quadra who is listening so carefully to what I have to say, to try to influence his minister and make him realize that, even if Quebec is a distinct society, the waters, rivers, docks and ships are no different. Even if Quebec is a relatively rich province with its iron deposits and other minerals, such as the bauxite found in the Lac Saint-Jean region

which is transformed into aluminum ingots, this is no reason to try to choke Quebecers by depriving them of their economic infrastructure, unless it is a current Liberal strategy.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra is looking at me and seems surprised that we could think of such things. You know, once we get used to hearing the current Prime Minister, we realize that words do not have the same meaning for him as for the rest of us; we are speaking in good faith. When the Prime Minister talks about a chair, it is not a horizontal seat with four legs. In the Prime Minister's mind, a chair can have two horizontal legs, two vertical legs and a tilted seat. That is a chair or a table for the Prime Minister. Now we have learned not to trust him. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra might find it very funny, but such is the sad reality in Quebec. The Prime Minister makes promises to us, but we learned many moons ago that we have to be cautious and examine what he means because one never wins against him. There is always a meaning nobody had thought of.

I think it is in the interest not only of Quebec but also of the whole of Canada to try to make the Prime Minister understand and reconsider this bill and its fee structure. As suggested by mayors of municipalities and by various other interested parties, before doing something irreparable, we should wait until we at least get impact studies and know what disastrous consequences such a bill could have.

• (1950)

So there is no point hurrying to shoot ourselves in the foot, to chop a hole in the bottom of the boat. Let us proceed slowly and await the results of studies.

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I speak tonight in support of the amendments put forward by the Bloc, by my colleague from Gaspé.

I am also glad to speak against this ridiculous attempt by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the government to charge fees for navigational aid services, whether it is for dredging or deicing the St. Lawrence River, without waiting for the results of economic impact studies.

I appeal to your common sense. The St. Lawrence River in the province of Quebec is quite unique. In any other country, in France or anywhere else, such a huge river would be called a sea. From Godbout to Matane, for example, this river is 26 miles wide, that is close to 50 kilometres. The waters of the St. Lawrence River are inland waters in Quebec. If that river had not represented something like a huge lung for Quebec, Canada's history would have been quite different.

Indeed, if British colonial forces had not felt the need to control this waterway leading inland, they would have left the decision making and the development of our people in the hands of the Canadiens, who became known as French Canadians and are now



*Government Orders*

called Quebecers. The St. Lawrence River is an inland waterway of a different type, a type which reflects what Quebec is.

But now, without consulting the provinces, without consulting Quebec, without consulting users and without consulting those who will be affected by this decision, whose impact could be quite dramatic, the minister has decided to go ahead and give himself the power to set the fees he finds appropriate without considering the effects it could have.

This is a major decision. It reflects a lack of interest for what Quebec is. It reflects a lack of concern for the extremely important economic role the St. Lawrence River could play in terms of inland navigation and shipping. There are a large number of businesses in my riding of Mercier, in Montreal, and the big ones that are still around rely on a combination of rail and water transport for their operations.

• (1955)

They are and will continue to be affected, as will the port cities located all along the St. Lawrence River.

Because of this government decision, this very important not only economic but social and even cultural fabric of the province of Quebec is being threatened.

The bill and all the literature on it give us food for thought. A few years ago, it was decided and rightly so that polluters must pay, whatever the field. That is when the polluter pays principle became popular. From what I read about the St. Lawrence River, something quite different is happening. Now it is the users who must pay. But should they be the ones to pay? Each case should be reviewed in terms of economic impact, social responsibilities and good citizenship.

What is important is that the St. Lawrence River can continue to play its role. If, contrary to what we would be inclined to think, the government does care about the economic role of the St. Lawrence River, how can it risk jeopardizing the economic mission of its ports? How can it penalize in this way Quebec and, with the Great Lakes, Ontario, before the results of the impact studies are out?

If, at least, businesses or institutions had shown some concern or even resistance, but this is not the case, because they know how important this is for Quebec. But what will happen when those users will be asked to pay for the impacts of winter, the ice removal and the dredging required as a result of erosion and other natural events? The users in a particular context or situation will have to pay.

I also urge and pray the member for Vancouver Quadra and the other member from British Columbia whose riding I do not remember to go on an excursion on the St. Lawrence River, to try to

understand why this issue goes well beyond the economic one that I just described with some emotion; it is important, but it goes well beyond that because we feel deprived of the control over this major waterway which is a great, magnificent and natural feature and which represents a unique asset, one that can also turn to our disadvantage because the fees, the rates that will be imposed could put in jeopardy its utilization for recreational, tourist and economic purposes.

• (2000)

We could be deprived of the full development stemming from the existence of this outstanding waterway, the St. Lawrence River, because the minister, in a totally arbitrary manner, empowers himself to impose a rate structure that could be to our disadvantage economically and favour, for instance, the harbours of northern United States.

As members, we will do everything that is feasible to prevent the government from ramming through this legislation which is appalling, unfair and which shows its complete insensitivity regarding the significance of the St. Lawrence for Quebec.

**Mr. Yves Rochelleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise also to express my opposition to the government's plan to offer Coast Guard services on a user fee basis. According to our information, this is not the first time the government tried to invade this field in order to raise new funds for the national treasury. We must examine carefully the content as well as the form of this proposal.

This time, the government's objective, through the Coast Guard, is to take in close to \$160 million by year 2000 from users, starting, in 1996, with an amount of \$20 million only for navigation aids, such as buoys and lighthouses that guide ships on the St. Lawrence River. The issues of icebreaking and dredging of the St. Lawrence River and approaches to ports are being determined. According to our information, the icebreaking plan will take form next fall.

As part of its strategy, the government asked a private firm, IBI, to study this question. As member of Parliament and associate member of the committee, I had the honour to take part in the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans, and I am also very pleased to speak as critic for regional development. Many witnesses said that the IBI study was a hollow sham. Yet, the study was quite voluminous, but, according to a witness, it was not worth the paper on which it was printed. This gives you an idea of the quality of the work done because it seems that it was all a bogus consultation process.

Afterwards, the government had to yield to the pressure exerted by the official opposition and call a meeting of the fisheries and oceans committee which, in turn, invited witnesses to appear before it in order to know the opinion of those we could call victims

*Government Orders*

of this government operation. Again, this was a bogus consultation process.

Many witnesses, and important ones at that, expressed their views. On the one hand, we saw the arrogance of the Coast Guard commissioner, Mr. Thomas, very self-confident, very proud to talk about the IBI study, and on the other, there was the disappointment, concern and even the anger of users who will have to foot the bill without getting any real explanation of what was going on.

It must be said that over the next three years, people who play a very important economic role, as I will explain later, will have to pay \$160 million without any impact study. Some witnesses talked about the devastating effects of that policy, for example, the SODES, which is an association of many highly credible maritime stakeholders in Quebec. There is no description of the services provided to users by the Coast Guard, nonetheless the user pay principle will be applied.

• (2005)

They did not feel the need to demonstrate rationally, as logically as possible, as convincingly as possible, the services actually rendered to these users they want to see pay in future. As for conviction or the moral aspect of the matter are concerned, the process is extremely arbitrary, as well as extremely authoritarian, somewhat typical of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Commissioner of the Coast Guard, that is for sure.

As well, there has been no demonstration of any effort whatsoever of rationalization of Coast Guard operations, because if the Coast Guard—which, if memory serves, costs \$860 million and change yearly—had successfully rationalized its operations, as the users suggest, those who have seen it in operation just about everywhere in Canada, there would be less money to collect and less reason to penalize users of these undefined Coast Guard services. This is extremely shocking. It is obvious to people that the Coast Guard has not cleaned up its own act before going and setting new user fees.

All of this gives rise to what I would term some disturbing facts. For example, the problem comes from Ottawa. Ottawa needs money and has decided to find a new way to intervene to meet this need. For its purposes, it has divided the country into three major regions.

So, while the problem is exactly the same from coast to coast, the country is divided into three parts: the west, the centre—that is, the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence—and the maritimes. As it happens, Quebec is the one that gets it in the neck, because it will end up paying, with the Great Lakes, nearly 48 per cent of the \$20 million at issue this year.

I have heard federalists say, for your information, that, if there is a country, there is a country. Unless Ottawa decides simply to

divide up the country, to acknowledge in some way that there are differences, big ones, we are obliged to talk sovereignty. There are therefore federalists who are legitimately upset, and, we hope, shaken by the federal government's move to divide up the country into the three regions I just mentioned.

What is more, according to user estimates, the government is raising costs, plus what this policy will mean eventually, by a dollar a tonne. The Coast Guard's response to this argument is that it is not a dollar a tonne, but ten cents a tonne. This is the kind of debate that can generate a lot of anxiety since some will think that 10 cents is important, but a dollar is even more so in a field where competition is exceedingly high. According to users, this will double the cost of maritime transportation operations in the St. Lawrence, if ever the contention of users is confirmed, that is, a \$1 increase.

So they caved in to the eastern and western lobbies, but especially the eastern lobby, that is, the maritimes, and decided on a fee structure that seems to be clearly in favour of Halifax as opposed to one of its competitor ports called Montreal. The port of Halifax is a port of call for big container ships whereas the port of Montreal is an unloading port. It seems that the decision to apply user fees based on the tonnage of transhipped or unloaded cargo favours Halifax, while the decision to impose user fees based on the size of vessels would have favoured neither of these two ports.

This is a rather sneaky way to favour one port over another one when both are competing against one another.

• (2010)

There is a disturbing fact which gives a very concrete idea of what to expect: For navigational aids, a single 25,000 tonne vessel will pay \$112,000 per year. A vessel of 25,000 tonnes, \$112,000 per year. Not only that, but policies are also being designed which will cost far more, in particular with respect to icebreaking operations. This gives us some idea of the scope of the problem we will soon be facing.

One wonders if this is not an effort to severely reduce the competitiveness of the ports on the St. Lawrence compared with those ports of the maritime provinces, of the east coast of the U.S., even of the whole Mississippi valley. St. Lawrence harbours are in direct competition with those harbours and if shipowners decide it is too expensive to sail through the St. Lawrence, the danger for not only the Quebec economy, but also central Canada, is that they will have missed the boat.

Aluminum plants, the whole pulp and paper industry, the oil industry, the mining industry might then be in jeopardy, together with tens of thousands of jobs related to all these sectors.

This is a major issue and the official opposition is asking for a one-year moratorium. One wonders if, in a sovereign Quebec, it

*Government Orders*

would even occur to the leaders to come up with such a scheme to hurt the economy instead of helping it develop.

**The Deputy Speaker:** My colleagues, before we hear the member for Châteauguay, I would like to remind you that we are studying group 11, that is Motions Nos 67, 68 and 70.

**Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate in this debate at report stage on Bill C-26, an Act respecting the oceans of Canada. This bill proposes that a tariff be unilaterally established for all services offered by the Coast Guard to the marine industry, including ice breaking and aids to navigation. It gives the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans all the powers he needs to collect the set fees.

The Bloc Québécois, under the leadership of my colleague, the member for Gaspé, presented a series of 57 amendments in order to make the fees more equitable and to bring the minister to consult the industry and the provinces before implementing or increasing any fees.

During public hearings, all stakeholders condemned the fact that the Canadian Coast Guard was planning to collect fees without any previous consultations. They asked the minister for a moratorium until the results of impact studies on the marine industry and industrial sectors relying on marine transportation are known.

Given the need for governments to rationalize their expenditures one can only agree with the general principle of user fees set on a base rate. However, the fee charged the service user must be proportional to actual use. Otherwise the fee schedule could be a life and death issue for a number of companies. In other words, it would be another policy based on a double standard.

While ships will have to pay more in the St. Lawrence River and in the Great Lakes, the port of Churchill, in Manitoba, would be exempted from paying for some services provided by the Coast Guard. And yet this port uses icebreakers more than any other, and is getting generous support from the Coast Guard. A policy with a double standard.

This policy appears to be just another part of Plan B against Quebec and its economic hub, Montreal. We are forced to wonder if the federal government is trying to starve out the Quebec economy in order to cool its demands for independence. That would, however, indicate a serious lack of knowledge of Quebec. Such an offensive would only reinforce our sovereignist intentions.

Quebec and Montreal cannot help but be negatively affected by this bill.

• (2015)

In support of this statement, I have an April 25 press release from the office of Quebec's ministre d'État à la métropole. The

minister is concerned about the economic impact on the Montreal region, and the Canadian Coast Guard's planned fees.

If I may, I would like to make a few points about this. On April 25, Serge Ménard, the Quebec minister responsible for Montreal, along with Mrs. Véra Danyluk, chairperson of the executive committee of the Conseil régional de développement de l'île de Montréal and of the executive committee of the Montreal Urban Community, and Mr. Patrice Simard, President of the Metropolitan Montreal Chamber of Commerce, all people very familiar with this matter, issued a press release. The salient points were as follows: they regretted the lack of an economic impact study; they called for a moratorium on this bill; they were amazed at the lack of any rationalization measures on Coast Guard operations. These are the points they made in their release. There was also condemnation of the hit or miss way the matter was being handled, and they also stated that the burden was assessed at that time at 48 per cent for mid-Canada (the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes), 30 per cent for the east, and 22 per cent for the west.

But the main part of their press release dealt with the importance of its metropolis for Quebec. This is what it said: "Every year, the port of Montreal handles 20 million tons of cargo and 726,000 containers transit through its facilities. This activity generates 14,000 direct and indirect jobs and revenues of \$1.2 billion annually. Many Quebec industries depend on this mode of supply. Furthermore, the port of Montreal must support strong competition from American east coast ports. Fifty per cent of the port of Montreal's container traffic comes from industrialized regions of the United States, namely the Midwest, New York state and New England."

"Since 60 per cent of the freight passing through the port of Montreal is shipped by railway to various continental destinations, the profitability of the railway network of the metropolis would also be affected by the tariff project. The Canadian government's proposed fee structure threatens the competitiveness of the port of Montreal on the American market, as well as the transportation and supply needs of Canadian industries", concluded Minister Ménard.

Again, this bill deals with all kinds of things, but brings no solution. Most of all, it annoys everyone. Let us consider motions in Groups Nos. 11, 8 and 9 dealing with recreational crafts and emergency situations. There was an emergency situation in my riding in January, when flood waters affected 1,200 people and cost \$3 million in Châteauguay. The problem was mainly due to the fact that the Coast Guard Rovercraft could not be used at the time because it was being repaired.

When we asked the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in the House, he told us that the rescue services on tributaries of the St. Lawrence and on the other rivers in Canada are under provincial jurisdiction. The Canadian Coast Guard provides ice breaking services on these tributaries at the request of the Quebec minister. He simply said the tributaries were a provincial responsibility.

*Government Orders*

• (2020)

In this bill, with the intention to regulate all types of boats, whether rowboats or pedal boats, on rivers or streams, I wonder what the Coast Guard has to do in this area.

On the whole, this about summarizes the bill. It affects nothing and everything. In my opinion, this bill is another bill in the style of the government. It intervenes everywhere and resolves absolutely nothing. Therefore, we simply have to vote against this bill.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I see in the gallery several young people who have come here to see how we debate legislation in the House of Commons. They must be just as scandalized as I am to see that there is only one Liberal member and one Reform member present. I think it is time to ask for a quorum count so we can have a normal debate according to the rules.

I ask that a quorum count be held, Mr. Speaker

[*English*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.

*And the bells having rung:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** I see 20 members present. Resuming debate.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to this group of motions, Group No. 11, concerning— The Liberals were not here a few moments ago and now they will not stop talking. They are not any more useful to us now than they were then.

Motion No. 70 says that the Coast Guard should provide its services in the most cost effective manner possible and, more importantly, that people in the industry should be consulted about the services for which they are paying. It is an interesting motion. To assess its relevance, it may be necessary to go back to the substance of this bill.

We are talking about user fees on the St. Lawrence Seaway, but most of all we are talking about conditions that will make this seaway an important economic asset for Quebec and for Canada.

We must not forget that there are several ports along the St. Lawrence River. Some are very large, others are smaller, but they are always important to the region where they are located, whether it be in Sept-Îles, Quebec City, Trois-Rivières, Montreal, Cacouna, Rimouski or Matane. These are all places where ports play an important role.

We are witnessing what I would call an attack on Quebec by the federal government through the imposition of fees. Let us not forget this is happening at the same time as the releasing of the ports. On one hand, the government paints an interesting picture for the future by decentralizing port management, but, on the other hand, it takes measures that will make ports on the St. Lawrence Seaway no longer competitive and no longer attractive to businesses.

I think there is a very important message being sent to the present government, this message being that people who are behind Quebec's demands are not what the Liberals would call separatists, but people from the aluminum industry, the pulp and paper industry, the mining industry, people from all these job creating industries that are good for the economy. The current government should take that into consideration. These people are all members of the Société de développement économique du Saint-Laurent. We are talking here about well known firms such as Daishowa and Alumax; in my area, Gaspesia, in Chandler; and F.R. Soucy, in Rivière-du-Loup. These are all businesses that will have to make major economic decisions for the next five, ten, fifteen or twenty years. When we tell them about the possibility of user fees becoming much higher, they may decide to go elsewhere, to expand their facilities less. We then see clearly the direct link that exists between regional development and the user fee policy.

• (2025)

Why should this kind of fee structure be adopted today? Did we make all the efforts necessary to find another solution? I myself have a proposal for the government that would replace its steam-roller approach. As Raymond Giroux, an editorialist at *Le Soleil*, wrote: "The administrative machinery already acts as though Canada was nothing more than a secondary residence for its 7 million francophones. Like air traffic control, the issue of ports is handled by the offices of deputy ministers, where the true power resides, in keeping with the Liberal tradition".

Could the minister not get out of his deputy minister's office, go out there and ask the people in the industry to propose solutions? These people are ready to propose solutions. They have already said they were willing to accept a new fee structure and, after a reasonable time, to adhere to the user-pay principle. It is not a matter of making Quebec pay for the services provided in the maritimes and Newfoundland. Rather, we must review all the solutions, not only raising fees but also looking at the way services are provided in the region.

The people directly involved in maritime shipping have interesting solutions to propose. Instead of raising fees, they would take measures to significantly reduce operating costs. As is well known, the coast guard sometimes behaves as it did in more prosperous times. For example, since its home port has long been outside Quebec, the icebreakers operating in the gulf must go back to their home port in the maritimes just to fill up on fuel. Is this still an

effective way to operate? Would it be possible to save money on this? Should we not review all of the coast guard's operations? I think there is room for self-examination here, but this has been somewhat neglected.

From that point of view, Motion No. 70 is interesting and I think the government would do well to redo its homework, get back to its users and seek proposals so that they can agree from the start on reduction targets that make sense, targets susceptible of generating a consensus. On this sound basis of an agreement on the targets to be met, we could then think about how to go about meeting these targets.

This would constitute a much more worthwhile solution than the one consisting in using a steam roller as the minister is doing right now.

This is a time of year when many of the costs associated with ice during the winter months are no longer incurred. Why would the minister not take a month or two during the summer to look into this, review the matter and find solutions that could meet the approval of all concerned? He could come back to the House with much more interesting answers, answers which could have been arrived at through parliamentary committees, by consensus, answers which could satisfy everybody, transparent answers.

At the moment, a strong impression is being created that this is part of an overall strategy to have Quebec lose its competitive edge. Certain operations lead us to believe that the government is holding a "garage sale", where Quebec's competitive advantages are being sold off, and the St. Lawrence is one of them.

It is also important to ensure that there is solidarity between users all along the river. It must be realized that, when a boat goes down or up the river, it can stop at various ports.

• (2030)

There some major ports which have the equipment necessary to load a ship. There are also several wharfs along the river where ships can take on cargo. For example, ships can take on wood, powdered milk and peat moss, to name but a few, in Cacouna's port, in order to make this stop cost effective, recover their costs and make a profit.

However, if a decision systematically puts industries which settle eventually in the region at a competitive disadvantage and if, indeed, there is a reduction in the use of ports, the whole development of Quebec will suffer, because all ports can be affected by these decisions. Therefore, before making any decision, the government would do well to ensure that there will be no surprises later on.

Public hearings could have been held which would have made it possible to take the public opinion into account. We are told that 75

### *Government Orders*

per cent of stakeholders have asked for a moratorium. Should not the government listen to these people, consider the advantages of this moratorium, give itself time to look for other alternatives and ensure that the business plan which would result would suit all users and not only those who want to maintain services without questioning their relevance?

That is why I think Motion No. 70 deserves to be supported. I would like members, especially those whose riding is affected by this situation, to consider their vote carefully and think about their constituents' interests before they simply support a government position.

True, the government must reduce its operating costs. It needs to raise its cash inflow, but it must do so with the knowledge that it will get a quality service at a minimal cost. It must not simply raise the prices since, by doing that, it does not apply the basic principle that it advocates, that is, sound management. For all these reasons, I ask the government to vote in favour of Motion No. 70.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member's time is up.

**Mr. Crête:** Mr. Speaker, I ask the consent of the House to let me speak a few minutes more.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to give the member a few more minutes?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Crête:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the House for realizing the importance of the issue and allowing us to debate it a little longer.

I want to emphasise a point I mentioned but did not elaborate enough on because of time constraints. Stakeholders asking for a moratorium as an opportunity for Quebec to suggest other solutions are not those we traditionally identify as sovereignists in Quebec. They are industrial stakeholders, people who make our economy work. They are corporations like Iron Ore, Alumax, Daishowa. They are all major economic stakeholders, people who have made their mark in Quebec's economy and have made investments that are growing.

Take an investment like Alumax for example. We gambled on its profitability. When it was first established in Quebec, that corporation had some strategic information whereby it knew that it would have to pay so much for transportation.

Today, it sees the rules being changed. We are telling these people very clearly and ruthlessly that, from now on, the rules will no longer be the same, that we have decided to increase the fees. These people know the St. Lawrence and the industry, they know what the impact of the government's decisions will be, and they also know what the operating costs are for these types of services. They agree to do their share. I would compare that to my house and

*Government Orders*

say I agree to pay the heating but if the tenant keeps the thermostat at 30 or 35 degrees Celsius, I am paying a lot for nothing.

• (2035)

Should it not be possible to start by finding a more economical way of managing? This is what those concerned are asking: they want the coast guard to provide its services in a more effective way.

Is the situation so urgent that the government must operate like a steamroller, and listen only to its senior public servants and not to stakeholders? I do not think so. There is time in the summer months ahead. It would be possible to arrive at a much more consensual solution that might please stakeholders.

I would like to draw your attention to an article published in the newspaper *Les Affaires*, on Saturday, February 10, 1996. The article is entitled "The fees proposed by the coast guard primarily affect St. Lawrence users" and contains a significant comment. It says: "The recovery policy of the Canadian coast guard, which comes under the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, is in addition to the ports marketing policy proposed by Transport Canada".

As you know, yesterday the transport minister tabled the Canada Marine Act. This is a very pompous title for an act. One would expect a general policy on the whole issue of marine transportation. Unfortunately, we do not find what we would expect, given the title of the legislation. Rather, this is an act dealing with the relinquishment of ports, which will have a major impact on how the river will be managed over the next 5, 10, 15 or 20 years.

Let us see what will happen. On the one hand, the Department of Transport says: "We will give very large harbours a freer hand; they will be able to operate in a more independent way and as such compete with each other and arrive at interesting results". But, on the other hand, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will increase fees to be charged at harbours along the St. Lawrence. But that is kept under wraps. As a result, the harbours in the maritimes will become much more competitive.

So, what is given with one hand is taken away with the other by changing the rules and charging unfair fees to harbour authorities in Quebec.

So what we are facing 5, 10 or 15 years down the road is a double challenge. I was talking about large harbours that will have complete autonomy, but what about regional harbours? For example, the harbour in Cacouna, which, according to the Department of Transport, is a profitable harbour. With the level of traffic in and out of the port we have right now, the port is efficient and viable. The local people were told: "You should take this in charge". A corporation made up of very dynamic people, called the Corpora-

tion de développement du port de Cacouna and chaired by the chief executive officer of F.F. Soucy, a paper mill in Rivière-du-Loup, undertook to examine this opportunity and said: "It would be an interesting proposition, but first, we should check the condition the infrastructure is in and see what we can do with it".

And all of a sudden this issue of fees comes up. An organization not as well informed as this one could have been taken for quite a ride, but the chief executive officer of the paper mill immediately realized the consequences this could have on this undertaking. He has been experimenting for a few years, and still does today, with ways to ferry wood from there.

Raising the fees will increase the ship rental costs and, ultimately, this kind of wood transportation will be made less viable.

Thus, because of those fees, an infrastructure that could be rather interesting for the region will be lost. It comes as quite a surprise that the government does not have a more comprehensive approach to this sector. One of the major causes of that may be that the bill was apparently prepared on the sly, that a firm position was taken without even consulting the stakeholders. Could it be because a new minister was appointed in the meantime? But is the minister just acting like the spokesperson of senior civil servants instead of setting the agenda? I do not know if this explains this situation, but the results are there.

• (2040)

The proposed fees for coast guard services will mainly penalize the users of the St. Lawrence River, who see this as a concession to the Halifax lobby. This is not new in Canada. There are many examples of this in the past.

When Canada was founded, Gaspé could have become our official port of entry. Its natural harbour is possibly the most beautiful in Canada and boats could have gotten there without any problem. No dredging or anything else would have been necessary.

If Gaspé had been chosen, the transcontinental railway could have started there and today the economic situation of the Gaspé peninsula would be quite different. The John A. Macdonald government deliberately chose to develop Canada from east to west, a decision which was very harmful to the province of Quebec.

Today, we see the same thing happening with these new fees. The government has decided to haul the carpet out from under the feet of Quebec users. You could say: Here goes another one of those blasted separatists, who is going to tell us that Quebec is hurting within Canada and that there is no other solution. He always says the same thing.

*Government Orders*

The problem the Liberal government is facing today is that the people who are demanding changes, who want a moratorium, who want the Coast Guard to clean up its act are not known for being sovereignists.

In this regard, let me quote Raymond Giroux, who says in his editorial comment: "Until now, the major industrial players—namely Iron Ore, Alumax and Daishowa—were scared stiff of being accused of acting in connivance with sovereignist politicians." The senior executives of Canada Steamship Lines, property that the minister Paul Martin holds in trust and which is part of the coalition, the SODES, the St. Lawrence Economic Development Council, are also mentioned.

These people who are mentioned, who are not identified as sovereignists and who were not particularly courting the yes side last fall, all agree that the federal government's proposal is not fair and that it will prevent Quebec from sustaining adequately competition. They all ask the government of Canada to go back and do its homework all over again, to look again at the way the consultations were held, to give consideration to the advice given by the industrial players and then—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Dear colleague, I believe the consent of the House was for a few minutes only and that we are now exceeding them.

**Mr. Crête:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since I had the consent of the House to extend my time, and since no specific time limit was imposed, I ask if I may conclude.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I will give one minute to the member to do so.

**An hon. member:** Is it one American minute, Mr. Speaker,?

**Mr. Crête:** To conclude, Mr. Speaker, we are speaking about motion No. 70. This motion states that the coast guard be required to provide services more efficiently. We support this motion because we believe there is some cleaning up to do in the coast guard.

Second, we are asking to allow the people in the marine industry to have their say in the services for which they will have to pay. I believe this would be a good solution in order to offer a better service at a lower cost. Let us respect the voice of the marine industry people who really know about the situation.

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I made a speech during the debate on Bill C-27, and you were in the chair. I had the opportunity to thank the Minister of Justice for presenting a bill aimed at the protection of women and children. While the bill does not go far enough, it is nonetheless a step in the right direction.

• (2045)

Unfortunately, today, I will not congratulate the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for what he intends to do with the bill we are studying.

On the trade scene, it seems that the present government set a course that it is following without any deviation and whose objective is to penalize Quebec, to weaken it economically.

Just think about the research and development policy which the Tokamak project illustrates very well, think about the GST, the helicopter contract, the fisheries, the agriculture, the raw milk cheese. Each and every time, Quebec is penalized. It is as though the government had deliberately made the decision to impoverish Quebec and to put it on its knees.

Every time the government makes a decision that goes against Quebec's interests, the Bloc denounces it. That is what we have done in the last few months with the maritime services fee structure. I take the opportunity to congratulate my colleague from Gaspé for the energy and the expertise he is showing in this debate.

Why is the Bloc Québécois opposed to Bill C-26? After hearing several of my colleagues I think that you probably begin to understand, but I will explain it again for those who may not have understood as well as you and for those who are watching us on television. Why should Bill C-26 be rejected?

These reasons are stated in the dissenting opinion released by the official opposition as an appendix to the report of the fisheries and oceans committee, a committee that heard witnesses, 75 per cent of whom agreed with the Bloc's dissenting opinion.

I will review the most important elements. First of all, the vast majority of witnesses who appeared before the committee asked for a one-year moratorium to allow the government to conduct comprehensive and independent economic impact studies in co-operation with the industry.

Even though this recommendation was perfectly reasonable, the government chose to ignore it completely. That is why I and my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois are taking an active part in this debate today. Why will the minister not budge? It seems that it is because of budgetary requirements imposed by the Minister of Finance that must be respected, regardless of the resulting inequities.

We can only condemn this reaction by the minister. He had a golden opportunity to work with the people directly affected by the new policy, who were glad to contribute to the cost of the services they receive, but who were simply asking the minister to take a serious look at the impacts the new policy would have on the industry. Forget it. Once again, we were not listened to. I hope they pay the price later on.

*Government Orders*

The second reason is that by establishing three different areas, the Laurentian area, including the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, the West and the East, with rules having different impacts for each area, the government is penalizing, that is right, you guessed it, the St. Lawrence.

The third reason is that, as part of the second round of budgetary measures announced, the government had to rationalize the cost of the Coast Guard. But, according to the witnesses heard, the government has simply not done its homework. We therefore find ourselves in the situation where, instead of rationalizing its staff, the government is imposing tariffs on the industry and thus jeopardizing not only the industry but the jobs that depend on it. Is this good management? It makes no sense at all.

The question is would the government have reacted so hastily in another situation where the economic interests of a region other than Quebec were at stake? I think not.

One final reason the Bloc Québécois is rejecting Bill C-26 is that the government has not given users a chance to give input on the relevance and effectiveness of services for which they will have to pay, and, subsequent to that, to comment on the method used to charge for these services. In short, the government has behaved like a dictator, with complete disregard for the economic interests of the industry and of the people affected by its decisions.

• (2050)

This is unacceptable. As the member for Québec, I would like to make the House aware of the importance of the marine industry for the economic life of my riding, and of the negative impact the implementation of Bill C-29 will have on it. First, some statistics: the Quebec City harbour, in my riding, accounts for 6,450 full time jobs, 123 businesses dependant on the marine industry, and \$352 million in economic spinoffs. This is the reason why I am getting involved in this matter.

Quebec City harbour, in my riding, will be penalized by the new fees levied by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Several leading figures in the marine sector mentioned this to me and asked me to rise today in the House and defend the economic interests of my riding.

This bill jeopardizes hundreds of jobs. As a result of this bill, the cost of sailing through the St. Lawrence will rise significantly.

Mr. Ross Gaudreault, the CEO of Quebec City harbour, believes that the fees could result in a cost increase of 80 cents a tonne for shippers. He fears that this increase will drive exporters to chose alternate harbours either on the eastern or western United States. This is the reason why we are worried.

Mr. Gaudreault is not the only one to fear such a possibility. The Quebec Minister of Transport, the mayors of Quebec City and

Charlesbourg, the St. Lawrence Maritime Chamber, the Ship Operators' Association, the Forest Industry Association and business leaders have all reacted negatively to the minister's plan. These are intelligent people who are able to analyze the kind of project that is proposed and to say it will be a disaster for the whole economic and marine life in the St. Lawrence River.

This bill is unfair for Québec and it is unfair for industry. It is unfair for the people of my county and for the people of other ports along the St. Lawrence River. It is unfair because it fails to take into account the economic reality of the region. It is a bill based on the division of Canada because of the inequality within the fee system. This measure puts the competitiveness of St. Lawrence River harbours at risk.

I hope the government will finally listen to the stakeholders, impose a moratorium before it decides on the new fee system and see what this measure puts at risk. Why push the adoption of bill when there will no ice this summer. As my colleague said, why not wait until fall to have time to shed some light on this bill?

I do not congratulate the minister of Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. It is too bad. I would have liked to congratulate him this evening. I like to be generous when I speak in the House and I like to say it when people do something good. But I think their ears are blocked and they cannot hear the Bloc members' propositions.

**Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Quebec, who made an excellent speech, took away from me many regional arguments regarding the coast guard.

However, since this is an extremely important problem not only for the Quebec City harbour, but also for the South Shore of Quebec City, I only have to mention what this will imply in terms of additional fees to Ultramar, which is a Quebec refinery and which needs the coast guard services not only for de-icing, but also for dredging activities. Ultramar accounts for 25 per cent of transportation services for the port activities in general in the Quebec region.

Before talking about the specific issues and the impact, I asked myself one first question about Bill C-26, which formalizes the transfer of the coast guard and Transport Canada to Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

• (2055)

I was naive enough to ask myself whether or not this kind of transfer was done in order to improve things. There is a need to assess certain criteria to determine the effectiveness of the structure responsible for providing the new service. Did this structure accomplish wonderful things so that it can be entrusted with greater responsibilities?



*Government Orders*

As far as Fisheries and Oceans is concerned, let us take the example of the cod. What happened to the cod stocks? We could even talk about a real disaster. The cod suddenly disappeared. We could also talk about the reduced quotas for several other species. A quarrel is under way in Acadia regarding crabs and lobsters. This government also restricted access to unemployment insurance. Regions like the Gaspé, Acadia and the maritimes essentially live off fishery resources. If the people in those regions are asked if they think Fisheries and Oceans Canada has been an effective department, they all agree that the opposite is true.

I am a sovereignist; I am an opposition critic who likes to criticize. In the incident involving a hovercraft under repair that occurred in Châteauguay earlier this year, I must say that the coast guard was rather effective. They now want to transfer this service to the minister of Fisheries and Oceans so he can come barging in to put some order into this. To do so, the minister and his officials had the brilliant idea of dividing the country into three regions: the Atlantic, the Central-Laurentian region, and the West.

Distribution must be fair. How can we in Quebec have confidence in this? The *Sir Wilfrid Laurier*, an icebreaker, also played a major role in the icebreaking operations on the river. About three weeks ago, the *Sir Wilfrid Laurier* sailed off for a long trip all the way to the west coast. Services are being phased out and hundreds of coast guard related jobs are being cut. Just recently, I heard of one hundred more of these jobs being cut in Quebec City.

That is incredible. They say streamlining is required because the deficit is high, and so is the debt. We agree that streamlining is necessary in some cases, but that is all the minister is doing. Where tariffs did not exist, he imposes tariffs. And this is just the beginning, \$20 million just for this year and just for navigation aids. That is \$20 million just for buoys. Then, at the next stage, involving icebreakers, similar cuts will be made. This is a five year plan. There one year where we are told that it will progressively add up to approximately \$100 million.

Quebec alone will bear 50 per cent of the cuts. I think about the icebreakers and I laugh. The service is still pretty good, for the time being, but there is nevertheless some nonsense that has to be brought to light. For example, half the icebreakers operate between Halifax and Gaspé. They are based in Halifax and in the other harbour. But it is a well known fact that there is no ice in those parts. How bizarre. There are some abominable things happening.

And they want to cut the number of icebreakers. Some winters, the hon. member for Richelieu will recall as I do—he will speak later and I would not want to steal all his material—having to wait four or five days for an icebreaker to come to the rescue and open up the seaway. The seaway is not for the exclusive use of Quebecers. We all know what it is used for and has been used for until now, and that is for freight shipping to the Great Lakes. It is also serving Ontario.

• (2100)

This is a shortsighted government policy which will affect Ontario, but mostly Quebec. Look at the figures. We had a little meeting, organized by our critic, with a senior public servant who gave us a nice chart. It shows that the objective of \$20 million for the first phase is divided as follows: \$5.8 million for the Atlantic; \$4.5 million for the West; and, for the central region—that is us—, \$9.7 million only for the first phase of the policy on navigation aids services.

This is the same proportion that will be allocated to us for the icebreakers, again in the first phase. We say: “Enough is enough”. Some projects are being taken away from Quebec, and the backbone of our economic development, the St. Lawrence, is being targeted, first by reducing services and, second, by imposing fees.

What is the real motive? Is it because the seaway is in bad shape, because it would cost a lot to modernize it, because the government thinks it might be better to abandon it and let marine traffic go to the eastern United States? If such is the vision of those who currently manage the country and Fisheries and Oceans Canada, we must condemn it and this is what we do. This is unbelievable.

We cannot accept a reduction of services and, at the same time, a fee increase. If this were a private business, such an approach would lead directly to bankruptcy. Those who provide advice to the minister are going to put him in a terrible situation. Why should Quebec should remain silent and be accommodating?

The hon. member for Richelieu was absolutely right when he said it was a shame to see so few members in the House during a debate as important as this one. There is only one member from the other side. We are not supposed to say things like that. We cannot insist too much. We cannot talk about those who are absent, but there is only one member from the other side. I congratulate him for being here and for understanding the importance of this issue for his constituents.

Through our active participation in this debate, we, Bloc members, want to stress the importance of a bill which will have a destabilizing effect on our economy. We have the right to defend our economy and we will do so.

**An hon. member:** Where are the Quebec Liberal members?

**Mr. Louis Plamondon (Richelieu, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on an issue so important for Quebec and the Laurentides-Québec area.

I am honoured to speak in the House after the prestigious performances of the hon. members for Trois-Rivières, for Lévis, for Québec, for Rimouski, and for Châteauguay, whom I wished to quote earlier because I intended to use the document he introduced

*Government Orders*

in the House, concerning this bill. I think he read a few paragraphs and I will insist on using the same document later on to support his argument which was so pertinent and which he presented in such an eloquent and elegant way.

As regards this bill and above all the group of motions we are studying, Group No. 11, the Liberal Party is proposing amendments which will change neither the content nor the intent of the law. The member opposite who has just arrived, the hon. member from New Brunswick, is said to take an interest in this bill only because he will vote along the party line.

I am disappointed and surprised—although I am not surprised to see Bloc members do their work, because they always do it well, with passion and accuracy—to realize that, in such an important debate, the Liberal Party did not manage to recruit even one member to present its position. They are ashamed of its position and it shows.

• (2105)

I understand why they look so sheepish over there. This bill is clearly indefensible. They are not taking part in the debate; their minister failed to get a single Liberal member to speak tonight in defense of their position, particularly on the motions in Group No. 11. This is rather surprising.

Liberal members are very disappointed. Especially those from Quebec, those who are directly concerned by the problem of harbours, the problem we have shown to be serious, for example with regard to navigational aids.

Now, these members know that this legislation lacks openness, like their party, like their leader. Also, every time we remind them of their promises, every time we point out they are not taking part in a debate as important as this one, they think of their red book, that they held up all the time on the campaign trail and that they are now trying to hide under their feet, because none of their promises has been kept.

Be it on the GST, on the transfer of copyright management from the Department of Industry to the heritage department, on their commitment to job creation programs, on the day care program, everything has been forgotten: the election is over. This is what Liberals always do, so this should come as a surprise to nobody.

However, we see in that party some sincere members who are frank enough to tell us outside the House how ashamed and disappointed this policy we are discussing today makes them.

Just imagine. It is impossible to foresee the economic impact of this bill on users. No assessment of the impact has been made. The bill has nevertheless been introduced in the House, and they said: We will just wait and see what happens. But everything the Liberals propose, whether constitutional or economic, always go wrong.

What is to be blamed for the present deficit if not the Liberal policies of the past, more particularly from 1981 to 1984? Who has drawn us into this constant constitutional quagmire? The Liberal Party. And now, the Liberals are transferring the coast guard to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans without knowing for sure whether there will be an internal reform or whether the services of the coast guard are those users need, and without consultation of the users on the services they would like to have. It is quite surprising.

They made a presentation during the committee hearings the Bloc Québécois called for, and witnesses said in so many words that the study made by IBI was a sham, a totally irrelevant exercise, as if they had studied the mating rites of the dodo bird instead of the problem of heavy cargo ships. Nothing in this bill is relevant to the services users really need.

These consultations were decried by all the participants. The government should have asked itself: “Why ask a private firm to consult the people, when we could do it ourselves, through a parliamentary committee that would be able, in a matter of just a few days, to meet with all the stakeholders, who could certainly make suggestions in the best interests of the people and the government, because of the savings they would entail, and in the interests of the users who, without having to face a fees increase, would be in a better position to compete against the port of Halifax and also the ports in the United States, and in particular, the port of Philadelphia, known for its very aggressive approach to recruiting new clients?”

We have a government that does not listen to anyone—as we can see on the constitutional issue in Quebec—in all the bills it has introduced, but this bill beats all.

We were told: “You can rely on us”. In fact, they introduced a bill in which they said: “We transfer the Coast Guard to Fisheries and Oceans Canada. But wait until you see this, we will try to charge some new fees. Will it be 10 cents or a dollar? We do not know exactly, we will try something and take it from there”. But if the whole economy collapses and we muddle the issue, what will happen? Will we be able to react? And what about the small businesses in my area, close to the port of Sorel, Fagen, for example, and the bigger companies, in the Bécancour industrial park, the largest industrial park in Canada, that all need adequate and modern services?

• (2110)

The Coast Guard really needs to evaluate its own services, especially when it comes to administrative costs. I am not talking here of boat crews but of administrative costs. This should be reviewed before any transfer is made, if it is ever made. There must be valid reasons to do this, like helping the users, who will in

turn better serve the people and save money while maintaining the competitiveness of the St. Lawrence ports.

These were the questions raised a little while ago by the hon. member for Trois-Rivières and the hon. member for Châteauguay, who quoted a letter released by the Quebec minister representing the views of not only the Quebec government but also the chairperson of the executive committee of the *Conseil régional de développement de l'île de Montréal* and Mr. Patrice Simard, who is the chairman of the Chamber of Commerce of Metropolitan Montreal. They all agree on the great threat this can be for the economy of Montreal. This is what these people who represent the economic interests of Greater Montreal are saying to the government and the government turns a deaf ear. There should be a limit to that kind of insults.

Why does the government not listen and not take the time to read the amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois? Why does it not postpone passage of this bill until the fall in order to hold quick consultations on these fees that will apparently have devastating effects? Actually, we will receive the first billing for signalling at the beginning of July. As for icebreaking and dredging, the fees could be astronomical, but the users will not have their say in selecting the services they wish.

The users are certainly willing to assume their share with regard to icebreaking, dredging and the setting up of the signals, but they want to do it at the lowest possible cost. And there is no guarantee for that. They know strictly nothing about the supplementary fees that will be charged. They have to take the risk without knowing the economic consequences. Consultation is lacking. Clearly, there is a self-examination to make regarding the methods used by the Coast Guard to manage the services and revise them in order to make them more efficient, modern and well suited to the present needs of the users.

Mr. Speaker, do I have the unanimous consent of the House to exceed the ten minutes at my disposal?

**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Plamondon:** This will be an opportunity for me to give a lesson to the members opposite. I understand, however, why they are hiding. I understand why they are ashamed of their government. I understand why they are disappointed in their government. I understand why they are hiding their red book.

But where are those top Liberal candidates who went everywhere and said their red book had a solution for all of Canada's and Quebec's problems? Where are all those top members? They are hiding and none of them dares to make a speech tonight to defend the interests of his own government. Even the Liberal members from Quebec are hiding. They know that the position taken by the government on this bill is indefensible. They know it is another

### *Government Orders*

dirty trick played on Quebec by the Liberal Party, which is a past master in this technique.

• (2115)

The complicity of the Liberal members from Quebec, who are refusing to take part in this debate, is incredible. They should, even if they are ashamed of their government, even if they are against this bill, even if they know that this bill will harm Quebec's economic interests, rise and say with us, putting aside all partisanship: "Together, the members from Quebec, we will defend Quebec's true interests, we will express our opposition to this bill, we will propose amendments, we will delay the bill's passage until next fall, we will allow the users to put forward solutions that would serve the interests of the people, that would serve the interests of the users, and that would ensure that the necessary economic restraints are imposed to enhance government management here".

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

**Mr. Plamondon:** I see the New Brunswick member on the other side. Yes, he must regret having given up his seat for the election of the present Prime Minister. He made the big mistake of giving up his seat thinking that his leader could put Canada back on the road to sound management, dynamic economic growth and good relations with Quebec. He believed, and today he is ashamed. He does not want to speak tonight either. He gave up his seat for someone who does not keep his promises, reneges on his commitments and ignores the red book.

And what is he waiting for today? We would forgive him if only he would say: "The interests of the nation come before the interests of a political party".

**Mr. Robichaud:** Absolutely. The interests of the country.

**Mr. Plamondon:** But no, he seems to be willing to serve his party before his country. People from New Brunswick are listening to you tonight, or rather, they are listening to your silence. Can we talk about the sound of silence? From now on, we will talk about the sound of silence among the Liberal members.

The Acadians thought that they had someone to defend their interests, but no. They elected a Liberal partisan who is willing to knuckle under and vote the way the whip says to when the bell rings, no matter if it serves the interests of the people or hinders the economic development of a whole area of Canada and Quebec. He is ready to renege on his promises, his commitments and his red book for the sole purpose of serving his party.

**Mr. Robichaud:** How many times did you vote against your party, Louis?

**Mr. Plamondon:** I notice that the member from New Brunswick recovered his ability to speak.

**Mr. Robichaud:** I find I am always able to speak out when I hear ridiculous statement.

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Plamondon:** So I guess he will join us in exposing this unacceptable bill, especially considering that Motion No. 11 is proposed by the Liberals. And yet they do not even defend it because that party is obviously led by someone who imposes his wishes, someone who says: "Now we like the GST. We did not like it during the election campaign, but we do now". And everybody says: "We like the GST".

For example, he said during the campaign that NAFTA was bad and that we had to fight against it, but now that he is in power, he is saying: "Let us welcome the president of Mexico and hear him praise us for the hard work we did which made NAFTA a success". That is what the Liberal leader and his government are all about. That is why the credibility of politicians is getting lower and lower in the polls. It is because of that kind of double talk from people like that. That double talk, the one heard during the election campaign and the one heard after the election campaign, is typical of the Liberal Party.

It is nothing new. Remember the campaign against Stanfield in the 1970s. Stanfield said: "We will have wage and price control because it is necessary in order to put the brakes on inflation". Trudeau said: "Never". Six months after the elections, the Liberals, who had been elected, introduced the same wage and price control policy that had been proposed by Stanfield.

In the 1979 referendum campaign, the Liberals said: "We are putting our seats on the line so elect us and we will give Quebec what it has been asking for for 30 years". Then, after the elections, they started to talk about repatriating the Constitution without Quebec's consent. It is the usual double talk. Think about the gasoline tax. The Clark government, which had been in office for nine months, was defeated because it wanted to increase the gasoline tax by 18 cents, if I am not mistaken.

• (2120)

And yet, six months after the Liberals were back in power, they increased it by 65 cents. They have always sung two different tunes. One during the election campaign, with a red book this time, the other times it was a pamphlet. They had answers for everything, but once in power they crumble. They crumble and they let senior officials and deputy ministers steer the boat. It is like a bicycle with a side basket. The Prime Minister takes his place in the basket and the deputy ministers steer first to the left and then to the right, and he sits back laughing and thinks he is setting the course. That is the Liberal government for you.

It is the power trip, the limousine, and as far as the people are concerned, they will keep their promise for the next election and win office again if they can. As a Liberal member in my region said: "We are never so poor that we cannot make promises". That is the Liberal Party philosophy.

We can see tonight with this bill that they have not changed. They have been like this for years. During all the years they held power, we saw these changes of tune. Today, with an election in the offing, people are wondering if they will trust them again. Of course, their popularity is dropping in the polls, of course, Liberal members are no longer able to defend the position of their party. They are ashamed, they have quit talking.

In a bill as important as this, they are almost muzzled. But there is no need. They hide so as not to have to defend such a position, because it is unacceptable from an economic point of view, unacceptable from the point of view of regional equity in Canada, because we are speaking about large regions.

Once again, they attack the region that includes Quebec. It is easy, because everything always goes well for the Liberal Party. What did they say during the election campaign? They said that it would take the fall of a big Conservative project. They looked around for a big project and came up with the helicopters in Quebec and figured that would be a good target to secure the votes of the rest of Canada.

Once elected, jobs in Quebec were next. When it was a question of reducing military spending, they wondered what they could go after in Quebec. It is a popular thing to sock it to Quebec, and that was what happened with the military college in Saint-Jean. The rest of Canada was delighted and the Liberal Party was able to keep some popularity.

It is always an easy thing for the federal government to sock it to Quebec. We are used to that. No wonder there is a sovereigntist movement here in Ottawa. It is because we have had enough of being one among so many others, a province like any other that is always the scapegoat of the federal government.

The member for Trois-Rivières was right in saying that we are once more the victims. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières used the word victims rightly. We are the victims of this reform, which could have otherwise been a major restructuring project inspired by some serious thinking on the part of all parties in this House. Have a look at the amendments proposed by the Reform Party. They are quite acceptable and quite debatable and would improve the bill. The Liberal Party will reject them all. It will reject the amendments from the Bloc, just like the users' suggestions.

Why? I call on this party, which claims to embody Canada, which even claims to embody Canada's two nations. Will it agree to listen to users and the other political parties, which took the time to consult the public. Will it return to committee and forget the IBI study, which is a sham criticized by all who have read it and have anything to do with the area.

So it will dismiss this study and simply rearrange the bill. We say there is a need to give thought to signage, the cost of it is very

high. The cost of ice breaking is very high, the cost of dredging is very high. What we are saying is what the users are saying and Canada's economics interests are necessarily repeating the same thing.

• (2125)

We say that a way must be found to distribute costs so that the taxpayers will pay less but we will maintain our competitive edge against other areas like the United States and Halifax. To do so, before we transfer the Coast Guard to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, we must consider its role and review all of its operations not for the purpose of making it disappear but for the purpose of transforming it into a service comparable to a private sector business which would do ice-breaking and dredging or provide navigational aids.

We know however that people working for the coast guard are extremely competent. We only have to look at the safety system we have in Quebec and Canada. I am saying that we want to reorganize the coast guard, but we want to keep these people and pay them a decent salary; for years now, they have made a lot of sacrifices in terms of salary freeze, cuts and job losses. We want to keep these competent people who are vital to sound management.

At the same time, we want to consider with them the kind of reorganization which would better serve users and the economic interests of the people, while meeting the goals of the government, the official opposition and the Reform Party, namely reducing costs. But it has to be a through a well structured reorganization, and not by way of a bill rammed down our throat at the end of the session.

In a couple of years, we will see the economic consequences. But will all our ports, all our transportation industry, all our small flourishing industries along the St. Lawrence River have been killed off for the sake of a test? As the member for Trois-Rivières said, if we want a fairer tax from coast to coast, let us base the system on the tonnage of vessels rather than transshipment or unloading, as is done in Halifax or in Montreal.

Let us think also about what the member for Châteaugay said when he referred to extremely important demands and quoted the letter of the stakeholders, of Simon Lacroix, which summarized the situation by speaking about what it meant for Quebec and Montreal. I am happy that the member from New Brunswick is present to hear this necessary object lesson.

For your information, the port of Montreal processes 20 million tonnes of cargo annually and 726,000 containers pass through it every year. This capacity generates 14,000 direct or indirect jobs, as well as revenues of \$1.2 billion a year. And the hon. member wants to kill off these economic interests.

### *Adjournment Debate*

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Mr. Plamondon:** No one opposite wants to defend this bill. I understand why. It is the shame of their party. They are ashamed of their party, of this marine policy, of their program. They are disappointed with their Prime Minister. They are disappointed with their minister, who does not understand anything about the economic reality in Quebec and in Canada as a whole.

So, we want a better user fee policy based on the ships' capacity, without taking into account ships that do transshipping or unloading. In brief, we would want to take the time to further reflect on this bill, instead of passing it quickly.

• (2130)

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member for Richelieu.

**Mr. Plamondon:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think my time is up. May I continue tomorrow? I had the unanimous consent.

**The Deputy Speaker:** We will see tomorrow.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

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

### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Vic Althouse (Mackenzie, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt a very interesting speech. I hope the member gets to continue it tomorrow. However, we are now officially adjourned and I wish to raise my point of business in the post-adjournment debate.

I posed a question to the minister of public works concerning the Peace Tower project. She answered a very small part of the broad range of questions I raised. She pointed out that the Ann Raney and Ray Wolf discrimination case had been withdrawn and concentrated her answer on that.

There are a great many things the House should be aware of with regard to the Peace Tower project. As a review, the previous minister of public works said he could not enforce any of the anti-discrimination clauses in the contract for the Peace Tower project because gender discrimination had not been proven. He essentially used the argument that it was before the courts.

That has now been proven and admitted to by the offending parties. The present minister is seeming to say that if there is nothing outstanding with regard to gender discrimination, there is nothing she can say.

*Adjournment Debate*

Members are aware that there are still two outstanding discrimination claims before the Ontario Human Rights Commission, the case of Marcel and Denis Lamoureux.

Other aspects of this contract become more and more disturbing as we go through it. There seems to be what I can only interpret as mismanagement on the part of Public Works and Government Services Canada and the officials handling the contracts.

The contract is available through the right to know legislation. There is a 30-day arbitration clause built into the contract. This issue began in August 1995 and public works officials did not step in to correct the problem of \$165,000 worth of work already done on the project for which Pro-Tech, Ray Wolf's company where Ann Raney worked, has never been paid. The salaries of 25 workers are still outstanding as a result of that. Also, a number of tools were left on site which they have been unable to recover.

Public works did a very poor job of investigating this situation. It did a cursory investigation of people on the site during working hours under the nose of the supervisor who appeared to have been most of the problem. How can honest answers be obtained from workers when their jobs depend on what they say about their supervisor, the person being investigated, when their supervisor is sitting there listening? They will not speak honestly or directly. Public works officials never arranged to meet with them off site or off the job. It did not do a proper investigation. Raney and Wolf were never interviewed by public works officials, yet public works has told the minister that it did an investigation.

Since those investigations and from listening to the CBC radio program "The House", there seems to be clear evidence that the subcontractor required that Ray Wolf as the owner of Pro-Tech pay what amounts to kickbacks in order to maintain himself on the site. Reports were that he paid almost \$13,000 in four or five weeks in June and early July.

• (2135)

He had been told by the supervisor that if these payments stopped there would be no work for him and his crew. It is unclear whether the reason for the pressure on Ann Raney was to put further pressure on Ray Wolf and his crew to continue the payments or whether it was simply a straight matter of sexual harassment.

However, the result has been that these workers have not been paid. Mr. Wolf and his company have been put under severe financial stress. He has lost a lot of tools, his truck, his car and perhaps his reputation with this situation. It appears on the surface at least that Mr. Wolf has acted in a relatively straightforward and honest way in this matter.

It really makes me, as a citizen of Canada, upset to think that our officials at public works would permit this kind of operation to go

on right under their noses, or above our heads more specifically, in the House of Commons on the Peace Tower project and not do anything to correct the injustice.

I had hoped the minister would address these broader issues to the rather broad question that I had put. All the minister did was say the parties had signed off over the sexual harassment case. I repeat, there continues to be a human rights case before the courts. That is true. However, all these other issues, which I think public works Canada has within its grasp to resolve and look after our interest as taxpayers, should be investigated. I am not sure public works Canada officials are the ones who should be the investigators any more.

**Mr. John Harvard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Mackenzie for his presentation.

Let me repeat for the hon. member this is a complicated case which deals with two very different issues. On one hand, there were allegations of discrimination involving two subcontractors, Colonial Building and Pro-Tech Restoration. Fuller Construction is the main contractor on this project.

When the Department of Public Works and Government Services learned of the allegations of discrimination on the job site, it immediately advised the general contractor, Fuller, that the anti-discrimination clause would have to be respected.

In this case the contractor accepted his responsibilities for the conduct of his subcontractor, Colonial. A settlement was negotiated between Colonial and Mr. Wolf and Ms. Raney. This agreement was signed by all parties involved and therefore fully resolves the issue of discrimination.

Even though this dispute was resolved through an agreement signed by all parties, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services wants to do more. She wants to do whatever is within her power to ensure this kind of situation can be dealt with more quickly and more efficiently in the future.

For this reason the minister has instructed her officials to review the terms of the department's contracts to ensure corrective action can be taken against contractors who have violated laws protecting individuals from discrimination and to ensure the department can quickly deal with any allegations of discrimination which may arise.

The department is also revising the terms of its contracts to ensure the non-discrimination clause also applies to subcontractors. This is in addition to asking Labour Canada to strengthen the anti-discrimination clause so this type of situation can be handled better in the future.

*Adjournment Debate*

An interdepartmental team has been put in place to explore practices and procedures to enforce the government's commitment to fairness in the workplace. The government strongly believes no one should have to suffer discrimination and we are committed to doing whatever we can to eliminate it.

## LACROSSE

**Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak with respect to an issue that was raised several months ago in the House dealing with priorities within the Department of Canadian Heritage and specifically in Sports Canada.

• (2140)

At the time I raised the question on March 25, I wanted to deal with the whole issue of how the department treated sports that were inherently and specifically Canadian. In particular I raised the question of lacrosse.

The Department of Canadian Heritage through Sports Canada is there to encourage sports in this country at a national level. In other words, we would have and provide some level of funding to those organizations which provide a national tie to other local and provincial organizations.

In Canada there are more than 200,000 young people participating in the sport of lacrosse, yet under the funding framework devised by Sports Canada the Canadian Lacrosse Association, the national co-ordinating agency for lacrosse in Canada, was cut totally from any funding whatsoever.

It seemed that was an anomaly, a bleep in the funding framework, created by people at Sports Canada. In bobsledding, in which there are 400 people including athletes and support staff, its national association received \$315,500 in 1995-96. Synchronized swimming, in which there are fewer than 10,000 people, received \$535,000 for its national association. Yet those youth, some 200,000, who participate in lacrosse in Canada are receiving nothing.

As a result of that I raised the question to the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who replied on March 25 that she would instruct her officials to find a way to provide funding to the Canadian Lacrosse Association because without that national association the sport will eventually die. There will be no national perspective, no national tournaments.

To this date there has been no funding provided, although the department has indicated it wants to explore it with the Canadian Lacrosse Association. I suggest there are certain anomalies within the department that must be corrected.

I will go one step further to what is referred to as carded A athletes. We certainly want to encourage our top level athletes in this country, as most countries do. We have reached a point where we are providing funding to athletes who are very wealthy.

For example, those athletes who sign endorsements for hundreds of thousands of dollars, in some cases more, continue to receive \$800 a month from the Government of Canada. The department seems to have reversed its priorities, whereas it has cut lacrosse off at the knees and provided \$315,000 to bobsledding and \$535,000 to synchronized swimming. It has said to these 200,000 children involved in lacrosse sorry, their national association does not count because under the circumstances it is not a recognized Olympic sport.

At the same time we are feeding out \$800 a month, about \$200 more than a single welfare recipient receives in the province of Ontario. Yet at the same time they are receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars in endorsements from commercial interests.

I am asking the department therefore to get its priorities in order, to say we believe there are some sports that are inherently Canadian. Let us forget about the International Olympic Association. Let us start looking at Canada. Let us start looking within the Department of Canadian Heritage. Let us start encouraging those sports that are inherently Canadian and provide funding to encourage them rather than to say we will write a blank cheque to the International Olympic Association and provide funding to those sports which are Olympic in nature but which in most respects are inherently not Canadian. I once again urge the department to move on that.

**Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton for his interest in this issue.

The Minister of Canadian Heritage has acknowledged earlier the importance of lacrosse as a sport in Canada and has pledged to restore some of its funding. The minister is pleased to announce the cultural development and heritage program within the Department of Canadian Heritage is providing a contribution of \$150,000 to the Canadian Lacrosse Foundation.

Lacrosse, which Parliament has declared as Canada's official national summer sport, has played an important role in the history and culture of our country and in shaping Canadian identity.

The support being provided by the cultural development and heritage program combined with other private sector sources of funds will allow the Canadian Lacrosse Foundation through the Lacrosse Heritage Institute and the Canadian Lacrosse Association to continue this long Canadian tradition.

*Adjournment Debate*

In addition, consideration is being given to the introduction of a sport development initiative which could assist sport organizations with a large domestic participation base. The minister fully expects that Lacrosse will be one of the sports that would be eligible for funding from such an initiative once it has met the criteria of the new program.

The minister has directed the officials of the department to work with the Canadian Lacrosse Association in order to pursue this

avenue in greater detail. I thank the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m.

(The House adjourned at 9.46 p.m.)

---



**ADDRESS PRINTED AS APPENDIX**

**APPENDIX**

Address

of

His Excellency Ernesto Zedillo

President of the United States of Mexico

to

both Houses of Parliament

in the

House of Commons, Ottawa

on

Tuesday, June 11, 1996

## ADDRESS

of  
 His Excellency Ernesto Zedillo  
 President of the United States of Mexico  
 to  
 both Houses of Parliament  
 in the  
 House of Commons, Ottawa  
 on  
 Tuesday, June 11, 1996

*His Excellency and Madam Ernesto Zedillo were welcomed by the Right Honourable Jean Chrétien, Prime Minister of Canada, the Honourable Gildas L. Molgat, Speaker of the Senate, and the Honourable Gilbert Parent, Speaker of the House of Commons.*

• (1035)

[Translation]

**Hon. Gilbert Parent (Speaker of the House of Commons):** Mr. President, Mr. Prime Minister, dear colleagues, Mexican friends and fellow Canadians.

[English]

I present to you the Right Hon. Prime Minister of Canada, Jean Chrétien.

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister of Canada):** Mr. President, on behalf of all Canadians it is an honour to welcome you to this special joint session of Parliament.

I want to take this opportunity to relate a little known story about the relationship between our two countries. It is reported that in the summer of 1861, several years before Confederation here in Canada, a trade mission left the port of Montreal to look for new markets for our goods. Word had reached the north that Mexico was a promising destination. A small delegation of entrepreneurs arrived off the port of Veracruz later that year.

Their timing was not very good. A few weeks earlier Britain and France, our two founding nations, plus Spain had landed troops in the city. In May 1862 Mexico fought a battle outside the city of Puebla. Of course our Mexican guests will know that Mexico won that battle. In fact, May 5 is still a national holiday. However, they may not know that in the meantime the Canadians had run away and decided to go to Brazil instead. They were not to come back empty handed. They always tried to do business. We are still like that.

Our bilateral relations may have been delayed somewhat in those very early days but we have made up for it since then. In 1905 Canada posted its first trade commissioner to Mexico. A few years ago we celebrated our 50th anniversary of official diplomatic relations. Over those years we have developed extensive political and economic links as well as countless personal connections

between our citizens. Most recently, our commercial relations have been galvanized by the North American Free Trade Agreement.

• (1040)

[Translation]

Trade is an important part of our relationship. Since the first year of NAFTA, we have seen a dramatic increase in bilateral trade between Canada and Mexico, as well as expanded trade and investment in the entire continent. We must continue to build on these accomplishments.

Our trade with each other is boosting economic growth and job creation in both our countries. The scope for expanding our trade and our investment contacts is enormous. The impressive business delegation you have brought with you will be visiting some of the major economic centres of Canada and will meet with our business community. We intend to make our partnership grow.

Of course our friendship extends well beyond trade. Since March 1990 more than 35 bilateral agreements have been signed with Mexico on matters ranging from environmental co-operation and education to mining and energy. Your visit will see more agreements signed, including a technical co-operation agreement between Elections Canada and your federal electoral institute.

[English]

Your visit also comes at a time when Mexico is undergoing a profound transformation. Under your leadership Mexico is preparing itself for the challenges of the 21st century.

As you know, Mr. President, I have been to Mexico myself. My visit in March 1994 coincided with one of the most tragic events in your history. It was a challenging year for your country, and there were some who feared for Mexico at that time.

I did not. I said that very day that I had faith in the ability of your democracy to survive those difficult shocks. Today I am extremely pleased to see that I was right. Two years later your administration is moving ahead quickly with important political and economic reforms. The turnaround you have achieved within the last few months is dramatic. Mexico is set for solid growth this year and has become a market economy to be reckoned with. I congratulate you on these remarkable achievements.

Mr. President, I think you will agree that Canada and Mexico have more in common than many people realize. Like Mexico, Canada is a country proud of its indigenous past and proud of the traditions we inherited from the European colonists who settled this country. We also value the contribution made by more recent immigrants.

Both Mexicans and Canadians are proud to have built unique and independent nations here in North America.

Like Mexico, we share a border with a large and powerful neighbour, the United States. Both our countries have a bilateral relationship with that country which is sometimes frustrating, often complex, but generally very rewarding.

In the course of your visit, Mr. President, you will travel 5,000 kilometres and I hope you will gain a better picture of who we are and the land we live in. Because the friendship between our two countries is important to Canada as we approach the 21st century, your visit is an opportunity for us to look to our common future, to assess how we can work together for our mutual benefit and to lead the way forward.

• (1045)

I am delighted that you have accepted our invitation to speak to the Parliament of Canada today.

Fellow parliamentarians, honoured guests, mes chers amis, please join me in welcoming our neighbour, y nuestro estimado amigo, the President of Mexico, Ernesto Zedillo.

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

[*Editor's Note: President Ernesto Zedillo spoke in Spanish and provided the following translation:*]

[*Translation*]

**His Excellency Ernesto Zedillo (President of the United Mexican States):** Excellency Mr. Jean Chrétien, Prime Minister of Canada; Very distinguished Mrs. Aline Chrétien; Mr. Speaker of the Senate; Mr. Speaker of the House of Commons; Honourable Senators and members of the House of Commons; Distinguished members of the Diplomatic Corps; ladies and gentlemen:

I deeply thank the Prime Minister for his words, those of a visionary statesman who has distinguished himself by serving his country and his people, the Chief of Government of a country respected and admired by all.

It is a great honour to address the representatives of a country founded in the values of peace and liberty, pluralism and respect, personal achievement and harmonious co-existence, democracy and justice.

Canadians are greatly appreciated in Mexico and throughout all the Continent due to their multiple origins which have become the strength of this great country, and because it has been able to prosper thanks to its rich diversity.

Mexico sees Canada as a nation with which we have the vision for a high-potential hemisphere with rising opportunities.

Mexico sees Canada as a North American partner, as a permanent interlocutor and a partner of initiatives; as a friend that lives in and is a part of the American Continent, one who today looks towards the American Continent like never before.

This is why Mexicans are pleased and encouraged by Canada's presence in continental forums such as the Organization of American States.

We are pleased and encouraged by Canada's increasing relations with Latin America and the convergent positions towards the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Most of all, we are pleased and inspired by the new ties of friendship, the intensification of productive exchanges and mutually beneficial co-operation which have been developing between Canadians and Mexicans during the last few years.

We recognize and appreciate the conviction and determination with which the Honourable Members of this Parliament are contributing to increase the dialogue and the interparliamentary relationship with Mexico.

That is why I am very pleased to be accompanied here and throughout this State Visit, by representatives of parliamentary groups of the Honourable Mexican Senate.

• (1050)

Thanks to more intensive work done by the Legislative Powers of both countries, the private sectors, the academic and cultural communities of both our nations, and of both Executive Branches, Mexico and Canada have already become close friends as well as trusted and reliable partners.

These new links have certainly received a decisive momentum from our partnership in the North American Free Trade Agreement.

To this effect, I pay homage to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien for the vision and the determination with which he has steered the Agreement's application here in Canada.

With NAFTA, the initiatives and projects used to sporadically appear in decades, are currently proliferating in just a few months.

With NAFTA, we are proving that a framework of liberty brings us closer, multiplies opportunities and contributes to stimulate progress and mutual benefits.

Thus, Mexico and Canada share the will and the commitment to include Chile in NAFTA. The access of that industrious country and of its vigorous economy in NAFTA will increase the opportunities and the benefits for all of us.

Mexico and Canada also share the will to extend free trade throughout the Continent.

NAFTA constitutes the legal framework for constructive goals. Its essence and objectives are accuracy and consensus; the defence of each legitimate interest and the transparency and acceptance of

solutions to each dispute; the recognition of rules we have jointly created and must jointly apply.

Mexico's conviction fully coincides with Canada's when it comes to applying and demanding respect of International Law principles.

Thus, like Canada, Mexico opposes legislation which entails an extraterritorial application contrary to International Law.

Like Canada, Mexico deems inadmissible any action that, while undertaken against one country, affects other nations; that instead of promoting liberty, it hinders someone else's; that instead of tearing down barriers, it builds them while prejudicing international investment and trade.

During the period in which Mexico suffered a grave foreign threat, President Juarez was inspired by an ancient principle in order to reaffirm that true peace may only be founded on respect of the Law, be it between men and women as well as amongst nations.

Mexicans have been absolutely faithful to the ideals and aspirations of liberalism that unites us as a sovereign and independent nation. This is why we defend and believe in this principle's validity.

• (1055)

Based on the affinity of ideas and principles, and on our ever cordial relations, Mexicans wish to establish with Canada an alliance to achieve change, progress and justice.

Mexico has become a country dedicated to deep change, an intense transformation that will reform past imbalances and undertake future challenges.

These imbalances created a severe financial crisis that we had to deal with ever since the first days of my government.

The Mexican people decided to quickly confront it in unison and determination by means of a strategy that will be the quickest, the one least affecting society, and the one establishing strong and long-lasting foundations to advance a vigorous, continued and sustained growth.

When we first applied this strategy we had the efficient and timely financial support of friendly countries and trade partners such as Canada. Today, I reiterate Mexico's recognition and gratitude to the Canadian people and government for their solidarity and their ever respectful attitude.

I also reiterate that the strategy has begun to show evidence of being the right one. The short-term disequilibriums that brought about the crisis have been corrected.

We are determined to preserve this strategy.

Thus, we have kept and shall keep maintaining the discipline and rigor indispensable to recovery and growth.

That is why we shall also maintain responsible and consistent policies to promote productive investment, protect and create jobs, increase wages due to rising productivity, and promote our domestic savings.

Our transformation is not short term, but one projected into years to come.

This is why structural change has continued with greater momentum through constitutional, legal and institutional reforms towards a greater liberalization of our economy.

Thanks to the reforms carried out during almost a decade and that we have reinforced in the past years, today, Mexico is undoubtedly a market economy, an open economy founded on free initiatives of small and large businesses, and on the free will of all workers and farmers.

My government has not seen last year's difficulties as a reason for paralysis and frustration, nor to go back to past policies or delay changes, but as a challenge to renew efforts and expand the transformation.

That is why our transformation is not only economic, but one that also involves our justice system, our democracy and our social life.

Based on our Constitution and freedoms, we have begun the transformation of our justice system.

Law reinforcement lies on freedom: the antidote against crime, corruption and impunity.

That is why laws in Mexico are being reinforced and solid foundations have been laid so that the Judicial Power can genuinely be impartial and independent, increasingly more professional and better trained to honestly and reliably carry out its responsibilities.

Amidst freedom and due process, justice must prevail in strict compliance with the law. And amidst all of this, no human rights violation can be tolerated.

My government firmly believes that no violation should ever be concealed, but that all authorities have a duty to rectify it and to reconcile the rule of law with full respect to all individuals' rights and dignity, to harmonize the individual's and society's rights.

• (1100)

That is the reason why, six years after its establishment, Mexico has the world's largest ombudsman system. This system has become an efficient tool for the protection of fundamental rights and more important, for the creation of a new culture of respect and awareness of human rights.

Living conditions bound by law, foster citizen participation and are the foundation for democracy, governing and a plural and harmonious coexistence.

The Mexican people have been transforming the norms and practices of our political life in order to live today in a full democracy.

Thus, even before taking office as President, I summoned all political parties, social organizations and citizens representatives to undertake a reform that guarantees just and impartial electoral conditions and civility in its application.

Today, the national political parties and Congress are putting together an electoral reform so that the 1997 federal elections be legal, transparent and fair beyond question.

Due to my political and moral convictions, and because of the popular mandate, I have an unyielding commitment to the democratic development in Mexico.

Law, democracy and dialogue constitute the framework to resolve differences inherent to a society complex and diverse, plural and dynamic.

Our rich diversity is showing in our vigorous cultural vitality. It is also expressed by sharp contrasts, things left undone over the years, poverty and marginalization.

This explains why in our public policies the highest priority is placed on social policy. More than half of the federal government's budget is devoted toward children's education, training for youth, family health, support for men and women living in rural areas, and basic community services.

Social policy has been widely and efficiently applied and has significantly enabled modern and highly developed areas in Mexico.

By the same token, the limitations and failings in its application help to explain why underdevelopment, poverty and injustice still prevail in other areas.

Underdevelopment, poverty, discrimination and injustice are precisely at the origin of conflicts which are, as in Chiapas, a matter of concern for all Mexicans and that have attracted international attention.

I have and will continue to have the conviction that the solution in Chiapas lies not in violence but in the law, nor does it lie on rancour but on dialogue; nor in confrontation but on negotiation until concord is reached and a harmonious coexistence is consecrated to overcome substantive problems.

A concord and a harmonious coexistence that become the source of long-lasting tranquillity, certainty and encouragement for communities that wish to reconcile the building conditions for a dignified and productive life, while safe keeping their customs and traditions.

The Mexican people are proud of these traditions and customs, of the pluralism derived from the millennial roots of our culture which has marked our history with its own unique seal.

In Mexico's National Emblem, an eagle stands on a cactus and wrestles with a snake. This millennial symbol sums up duality in the universe: celestial and earth forces, air and earth, fire and water, are battling against each other.

• (1105)

The need for alignment, without putting aside opposite views, is the kernel of our identity and may be recognized throughout all our history. You can find it from the mythical creation of the sun and the moon in Teotihuacan, and the vigorous indigenous and European roots of our civilization, to the basic education transmitted today via satellite in indigenous languages to the most remote communities in our territory.

The need to not put aside opposite views but to keep and appease this duality is what Octavio Paz has referred to as the longing to live, that deep Mexican longing to prevail.

That is why we are committed to preserving and strengthening our indigenous community's rights to their cultural identity, their language and their customs.

We know that by preserving this plural vitality we cultivate the essential strength that nurtures our society.

We know that our transformation shall be complete only if it preserves that plural vitality; if it respects our history's and culture's legacy; if, united in diversity, it leads us to a future of well-being and dignity for all.

That is why Mexico is interested in developing closer ties with Canada, a nation built upon a rich diversity which is the foundation of its strength and which vigorously shoulders a continuous transformation.

All Mexicans share with Canadians the desire, in Margaret Atwood's words, of having good jobs, food on the table, a secure future for the children, as well as respect, social justice and cultural continuity.

Mexicans also share with Canadians that, as Prime Minister Jean Chrétien has put it, we are people who do not expect miracles to happen. We expect integrity, hard work and an environment of trust to overcome our challenges and benefit from opportunities.

I firmly believe that through the strengthening of our relationship we are creating this environment of trust for intense work and transformation, for peace and justice, for stronger partnership and mutual prosperity, and for a closer friendship between Mexico and Canada.

Merci beaucoup. Thank you very much. Muchas gracias.

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

• (1110)

[*English*]

**Hon. Gildas L. Molgat (Speaker of the Senate):** Your Excellency, El Presidente de Mexico, monsieur le premier ministre du Canada, Mr. Speaker of the House of Commons, Your Excellencies, my colleagues in the Parliaments of Canada and Mexico, mesdames et messieurs, buenas dias a todos y bienvenida a Canada.

It is my honour to join my compatriots in welcoming you, Mr. President, to the Parliament of Canada and to thank you for the very gracious address which you have just given us. But my words are as nothing compared to the warmth of the applause that you heard from my colleagues.

We are doubly honoured by the attendance of so many distinguished visitors from your country in your delegation: many members of your Parliament and several of your cabinet ministers.

We welcome you to Canada in summer, just as so many Canadians have been welcomed to Mexico in winter, a practice which long preceded NAFTA.

[*Translation*]

Canadians greatly enjoy your climate and your culture, but, above all, they greatly enjoy the warmth of your people.

[*English*]

Some 200 years ago, England's Sir Horace Walpole wrote:

The new Augustan age will dawn on the other side of the Atlantic. There will perhaps be—a Virgil in Mexico.

[*Translation*]

Given your literature, your music, your history and your modern architecture, and also when we think about the economic recovery that you have achieved with Canada and with the United States, we rediscover faith like Walpole.

[*English*]

Your expanding outlook, your associations are far reaching indeed. They are world-encompassing associations. Your partner-

ship in NAFTA, your links with the Rio Group, with the Organization of American States and with the United Nations, all of these are indications of the broad vision of Mexico.

Mexico and Canada have travelled far down the road to progress. While our histories may differ in many ways, Mexico and Canada have many similarities.

We both started from colonial roots and by the determination of our people we have created new nations; nations committed to human advancement. These purposes which we share, these links which we have forged, will stand us in good stead in the years ahead.

Co-operation now exists between us across a very diverse spectrum, from science to communications, labour to finance, from environment to culture. This co-operation has fostered solid relations between our people; relations that are enhanced by important visits such as this one.

The recently concluded 10th interparliamentary conference on Mexico and Canada held in Ottawa also attests to our deepening ties. I am delighted to see here, in your delegation, the Speaker of your Senate, Senator Fernando Ortiz Arana, and others who took part in those discussions.

Through increased tourism, student exchanges and business associations, Canada-Mexico links are becoming stronger.

[*Translation*]

Our respective governments must encourage these contacts. The friendships that these contacts build and also the opportunity to exchange ideas that they allow will play a crucial role in promoting mutual understanding in a world that is becoming a global village.

[*English*]

We thank you, Your Excellency, for your expressions of friendship which we deeply appreciate and warmly return. We also thank you for the insights that your address has given us. We look forward to further opportunities to increase our ties to your magnificent country.

• (1115)

Que la amistad entre Canada y Mexico continue prosperando.

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

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Gilbert Parent (Speaker of the House of Commons):** Mr. President, we listened with a great deal of interest to the speech that you have delivered on behalf of your government and on behalf of the Mexican people. Your warm words reaffirm the solid links that bind our countries, and bear witness to a friendship that is deepening and intensifying.

[English]

Mr. President, this Chamber embodies our history and reflects the face of Canada. Here in Parliament our democracy finds its ultimate expression and Canadians shape their destiny.

Mr. President, you have brought a very friendly atmosphere to this normally fiery and partisan place. And I hope it stays this pleasant when we resume our debates this afternoon.

You know, Mr. President, we follow pretty strict rules to keep things civil in this House. For one thing, we rarely let in our colleagues from the other place but they are here today. And we never allow strangers to speak in this chamber.

You are no stranger to us, Mr. President.

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

**Mr. Speaker Parent:** We reserve you this honour because you are more than just a neighbour. We count you among our friends.

Indeed, it is you who have honoured us with your presence and you have honoured all Canadians with your words of friendship.

It is on their behalf that I offer you our very deepest thanks for coming to be with us.

I now adjourn this meeting.

---





# CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 11, 1996

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>CFB Greenwood</b>	
Mr. Murphy .....	3627
<b>Mexico</b>	
Mrs. Debien .....	3627
<b>Agriculture</b>	
Mr. Breitreuz (Yellowhead) .....	3627
<b>North American Free Trade Agreement</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	3627
<b>The Late Steve Neary</b>	
Mr. Simmons .....	3628
<b>Via Rail</b>	
Mr. English .....	3628
<b>Public Service Awards</b>	
Mr. Pagtakhan .....	3628
<b>Quebec Referendum Act</b>	
Mr. Langlois .....	3628
<b>Liberal Party</b>	
Mr. Mayfield .....	3629
<b>Peter Bosa</b>	
Mrs. Finestone .....	3629
<b>Youth</b>	
Mr. Valeri .....	3629
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	3629
<b>Maritime Pipeline</b>	
Mr. Patry .....	3629
<b>High School Graduates</b>	
Mr. Duhamel .....	3630
<b>Gulf Canada Resources Limited</b>	
Mr. Pomerleau .....	3630
<b>Newfoundland Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	3630
<b>Medicare</b>	
Mr. Cullen .....	3630
<b>Member for Jonquière</b>	
Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral .....	3631

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>First Ministers' Conference</b>	
Mr. Duceppe .....	3631
Mr. Dion .....	3631
Mr. Duceppe .....	3631
Mr. Dion .....	3631
Mr. Duceppe .....	3631
Mr. Dion .....	3632
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	3632
Mr. Young .....	3632

Mr. Bellehumeur .....	3632
Mr. Dion .....	3632
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. Strahl .....	3632
Mr. Dion .....	3632
Mr. Strahl .....	3633
Mr. Dion .....	3633
Mr. Strahl .....	3633
Mr. Dion .....	3633
<b>Securities</b>	
Mr. Loubier .....	3633
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3633
Mr. Loubier .....	3633
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3633
<b>Justice</b>	
Miss Grey .....	3634
Mr. Rock .....	3634
Miss Grey .....	3634
Mr. Rock .....	3634
<b>Justice</b>	
Mrs. Venne .....	3634
Mr. Rock .....	3634
Mrs. Venne .....	3635
Mr. Rock .....	3635
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Solberg .....	3635
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3635
Mr. Solberg .....	3635
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3635
<b>Blood Supply</b>	
Mrs. Picard .....	3635
Mr. Dingwall .....	3636
Mrs. Picard .....	3636
Mr. Dingwall .....	3636
<b>Regional Development</b>	
Mr. Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) .....	3636
Mr. MacAulay .....	3636
<b>Fisheries</b>	
Mr. Harris .....	3636
Mr. Mifflin .....	3636
Mr. Harris .....	3636
Mr. Mifflin .....	3637
<b>Day Care Services</b>	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	3637
Mr. Young .....	3637
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	3637
Mr. Young .....	3637
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Williams .....	3637
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3637
Mr. Williams .....	3637
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	3638
<b>Trade</b>	
Ms. Torsney .....	3638

Mr. Eggleton .....	3638
<b>Haitian Police Force</b>	
Mrs. Debien .....	3638
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	3638
Mrs. Debien .....	3638
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	3638
<b>Canadian Wheat Board</b>	
Mr. Hermanson .....	3639
Mr. Goodale .....	3639
Mr. Hermanson .....	3639
Mr. Goodale .....	3639
<b>First Ministers Conference</b>	
Ms. McLaughlin .....	3639
Mr. Irwin .....	3639
<b>Mexico</b>	
Mr. Assadourian .....	3639
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	3640

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Columbia River Treaty Permanent Engineering Board</b>	
Ms. McLellan .....	3640
<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	3640
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	3640
<b>Criminal Code</b>	
Bill C-45. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	3640
Mr. Rock .....	3640
<b>Canada Elections Act</b>	
Bill C-301. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	3640
Mr. Ianno .....	3640
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Motion for concurrence in 21st report. ....	3640
Mr. Zed .....	3640
(Motion agreed to.) .....	3640
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Bill C-205</b>	
Mrs. Terrana .....	3640
<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Mrs. Terrana .....	3641
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mrs. Terrana .....	3641
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. McClelland .....	3641
Mr. Karygiannis .....	3641
<b>Turkey</b>	
Mr. Karygiannis .....	3641
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Penson .....	3641
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Penson .....	3641
Mr. Maloney .....	3641
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Maloney .....	3641

<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Zed .....	3641

### GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Witness Protection Program Act</b>	
Bill C-13. Consideration of Senate amendment .....	3642
Mr. Peters .....	3642
Motion for second reading of amendment and concurrence .....	3642
Mr. Discepola .....	3642
Mr. Langlois .....	3642
(Motion agreed to, amendment read the second time and passed.) .....	3642
<b>Oceans Act</b>	
Bill C-26. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	3642
Motions Nos. 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 50, 53, 56 and 73 .....	3642
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	3642
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	3644
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	3645
Mr. McWhinney .....	3646
Mr. Dubé .....	3648
Division on Motion No. 36 deferred .....	3649
Division on Motion No. 44 deferred .....	3649
Division on Motion No. 45 deferred .....	3649
Division on Motion No. 50 deferred .....	3649
Division on Motion No. 53 deferred .....	3649
Division on Motion No. 73 deferred .....	3650
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	3650
Motion No. 54 .....	3650
Mr. Mifflin .....	3650
Motion No. 55 .....	3650
Motions Nos. 69, 71 and 92 .....	3650
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	3650
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	3651
Mr. McWhinney .....	3651
Mr. Dubé .....	3652
Mr. Baker .....	3653
Mrs. Guay .....	3654
Division on Motion No. 54 deferred .....	3656
Division on Motion No. 55 deferred .....	3656
Division on Motion No. 69 deferred .....	3656
Division on Motion No. 71 deferred .....	3656
Mr. Mifflin .....	3657
Motion No. 65 .....	3657
Mr. McWhinney .....	3657
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	3658
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	3658
Mr. Baker .....	3660
Mr. Dubé .....	3660
Division on Motion No. 65 deferred .....	3662
Mr. Mifflin .....	3662
Motions Nos. 67 and 68 .....	3662
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	3662
Motion No. 70 .....	3662
Mr. McWhinney .....	3662
Mr. Scott (Skeena) .....	3663
<b>Copyright Act</b>	
Bill C-32. Consideration resumed of motion .....	3663
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 190; Nays, 36 .....	3664
(Motion agreed to, and bill referred to a committee.) .....	3664
<b>Criminal Law Improvement Act, 1996</b>	
Bill C-17. Consideration resumed of motion .....	3664

Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 186; Nays, 40 .....	3665
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.) .....	3666

**PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

**Canadian Wheat Board Act**

Bill C-212. Motion for second reading .....	3666
Mr. Hoepfner .....	3666
Mr. Robichaud .....	3668
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	3669
Mr. Hermanson .....	3670
Mr. Kirkby .....	3672
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	3673

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

**Oceans Act**

Bill C-26. Consideration resumed of report stage .....	3674
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé) .....	3674
Mr. Nunez .....	3675
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) .....	3676
Mrs. Guay .....	3677
Mr. Lebel .....	3679
Mrs. Lalonde .....	3680

Mr. Rocheleau .....	3681
Mr. Godin .....	3683
Mr. Crête .....	3684
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) .....	3687
Mr. Dubé .....	3688
Mr. Plamondon .....	3689

**ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS**

**Human Rights**

Mr. Althouse .....	3693
Mr. Harvard .....	3694

**Lacrosse**

Mr. Gallaway .....	3695
Mr. Kirkby .....	3695
Appendix—Address of His Excellency Ernesto Zedillo, President of the United Mexican States .....	3697

**Adress Printed as Appendix**

**Appendix**

Mr. Parent .....	3698
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	3698
Mr. Zedillo .....	3699
Mr. Molgat .....	3702
Mr. Parent .....	3702

**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://www.parl.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.**