



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 065 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Wednesday, June 19, 1996**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

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

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

The House met at 2 p.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

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

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

---

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

### REPLICA GUNS

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I recently visited the David Livingstone Elementary School in Vancouver and met with the very young but very bright students at their invitation.

They are concerned that replica handguns and other weapons that are astonishingly realistic are readily available in local convenience stores. Such replica guns have been used in hold-ups and similar acts of violence. Police officers report that in crisis situations they have been unable to distinguish them from the real thing.

The David Livingstone Elementary students want the federal government to ban the importation, sale and manufacture of all such replica guns in Canada. They have put together a petition of more than 2,000 names which I have passed on to the Minister of National Revenue for consideration.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

### WORLD FOLKLORE FESTIVAL IN DRUMMONDVILLE

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, from July 5 to 14, the international community will meet in Drummondville, the major centre in my riding, for the World Folklore Festival where, for 10 days, over 1,000 artists representing 20 countries will

delight the crowds with all the charms and treasures of folk arts and traditions.

In 15 years, the World Folklore Festival has become the largest of its kind in the world. The festival, which now attracts 1 million visitors a year, owes its huge success mostly to the 2,500 volunteers who run it.

I invite all my colleagues in Parliament and their constituents to come to Drummondville's glorious fair between July 5 and 14 to celebrate the world and its cultural wealth.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### CANADIAN HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT AWARDS

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, there were 22 Canadian finalists in the recent Canadian Healthy Environment Awards program. Four of those finalists were from my riding of Mission—Coquitlam.

Verna Hall, Tim Roark and Charles Young from Maple Ridge were finalists in the arts, media and communications category.

I especially want to recognize Sarah MacEachern, of Maple Ridge Secondary School for winning the top award for Canada. Her achievements?

Sarah produced a video entitled "For all Living Things" and sent it to all elementary schools.

In grade 9 she co-chaired and in grade 10 she chaired the school's Global Awareness Club. This club is so active it won the Minister of the Environment Award for British Columbia.

Sarah has organized earth weeks, guest speakers, recycling programs in the cafeteria, composting in the schools, raised money for Christmas food banks and planted many trees. Sarah was also a member of the Youth for Global Awareness Conference provincial planning committee.

Sarah, congratulations for reminding us adults how important the environment is.

\* \* \*

### RAILWAY SAFETY

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, just the other day legislation which had to do with railway safety was referred to a committee.

*S. O. 31*

One thing I would like to put on the record having discussed this with a number of people who work on the railroad, particularly locomotive engineers, is the need for the legislation to address, if it does not now do so and I do not think it does, the need for double arms at controlled railway crossings. At present our railway crossings have a single arm but in Europe there are two on either side which prevent people from running through. As a result, a lot fewer people are killed trying to run through railway crossings.

This is something we should look at for this country. Fixing up these railway crossings would create short term jobs and in the end it would save a lot of Canadian lives. I recommend this measure to the committee.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SAINT-JEAN-BAPTISTE DAY**

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, do you know that in my riding this year many Quebecers will have to watch the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day parade on television?

• (1405)

The fact is that, this year, the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste has invited only Quebecers not wearing their national costumes to take part in the June 24 parade.

[English]

My friends, we are all welcome, but only if we leave our foreign costumes at home. Take off your saris, remove your boubous and your lederhosen and pull on your wool sweaters.

[Translation]

No silk, no cotton, only pure wool will do.

[English]

No balalaika, no bouzouki, no jazz, no reggae either.

[Translation]

Their theme is “Quebec, I have loved you for a long time”, but must I renounce my origins for you to love me?

[English]

Why on Saint-Jean Baptiste Day are all Quebecers not equal, not allowed to be themselves? Why are radicals allowed to run this parade?

\* \* \*

**ARMENIAN GENOCIDE OF 1915**

**Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as reported by the Armenian newspaper *Abaka* in Montreal, on April 24, 1996 Yvan Bordeleau, Liberal MNA for l'Acadie, was

refused the consent of the Pequist government to introduce a motion to commemorate the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide of 1915.

This unfortunate decision ends a 16-year old tradition in the National Assembly of Quebec. Ironically on the 81st anniversary of the Armenian genocide, the Parliament of Canada unanimously passed a historic resolution that will see the week of April 20 to 27 each year set aside to remember the victims of atrocities, inhumanities and genocide.

I am appalled at the actions of the Pequist government in failing to continue the tradition of recognizing the first genocide of the 20th century.

I call on the Bloc Quebecois members to encourage their colleagues in Quebec to once more recognize in an official way the anniversary of the Armenian genocide. It is time to put an end to this hypocrisy.

\* \* \*

**RAY KARLSON**

**Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Dauphin—Swan River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to acknowledge the outstanding achievement of a member of my riding of Dauphin—Swan River, Mr. Ray Karlson.

Yesterday Mr. Karlson, the superintendent for mail operations in Dauphin, Manitoba, received the Golden Postmark Award in recognition of outstanding contributions to Canada Post and his community.

Fair, courteous, resourceful, compassionate and an all-around terrific boss are the words used to describe Mr. Karlson by his co-workers. Mr. Karlson is known for going above and beyond the call for employees and the people of Dauphin and area, whether it means coming in on weekends or delivering a parcel personally.

Mail service is of crucial importance to rural areas. I would like to take this opportunity to salute Mr. Karlson and all Canada Post employees in rural Canada for their commitment to their jobs and communities. They deserve our stamp of approval.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PARC DE L'AVENTURE BASQUE**

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, Trois-Pistoles has been shaped by over 300 years of history and presence in America, but it is also the site of the Basque adventure on this continent. The Basques, a people of proud sailors, started hunting whales in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the late 17th century. The ovens they used to melt blubber can still be seen on île aux Basques.

The Parc de l'aventure basque en Amérique opens June 22. This multicultural crossroads highlights the Basque presence in America and the history of this people.

The people of the Trois-Pistoles region are proud of this past and even named their regional county municipality RMC des Basques. I wish to congratulate the people behind this project. Knowing where we come from makes it easier to determine where we are going.

\* \* \*

[English]

### LUMBER EXPORT QUOTA

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that you need a strong foundation to build a sturdy home.

The Minister for International Trade however is building his house on the shaky foundations of the federal export quota. The minister mistakenly believes that his recent lumber deal with the United States is helping the lumber industry. He hopes the Canadian lumber industry will provide him with the materials necessary for this construction. But even quality Canadian lumber will not be able to hold up this ill-conceived design.

As a result of the minister's faulty construction, the lumber industry is suffering as lumber shipments have slowed to a crawl. Now, instead of dealing with the Americans who have been hacking away at our lumber exports, 2,600 Canadian companies are watching as their own government is taking an axe to the whole works.

If the minister is serious about building a sturdy home fit for our Canadian climate, he had better design a new blueprint.

\* \* \*

• (1410)

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Churchill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was very saddened to learn this week of the death of my constituent, Sonia Ross of The Pas. Sonia was the second aboriginal woman to die violently in The Pas area in recent months, the first being Dorothy Martin who died on April 26.

While both of these matters are now before the courts, the apparent circumstances raise serious questions about the safety of women in situations of domestic violence.

People in my constituency want action to protect women. I urge members of this House to join me in pursuing this matter in the months to come.

*S. O. 31*

[Translation]

### SIR WILFRID LAURIER

**Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on June 23, that is four days from now, in Arthabaska, in Saint-Lin des Laurentides, in Québec-Est and in Brome-Missisquoi, we will commemorate Wilfrid Laurier's election victory as the first Quebecer to become Prime Minister of Canada.

Remembering our roots 100 years later, on the eve of Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day, is a fitting way to honour one of Canada's great Prime Ministers. He was the one who gave a definition of Canada that allows the Quebec Liberal Party and experienced politicians in Ottawa alike to talk today of "two founding peoples forming one nation".

On the basis of the ten provinces, the five regions and—we will remember the right of veto—the two founding peoples and the nation they form, I state loud and clear in this House:

Long live Quebec,  
Long live Quebec within Canada, and  
Hail to Wilfrid Laurier.

\* \* \*

### BOMBARDIER

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Vaudreuil, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the mere evocation of the name Bombardier reminds us, and for good reason, of the humble beginnings of this international company in the workshop of a young Valcourt designer.

On Bombardier's drawing boards, we can now find plans of Seadoos, high speed trains and business aircraft lying next to plans for the Skidoo that made Bombardier famous.

At the stockholders' meeting held in Montreal yesterday, participants found out for themselves that vitality and innovation are indeed the driving force of this business, which brought in \$7.1 billion in revenues for fiscal year 1995.

Company executives are working very hard to secure a contract worth \$1 billion to build 50 regional aircraft.

We wish Bombardier good luck in securing this contract that will ensure that important high technology jobs are created and maintained in Canada.

\* \* \*

### CITY OF RIMOUSKI

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, this year, the city of Rimouski celebrates its 300th anniversary. It celebrates its three centuries of history along the majestic St. Lawrence River. Over the years, the descendants of Rimouski's first settlers built what was to become the main

*Oral Questions*

regional centre, as well as an active and determined community which values its heritage, while being open to the world.

This adventure in time which Rimouski is proposing this year is an invitation to renew with the past, so that it can guide us in our march toward the future.

I want to stress the good work done by the organizing committee responsible for the festivities, and I invite all Canadians to come and celebrate with Rimouski residents their city's 300 years of history.

\* \* \*

[English]

**EARLY PAROLE**

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to inform the House and all Canadians that yet another victim suffered a grievous assault last night. As the victim was respected and well regarded by members of this House, I feel that details of the assault ought to be made public so that we can all express our outrage at the injustice that was suffered.

The deed was nasty, brutish and short. The attack stripped the victim of formerly sound and healthy features leaving only a mutilated shell. Then the perpetrators of this foul deed each made a solemn affirmation to not even report the sad result.

Last night, Liberal members of the justice committee ruthlessly did away with Bill C-234 which would have eliminated early parole for first degree murderers. They left in its place Bill C-45, a pitiful and toothless caricature.

Over the past several weeks the victim, Bill C-234, had provided hope and encouragement to many Canadians looking for greater truth and trustworthiness in sentencing. How sad that last night's attack replaced their hope with betrayal and senseless loss.

\* \* \*

• (1415)

[Translation]

**FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE**

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the first ministers' conference begins tomorrow but, for some time already, we have been hearing comments from certain provinces regarding the content and the objectives of the meeting.

Yesterday, the Prime Minister clearly explained that, as far as he and his government are concerned, the conference will not be turned into another last-ditch attempt, where participants would work until they dropped to renew Canadian federalism.

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss and to settle concrete issues. Canadians want their governments to co-operate together to create jobs, stimulate economic recovery and redefine social programs. This is the mandate the Prime Minister gave himself and we are convinced that he will succeed in fulfilling it.

\* \* \*

[English]

**NEWFOUNDLAND**

**Mrs. Bonnie Hickey (St. John's East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been a week since Michael Walker of the Fraser Institute said that Newfoundland was a morally bankrupt society and that Newfoundlanders do not even think to ask what they can do to solve their own problems, they ask what Ottawa can do for them.

After a week of waiting there has been no apology from the Reform Party nor from Michael Walker, who himself is a Newfoundlander. I can only assume that all sitting members of the Reform Party endorse this statement of intolerance and feel that Newfoundlanders are not worthy of being Canadian.

This is quite an attitude to have toward fellow Canadians for a party that has the audacity to call itself a government in waiting. I cannot imagine the devastation which that party would bring upon our nation if hon. colleagues opposite were some day to sit on this side of the House. What a shameful display of leadership. What a lack of leadership.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I ask through you that the Reform Party apologize to the people of Newfoundland.

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[Translation]

**FIRST MINISTERS' CONFERENCE**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the first ministers' conference, we are discovering the intentions of the federal government little by little and we now know what will be on the conference agenda. The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs confirmed yesterday that the conference agenda reflects choices made by the federal government.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister confirm that the federal government will be deciding on the agenda and on what will or will not be discussed with the provinces? Will he confirm that he alone will be setting the table?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the dinner will be held at 24 Sussex, it will be hard for me to have people from every province come and get the table ready. The

*Oral Questions*

provinces were in fact consulted. I myself have been speaking to the various premiers over the past few weeks, to discuss subjects that might be raised.

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has travelled around the country. He has talked with governments and made his report. We have prepared an agenda, and it will be the job of the meeting chair to prepare discussion. In general, the premiers were aware of the direction of discussions, and I think we will have more on the table than we can deal with in a day and a half.

My relations with the premiers are generally fairly cordial, and if there is something urgent to discuss, we are prepared to do so, but there is more than enough on the agenda for a one day meeting and a dinner.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, will the Prime Minister acknowledge that, regardless of the subject chosen for discussion and the potential focus of decentralization, his approach and that of his government are always the same: the central government will always have the power to dictate national standards, to set broad guidelines, and the provincial governments will always be seen as playing a supporting role as administrator?

• (1420)

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the Canadian Constitution, the jurisdictions are clear. In many areas, the provinces decide and do things that we do not approve of and we do not make a great song and dance of it every day.

Under certain circumstances, when it is in the interest of all Canadians, as in the area of health, for example, we have five conditions that the provinces have accepted. A few weeks ago, the Government of Alberta was not prepared to go along with the notion that there should be no user fees. The Minister of Health persuaded the Government of Alberta, following discussions, to agree to the five conditions.

These conditions are acceptable to both the provinces and the federal government, because they are in the interest of Canadians.

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Leader of the Opposition, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that the Constitution sets out the areas of jurisdiction. The problem with Canadian federalism, however, is that the Prime Minister has this incredible propensity for getting into areas of jurisdiction that do not belong to him. That is the problem.

The throne speech indicated that the government will not use its spending power without the approval of a majority of the provinces in a given sector.

Would the Prime Minister confirm that, if the majority of the provinces joined forces to ask the federal government to intervene in an area of provincial jurisdiction such as education, Quebec

could opt out with full compensation only if it complied with the national standards set by the majority of the provinces asking the federal government to intervene in this area?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, the question is purely hypothetical. There is no question of any intervention in the field of education at the moment. However, I think the federal government's statement is very clear.

We have said we have no intention of interfering in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction without the consent of the majority of the provinces. Moreover, the provinces have the right to withdraw if they wish. Obviously the matter of compensation would be negotiated if we ever got to that point.

At the moment, it is out of the question. We have said we do not want to do it any more. We will focus on our own programs and manage them well so we can ask the provinces to do the same in their jurisdictions.

\* \* \*

**SOCIAL PROGRAMS**

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday, at a press conference on the occasion of his speech to the Ottawa-Carleton Economic Development Corporation, the Prime Minister expressed an interest in the creation of a national program jointly administered by the federal and provincial governments and aimed at improving the situation of disadvantaged children. Members will recall that this program was inspired by the work of the Ministerial Council on Social Policy Reform.

Will the Prime Minister confirm that this is an unprecedented centralizing offensive, with the federal government attempting to disguise under noble intentions a desire to grab control of all social problems, which are administered by the provinces and come under their exclusive jurisdiction?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, through tax incentives, the federal government assists in this area, and this was announced in the budget.

I think the Minister of Finance has improved the system so as to use the taxation system to help the children of disadvantaged families who are at risk. This we have been doing for some time. The provincial governments have a similar system. They are asking if there might not be a possibility of our working together. This request originated with the provinces and I am prepared to sit down with provincial representatives.

As you know, Bloc Québécois members love to rant and rave in front of an audience, but they ought to know that it was the provinces which asked the federal government for this. If they do not want us to talk about it, I think the losers will be the disadvantaged children of Canada.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, given the way the federal government wishes to exercise its spending powers, and given the Prime Minister's response, are we to understand that Quebec, which never agreed to take part in this consensus with the other nine provinces, will have to conform to the standards set by Ottawa and the nine other provinces, if it wishes to obtain full and total compensation in pulling out of this program?

• (1425)

[English]

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we will discuss that. We are in the field. We already have some tax incentives to help poor families provide for their children. Some provinces have similar programs and they would like to talk with us.

I know that the people of Quebec, not the Bloc Québécois, would like all governments to work together to have a better society in Canada and in Quebec at the same time.

\* \* \*

**JOB CREATION**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister said that job creation would be the number one priority at the first ministers' conference. The key to job creation is not public works projects but genuine tax relief.

Yesterday in the House when government ministers were asked why tax relief was not front and centre on the agenda of the first ministers' conference, they had no explanation.

If job creation is one of the Prime Minister's top priorities, why is tax relief not high on the agenda of the first ministers' conference?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, at this time the priority is to eliminate the deficit both at provincial and federal levels.

I would like to read to the leader of the third party what was said by the member for Capilano—Howe Sound who argued recently at the Reform convention in Vancouver that there should not be tax cuts until the deficit is eliminated. At the same meeting the member for Calgary Centre said that a proposal for cutting taxes at this time was "voodoo economics".

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

**Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** Mr. Speaker, I have a problem. I do not know who is on the side of voodoo in that party.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister had read a little further he would know that if the Reform taxpayers' budget had been implemented in 1993 his

government would have a surplus next year and be in a position to offer tax relief.

Four months ago in this House the Prime Minister admitted that governments do not create jobs. Yesterday he revisited the idea of an infrastructure program run by government as the principal instrument of job creation.

The government seems unable to grasp the 1990s principle of job creation that a dollar left in the pocket of a taxpayer creates better and more jobs than that dollar in the pocket of the finance minister.

Instead of committing billions of dollars to another temporary infrastructure program, has the government ever seriously considered how many real jobs would be created by a multibillion dollar federal tax cut?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I was in the beautiful city of Calgary. The mayor of Calgary and the mayors of all the cities of Canada were congratulating this government for the initiative two years ago to have a good infrastructure program. In doing that a lot of things have been repaired, restored and ameliorated in Calgary and in all the cities of Canada.

The mayors would like us to be there. We will discuss that with the premiers later this week. It has been a great success. We have managed to reduce the deficit and we have managed to reduce interest rates. With the good management of the financial affairs of the nation, the Canadian economy has managed to create 600,000 jobs since the day we became the government.

• (1430)

I think that is why the people in Hamilton two days ago made sure that the Reform Party and its policies finished fourth.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's answer is straight out of the 1960s. We have 1.3 million people unemployed. We have two to three million people under employed. We have one out of four Canadians worried about their jobs.

The Prime Minister does not have to talk to the House about creating jobs in the tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands. He has to talk about creating jobs in the millions if he is going to address this question.

I ask him again, and I will put it very simply. Has the federal government analysed—

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

**An hon. member:** Don't use big words, Preston. Remember who you are dealing with.

**Mr. Manning:** Has the federal government analysed how many real jobs could be created by a federal tax cut? Yes or no.



*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the leader of the third party that—

**Mr. Speller:** The fourth party.

**Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** The fourth party, yes, that is so. It is very confusing these days. The fourth party, I mean.

I remember that the sixties were not that bad. I was a member of Parliament and the premier of Alberta was Mr. Manning. In those days Albertans were bragging about what a good government we had in Alberta and in Canada.

We can do things the right way when we are making sure that we can reduce the deficit but at the same time we can improve the infrastructure of the country which will be an improvement for generations to come. I think that is good economic policy and it is why the people of Canada prefer our policies to their voodoo policies.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SOCIAL PROGRAMS**

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

The Prime Minister wants us to think that his first ministers' conference will make it possible to decentralize the federation. How could that be when, on the one hand, he is withdrawing partially from manpower training, and on the other, he is announcing his wish to be fully involved in the whole issue of social programs.

Is that the Prime Minister's decentralization model, to withdraw partially from one jurisdiction in order to more easily take over another?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we will be examining with the provinces a report presented by the provincial governments to the federal government. We think it is possible to improve the state of social programs and to ensure that they are available to all Canadians in the years to come.

I think it is incumbent on all governments to speak to one another in order to ensure that the social safety net is there for the poorest members of our society today, tomorrow and for many years to come in Canada.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am going to give the Prime Minister another chance to answer my question. At the conference, he is getting ready to pull out of certain provincial areas of jurisdiction, provided he is allowed to take over securities.

How can the Prime Minister say that that is not his decentralization model—give with one hand and take with the other?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the national securities measure, as proposed by the Minister of Finance, is voluntary, and the provinces that wish to participate can participate, and those that do not, will not. I think this is a good way to ensure that we eliminate duplication, but those who like duplication can keep it.

\* \* \*

• (1435)

[English]

**CANADA PENSION PLAN**

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The doubling of Canada pension plan premiums will result in a very significant pool of Canadian taxpayer retirement cash accumulating in the hands of government.

What Canadian in his or her right mind would trust a government that has our country \$600 billion in debt with the income for his or her retirement? Why should Canadians trust the government to manage their retirement income?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this question was discussed at considerable length during the very valuable consultation process that was undertaken by the federal chairman of the consultation process, David Walker, as he went across the country.

It was discussed quite extensively yesterday with the finance ministers. There was general agreement that if such a fund were to be created, it would be managed best by a group of investment advisers on market principles at arm's length from the government.

**Mr. Ian McClelland (Edmonton Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that is good news. I am sure Canadians would feel much more secure if the fund were made politician proof so that this huge fund of resources could not then become a slush fund for political parties or politicians.

Following up on the response, will the 20 per cent investment rule be waived? Second, Canadians need to be assured that the retirement income of today's retirees and those who will retire in the immediate future will be protected. Those of us who are grandparents understand that our grandchildren should not pay a disproportionate share of both the national debt and retirement income.

Has the government done any studies or background work on the impact of this fund on job creation and growth, particularly to those in the 20 to 45-year age group?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked a series of question and it is somewhat hard

*Oral Questions*

to decipher exactly what he is driving at. I believe he is trying to address a very important problem.

There was discussion of the 20 per cent rule at the meeting. There were those who felt it should be waived, and others felt it should be maintained. Obviously this will be part of the ongoing discussion. The issue is whether there should be one set of rules for this fund and another set of rules for other pension funds. On the other side, of course, is the tremendous investment weight that this fund might have.

That is the only one of the many questions the member asked. I am sure he will ask the others subsequently and I will answer them at that time.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**GOODS AND SERVICES TAX**

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, six provinces asked that the GST be listed on the agenda of the first ministers' conference. Yesterday, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs told us to wait for the results of the finance ministers' conference. Nothing has been settled, as the provinces' request was turned down by the federal Minister of Finance.

The Prime Minister put the securities commission on the agenda because, he said, the provinces asked him to. He also put social programs on the agenda, again because the provinces asked him to. Will the Prime Minister put the GST on the agenda because, once again, the provinces have asked him to do so?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we discussed the GST issue yesterday. We also discussed other tax issues. It was a good discussion. There were differences of opinion, not only between the federal government and some of the provinces but also among the provinces themselves. That is quite normal.

The issue was put on the agenda of the finance ministers' meeting at the provinces' request, and it is there that it should be discussed.

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance has just decided where the issue should be discussed, even though the provinces have asked that it be considered at the first ministers' conference. The minister has decided that it would not be discussed there.

**An hon. member:** Perhaps he is the boss.

**Mr. Duceppe:** Yes, perhaps he is the boss.

• (1440)

How can the Prime Minister state that economic issues are at the top of the agenda when he refuses to discuss the GST, which is nothing if not an economic issue, as it enriched federal coffers by close to \$17 billion in 1995? How can they set aside such an

important question and try to convince people that economic issues are at the top of the agenda?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the GST was put on the agenda of the finance ministers' meeting, not because I asked for it, but at the provinces' explicit request. The finance ministers from Alberta and Quebec asked that it be discussed at the finance ministers' meeting, and that is what we did.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CANADA PENSION PLAN**

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we have heard that Canada pension plan premiums are to double over the next few years, which means the government will increase payroll taxes by another 5 per cent. The Minister of Finance has said payroll taxes kill jobs. Nevertheless, he is going ahead with this tax increase.

Will the Minister of Finance explain to those people who cannot find a job why he intends to destroy their careers in order for him to achieve his Canada pension plan objectives?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate but it is a reality that in order to ensure the Canada pension plan will be there for succeeding generations, premiums will have to be increased. That is the view of not only the federal government but of the chief actuary, the vast majority of knowledgeable commentators and the view of each and every one of the provincial governments at the meeting yesterday.

There is something else. The Reform Party has put forth its alternative plan. It ought to be very clearly understood that not only would that alternative plan of the Reform Party destroy the Canada pension plan as it is now, it would increase the premiums substantially above that which the ministers are talking about.

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it may be a reality that Canada pension plan premiums have to go up but it is also a reality that the government taxes every Canadian at every opportunity it can. The GST has been harmonized and it is costing us billions. We have seen gasoline taxes go up and so on.

When will the Minister of Finance get off the backs of the job creators, the small business people, cut spending, lower taxes and allow some tax room for the higher CPP premiums he is talking about?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the real question is when will the Reform Party stop talking out of both sides of its mouth?

The Reform Party has proposed the decimation of all those initiatives which help small business. It has brought forth a budget which would make it impossible for small business to develop new technologies. It has brought forth a budget which would make it impossible for small business to export. It has come up with a retirement savings plans which would impose a burden on small

*Oral Questions*

business that would be absolutely crippling. That is what the Reform Party's policies are. Why will its members not admit it?

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SECURITIES**

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Speaking before an audience of business people yesterday, the Prime Minister announced his firm intention to invade the area of securities, an exclusive provincial jurisdiction, in spite of the fact that Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia object to such an invasion.

Did the Prime Minister mean to tell us yesterday that he intends to pursue promoting the creation of a Canadian securities commission, even if, according to Quebec, Alberta and British Columbia, this will have the effect of concentrating Canada's financial community on Bay Street, in Toronto, at the expense of other parts of the country?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is mistaken. First of all, we are acting at the provinces' request. This was discussed yesterday and what the federal government said is that, if this is the wish of a significant number of provinces, we would be prepared to accommodate such an approach, but this is at the request of the provinces.

• (1445)

In fact, I have to tell the hon. member that the Government of Alberta supports the project. There is a difference of opinion with Ontario, but Alberta is on board. He is mistaken.

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, since this debate on the federal government's encroachment on the area of securities started, the Minister of Finance has told us one thing and another. He said there is very strong support for his project across the country. I would like him to name a few associations that support his project, because I have a whole list here of people who are opposed to it.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Does he not realize that, no matter who is making the request or why, creating a national securities commission would constitute a glaring and unacceptable violation of the Canadian Constitution that he so fiercely defends?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, first, it does not violate the Constitution. Second, there is no invasion of provincial jurisdiction, as it will only be a delegation of provincial responsibilities to a national institution. Third, in our

discussions yesterday, it was very clear that we are acting at the provinces' request.

I cannot understand why the hon. member wants to deny the other provinces the chance to compete with foreign countries. If the hon. member has a list of brokerage firms, I would appreciate it if he would give it to me. I would like the hon. member to give me his list of Montreal brokerage firms that are refusing to participate. Let him give it to me.

\* \* \*

[English]

**COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY ESTABLISHMENT**

**Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in March of last year the House unanimously voted to recommend the establishment of an independent mechanism to review the operations of the Communications Security Establishment, a Canadian intelligence agency that has no statutory mandate or control.

My question is for the Minister of National Defence. Further to his recent statements on the issue, can he tell the House now what action the government will take to provide greater public scrutiny of the CSE and its operations?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River for his tireless work on this subject and the motion that was passed unanimously in the House a year ago.

The government today has appointed Mr. Claude Bisson, former chief justice of Quebec, under part II of the Inquiries Act, as the first commissioner for the Communications Security Establishment. He will have full access to all materials, records and documentation. He will make an annual report to me as minister which I in turn will make to Parliament.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago a group of small businessmen from the used goods sector sat down with the finance officials to discuss the minister's new tax grabbing, business gutting, job killing changes to the GST.

At that meeting the finance department's taxation tsar informed them that if they wanted to save their own hides from these changes "all you really have to do is get your provinces to harmonize with the GST".

*Oral Questions*

Can the minister say extortion? Why is the finance minister now resorting to strong arm tactics and job killing taxation policies to coerce the provinces into this bogus harmonization plan?

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, that is absolute nonsense. I am glad to see the hon. member finally admits that tax harmonization would lead to far greater job creation, and there is no doubt that it would.

What the Department of Finance is saying is that if the provinces harmonize consumer prices will go down and the cost to small and medium size businesses will go down, which means our exports go up and more jobs are created.

I am delighted to see the hon. member for Medicine Hat has finally seen the light of day. Harmonization creates jobs. Good for him, he finally recognizes it.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, by forcing these people to go along with his plan to get him off the hook for the GST promise he and his government broke, all he is doing is delivering the tax equivalent of a horse head into their collective beds.

Is the finance minister so desperate now to force a harmonization agreement that he is prepared to make these small businesses an offer they cannot refuse if they want to save their industries from job killing taxation measures? Is that real Liberal leadership?

• (1450)

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is not the horse's head that the Reform Party has to worry about.

The Department of Finance is certainly prepared to sit down and work with small and medium size business on this. There would be no attempt to coerce anybody. We want to work out problems. There are problems and members on this side of the House have raised a number. The department is working on the problems. It would be very helpful if the hon. member would try to be as constructive as Liberal members.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**BLOOD SUPPLY**

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

Last week, the minister wanted details about certain flaws in the national blood supply system. Well, here are some. Luc Simon, from Montreal, and other hemophiliacs recently had to send back blood products to the manufacturer, Bayer. These products could not be used, because factor VIII was turbid for reasons which remain obscure, since no report was published to explain this incident, which the minister claimed to ignore.

Considering that Health Canada has a responsibility to do its utmost to ensure that blood products are perfectly safe, from the time blood is collected from a donor until it is administered to a patient, why did hemophiliacs have to use their own initiative to force Bayer to withdraw faulty products?

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, any responsible company that receives complaints from consumers with regard to its products must do investigations. Bayer is investigating those complaints. Health Canada is working with the company and the consumers to examine the nature of the complaints and the extent of them. When the investigations are complete the information will be readily available.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. In order to prevent such incidents from occurring again and reduce the risks for users, will the minister pledge to define a set of rules to be followed in such cases, and will he delegate all safety issues to a single agency to which hemophiliacs could report any problem related to the safety of supplies?

[English]

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I know the question from the hon. member is a serious one, but I wish to inform her there is already in place a regulatory agency, Health Canada, which monitors these kinds of concerns. There are from time to time complaints which consumers will make, and those complaints have to be investigated thoroughly.

If the hon. member is suggesting there are some real substantive shortfalls relating to this product, if she has that evidence I would be happy to receive it and to make certain the investigation is underway and is very thorough.

\* \* \*

**CANADA CUSTOMS**

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, prior to the Sawatzky decision, Canada Customs under the direction of the Canadian Wheat Board seized a number of trucks and property belonging to farmers from the Yorkton—Melville constituency.

Since Mr. Sawatzky was found innocent, it would seem the government no longer has any authority to hold the trucks seized before the government quickly closed the loophole.

My question is for the minister of agriculture. When will these farmers have their private property returned to them?

**Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the issue we are talking about here is a very important one. It is about farmers who, quite frankly, did not obey the law.

The customs officers at the border points have had a difficult time but are handling it in a very professional manner.

• (1455)

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the revenue minister is covering the ag minister's behind here. I think the revenue minister knows the courts found these people innocent. The revenue minister has publicly stated she has no sympathy for farmers who have had their trucks seized. Now she has no respect for court decisions or property rights.

These farmers are being denied the use of their property and the right to due process of law.

When will the minister show some respect for property rights guaranteed these farmers under the Canadian Bill of Rights when it guarantees every Canadian the right to the enjoyment of property and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman made reference to due process of law.

He will know that in the case of the litigation underway in western Canada there have been two conflicting court decisions, one earlier this spring in a case called McMechan and Cairns that went in one direction, and another decision in the Sawatzky case that went in the other direction; both decisions by the same provincial court level. That obviously creates a conundrum in terms of future interpretation. Some of those matters are at this moment under appeal.

I remind the hon. gentleman the appeal process is a part of the due process of law.

\* \* \*

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

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

On page 70 of the red book there is a commitment to Canada's role in the global reduction of greenhouse gases which cause climate change. Our commitment is to reduce carbon dioxide emissions 20 per cent by the year 2005.

Can the Minister of Natural Resources inform the House whether she is on target in delivering on this important promise?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is clarify the exact commitment made by the Government of Canada. We made a commitment at Rio to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000.

#### Oral Questions

The hon. member is right, but in the red book we talk about working with other stakeholders. We talk about working with the provinces, the municipal governments and other important stakeholders to attempt to go beyond stabilization and to reduce greenhouse gases further.

Let me assure the hon. member we are doing just that and NRCan takes its leadership role very seriously in this regard. We run—

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

**Ms. McLellan:** Mr. Speaker, climate change is one of the world's most pressing environmental challenges and the hon. members of the Reform Party do not want to listen.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### NATIONAL DEFENCE

**Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, when everyone thought the government had finally given up the idea of buying four new submarines, and at a time when it cuts blindly in its budgets, yesterday the Liberal majority in the Standing Committee on National Defence adopted, following a proposal by the Reform Party, a motion urging the government to take the necessary steps to immediately buy the four British submarines.

Are we to understand that the government has not given up the idea of wasting hundreds of millions to buy these submarines, and what guarantee can it give that it will not take advantage of the summer recess to secretly earmark hundreds of millions, as it did last year with the armoured vehicles?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has been discussed on and off for some time now.

The hon. member would know if he had paid attention to various press reports that I have stated that the government does not intend to proceed at this time.

\* \* \*

#### JUSTICE

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the justice minister continues to punish the victims of crime. He is forcing them to relive the horrific events surrounding the murder of their children and grandchildren. The pain and suffering these parents have endured and continue to endure as a result of the Liberal sympathetic handling of premeditated killers was evident yesterday in the faces of the emotional words of Debbie Mahaffy, Sharon Rosenfeldt, Steve Sullivan, Darlene Boyd and Joanne Kaplinsky.

*Privilege*

• (1500)

Why does the minister not put an end to their nightmare? Why does the minister not stand up for the victims of crime instead of their killers and repeal section 745 of the Criminal Code?

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is precisely out of sensitivity for the plight of the victims and it is precisely to achieve the underlying objectives of the criminal justice system that the government has put before the House legislation to improve section 745 of the Criminal Code.

The changes will screen out applications to ensure that only those that are meritorious will get before a jury. There are changes to ensure that once the case is before the jury, the shortening of the period of parole ineligibility will occur only when the jury is unanimous. There are changes that will ensure that in the future those convicted of multiple and serial murders will not have the right to apply under any circumstances.

I am glad to know that the hon. member is clearing the way so we can deal with that legislation this week. I urge him and his colleagues to support that legislation so we can improve the criminal law of this country.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH**

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

Today a federal study was released showing that tobacco and alcohol use costs Canadians more than \$17 billion every year. In light of these devastating costs and concerns about huge donations from the alcohol and tobacco lobby to the Liberal Party: \$50,000 from Labatt's; \$46,000 from Imasco, will the minister now commit to bringing in a long overdue bill on tobacco advertising? Will he finally take on the alcohol lobby and support the bill passed in principle earlier in this House on alcohol labelling directed at pregnant mothers?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be aware that a blueprint was issued many months ago and consultations have taken place across the country.

We are now in the process of putting pen to paper for the purposes of writing a document whereby we would take in comprehensive measures to address this very, very important subject matter.

I want to say to the hon. member that we have to deal with the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada which has many charter implications. We are attempting to resolve with the Minister of Justice and others some of the difficulties we have now recognized in order that our comprehensive package will be effective, and also

that it will not be challenged in the courts either by tobacco manufacturing companies or by other individuals.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** We have distinguished guests in the gallery today. We have the honour of welcoming a group of fellow citizens who gained fame in several fields of human activities. These people made a great contribution to their community and they are a credit to our country.

[English]

It is fitting that we have them as guests this week because Friday marks Canada's first National Aboriginal Day, a day for us to celebrate aboriginal culture and native peoples' contributions to this country.

These are men and women of exceptional talent and dedication. They are leaders, pioneers, and symbols of excellence for Canada. I am going to name them and I would like them to stand. I would like members to hold their applause until I have named the recipients of our first National Aboriginal Achievement Awards: Albert Charles Rock; Ambassador Mary May Simon; Robert E. Johnson Jr.; Alwyn Morris; Grand Chief Phil Fontaine; Dr. Marlene Brant Castellano; Rose Auger; Dr. Frank Calder; John Kim Bell; and our colleague, Elijah Harper is also the recipient of this award.

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

• (1505)

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, I have a question of privilege, a notice of a question of privilege and a point of order that I would like to deal with. I will deal first with the notice of question of privilege.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## NOTICE OF QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice of my intention to raise a question of privilege with respect to a decision of the justice and legal affairs committee yesterday.

As you know, Bill C-234 was passed at second reading in this House on December 13, 1994. At yesterday's meeting of the justice and legal affairs committee, the committee voted not to report that bill back to the House.

I wish to give notice to the House, to the government and to any other interested members that I intend to prepare submissions and raise that question of privilege presumably sometime in September when the House reconvenes.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley on a question of privilege.

*Point of Order*

**Ms. Meredith:** Mr. Speaker, I believe that would be in order after the report is tabled.

\* \* \*

**POINT OF ORDER**

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order regarding Questions Nos. 25 and 26 on the Order Paper which have again languished on the Order Paper for 45 days without a response.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware I first introduced this question in the House on December 1, 1994. On June 21, 1995 I raised a first point of order in the House. The then parliamentary secretary to the House leader said: "We will get him the answer. It is nearing completion". The hon. member even added: "I hope he has a long holiday coming up from Parliament so he can sit down and read it when he gets it", but I did not get it.

On October 26, 1995 I again raised a point of order on the delayed response and the same member responded: "Eighty per cent of the questions that have been placed on the Order Paper during this session have been answered". He said the government had been "assiduous in attending to its duties", but I still had no response to my question.

When Parliament returned after prorogation I reintroduced the question, confident that a reply was imminent since the government had led me to believe it was days away from a reply at the end of the session. However, a spokesman for the government House leader's office was quoted in the newspaper as saying that the government would not divert personnel to answer my question since my request was outrageous.

This apparent obstruction of my parliamentary duty prompted me to raise a question of privilege on April 24 in this House. The response of the deputy leader of the government was to assure me, this House and the Chair that the government wanted to answer every question. The chief government whip echoed the sentiment and promised that when the information was available it would be responded to. You, Mr. Speaker, recommended that an attempt should be made by the government to answer these questions as quickly as possible.

• (1510)

Because of these promises, Mr. Speaker, your ruling on May 6, 1996 found that it is very difficult to accept the veracity of the remarks allegedly made by an unidentified person in the government House leader's office. However, after having reviewed all of the papers you did emphasize that the government must in all

respects endeavour to respond to questions, adhering to the spirit of the rule. You also added that written questions posed by members are an important tool at the disposal of members of the House and are used to solicit information as well as to help hold the government accountable for its actions. It is precisely for this reason that members of the ministry are responsible to the House for the actions taken regarding the preparation of responses to these questions.

Despite this clear and forceful recognition of the importance of questions on the Order Paper and the responsibility of ministries, despite the assurances to myself, to the Chair and to the House from the deputy government House leader's office that an answer was forthcoming, despite waiting almost one year since I was told that the answer was nearing completion, I have again waited the requisite 45 days for a response and have yet to receive a reply to my question.

I see a pattern here, Mr. Speaker. On May 6 your ruling was based on assurances that an answer would be made available, and that has not happened. Not only have I been repeatedly misled by indications that my question was to be answered, so has the Chair. Promises, patience and due process have amounted to nothing.

Should I go directly to the Minister of National Revenue and ask that the Income Tax Act be applied to all order in council appointments? Short of this, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 39(5)(a), and in the spirit of your ruling of May 6, 1996, I ask you again to look into the matter to find out why, after a year and one-half, three points of order and a question of privilege I do not have a response from the government to Questions Nos. 25 and 26 on the Order Paper.

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the concerns of the hon. member. As one who is a staunch defender of access to information, I regret this.

May I just say that the parliamentary secretary to the House leader is unavoidably absent from the House. I ask that we continue this point of order in tomorrow's Routine Proceedings so that there may be a proper response from the people who are informed on the issue.

**Mr. Hermanson:** Mr. Speaker, I have raised a similar question. I wonder, if the government is offering to do this, if it would do the same thing for—

**The Speaker:** I will deal with one point of order at a time.

What we have is a request that we postpone this until tomorrow, until the parliamentary secretary can give us a full answer. I believe the House would be willing to wait until tomorrow and would agree to that particular request.

*Routine Proceedings***ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

● (1515)

*[English]***GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS**

**Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 30 petitions.

\* \* \*

**REVIEW OF FINANCIAL SECTOR LEGISLATION**

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table a document entitled the "1997 Review of Financial Sector Legislation; Proposals for Change".

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I can only deplore the delays surrounding the tabling of the white paper on the review of the Bank Act. This report was to be made public in April, and now, at the end of the session, the parliamentary secretary, almost on the sly, rushes in this important report.

You may rest assured that the official opposition will be very vigilant during examination of the provisions of this white paper and the bill that may result from it, because we feel like we are being taken for a ride every time the secretary of state tables something in the House.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I am sorry to have to tell you that the minister was entitled to make a statement following the tabling of these reports. We got a bit ahead of ourselves. The minister has the floor.

\* \* \*

*[English]***FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

**Hon. Douglas Peters (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table a consultation paper on federal financial institutions legislation which presents a series of proposals to safeguard the interests of consumers, to make improvements to the legislative and regulatory environment in which the federal financial institutions operate, and to start the process of fundamental thinking about the framework the sector will require as it moves through times of rapid change into the next century.

Canadians can be proud of having one of the strongest financial systems in the world, a system that is efficient, effective and stable. It offers a good balance between competition and the stability of financial institutions. We want to continue to make sure this is true.

The federal government monitors developments in the financial sector and looks for ways to improve the system. In 1992 many of the restrictions preventing financial institutions from fully competing with each other were removed. The general consensus appears to be that these changes produced positive results.

When the 1992 legislation was passed it was agreed that the legislative framework should be revisited in five years. After extensive consultation and analysis, the government has concluded that the framework established in 1992 should be kept largely intact. There is room, however, for a number of important adjustments to be made.

We want to do the following. We want to strengthen consumer protection. We want to ease the regulatory burden on financial institutions and keep the legislation current with evolving trends. We also want to ensure that we raise our eyes to a broader vision of the future.

We recognize that the financial sector operates in a rapidly changing environment in Canada and abroad. Fundamental questions have been raised by the stakeholders in consultations. These questions, mainly involving the structure of the industry and the role played by financial institutions, must be addressed to ensure that we continue to have a strong and secure financial sector that supports economic growth and job creation.

The issues raised are complex and they must be addressed in a broad context. A task force on the future of the Canadian financial services sector will be established to provide advice to government on public policy issues related to the development of an appropriate framework.

● (1520)

I will ask the task force to consider a number of factors in its deliberations. First, what changes to the framework are necessary to ensure that the financial sector contributes to economic growth and job creation? Second, how can this sector meet the emerging needs of Canadian business and consumers? Third, how to promote competitiveness and efficiency in the sector. Fourth, how to foster innovation. Finally, all of this is done while maintaining the safety and soundness of the Canadian financial system. We will provide further details of the task force mandate and composition in the fall.

Ultimately, the question I want addressed is what should be done to make sure that Canada continues to have one of the best financial systems in the world. The study will shape the next round of amendments to the legislation which the government proposes take place no later than five years after the passage of the 1997 legislation. The government will be counting on this group for



dispassionate advice based on the best interests of the Canadian economy.

This marks an appropriate point to discuss in some detail a set of important proposals in the paper, the proposals to further safeguard the interests of consumers. This is a matter of significance to the government.

We recognize the efforts made by the financial institutions to address privacy concerns over the past few years and plan to build on their successes. We propose to introduce regulations governing the use of consumer information by federal financial institutions.

The government will work with the banks, trust and loan companies to simplify and improve methods of providing information about their fees. Financial institutions will also be required to provide more detailed information about the cost of credit.

We will work with consumer and community groups and with the financial institutions to develop and put in place a strategy to improve the access of low income Canadians to financial services.

The government will also work with stakeholders to determine whether there is a need for new measures protecting consumers from abusive tied selling.

In addition to these significant consumer protection initiatives, the paper contains important initiatives to streamline and clarify regulatory requirements, and to minimize delays when regulatory approvals are required.

The paper also recognizes the importance we attach to reviewing the regulatory structure supporting the payment system. A safe and sound payments system is a vital part of the operations of a modern, sophisticated economy.

The Department of Finance will establish an advisory committee to study payment systems issues. The committee will provide important input to the broader work of the task force on the development of a suitable framework for the financial sector in the 21st century. With regard to the legislative proposals contained in this paper, the government will begin a consultation process. Both the House Standing Committee on Finance and the Senate committee on banking, trade and commerce will hold hearings. I look forward to their input.

I urge hon. members to read this paper and to become familiar with the proposals. I will be pleased to receive comments before we move to legislation in the fall.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Madam Speaker, as I was saying earlier, we in the official opposition can only deplore the many delays surrounding the tabling of the white paper on the review of the Bank Act.

*Routine Proceedings*

We also deplore the fact that the secretary of state is once again turning over the work he should have done over the past year and a half with respect to the review of the Bank Act to select committees, which will probably work behind closed doors, a habit the government took to in the taxation review process and in the scandal surrounding the transfer by family trusts of two billion dollars to the U.S., tax free.

In conclusion, the official opposition will be extremely vigilant when it comes to this important matter of the review of the Bank Act and, in particular, the federal government's respect of provincial jurisdictions, the effects of such a review on the concentration of the financial market, and the real defence of the interests of consumers in Quebec and in Canada. Quebecers and Canadians must and can count on the official opposition, on the Bloc Québécois, to defend their real interests.

[*English*]

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, members of the Reform Party of Canada welcome the opportunity to respond to the minister's long awaited white paper on the review of financial institutions legislation. We all know how important a stable, efficient, competitive and innovative financial system is to a complex economy like Canada's, so the impending review is viewed with a great deal of seriousness.

• (1525)

The four pillars of the financial sector, banking, insurance, trust companies and securities dealers, have crumbled as deregulation and technological progress has blurred the lines of distinction. The banks have been applying pressure ever since to enter into other sectors such as retail insurance, auto leasing and increasing their interest in the securities market.

Further deregulation and the subsequent increase in the size of the banks, however, could reduce competition in the financial sector and hurt consumers.

Reform believes that the protection of the consumer and a more competitive environment are the two key elements that must be addressed in this review. While Canadians acknowledge that we have a strong and stable financial system they are clearly suspicious of the power of some of our institutions.

While we commend the minister for placing the interests of consumers at the top of his list of priorities, we believe that in order to strengthen the confidence of consumers, these issues must remain paramount and the process must be, above all, transparent. Canadians must be able to see the process in order to put faith in it and to be certain that all interests were considered.

A special concern for me is the issue of privacy and how the banks handle confidential personal information. Canadians are extremely concerned about the subsequent use of personal information that they must provide to financial institutions in the course of

*Routine Proceedings*

doing business. I hope that this important issue will be given serious consideration .

Canadians are more knowledgeable about their financial system that many in the industry give them credit for. They realize that banks are more than a place to keep their money or to cash a cheque. This was evident in our party's recent assembly in Vancouver where the grassroots passed the following resolution:

“Resolved that the Reform Party ensure that federal legislation on financial institutions protects Canadians from experiencing a monopoly of financial services by any one sector. Particularly, banks should not be allowed to further enter into the insurance industry or the auto leasing business.

“The Reform Party further recommends that a moratorium be placed on any further, partial deregulation until a thorough review of the entire financial system with the aim of increasing competition within the financial sector. Such a review must also assure the stability of the financial system and retain prudential regulation for the protection of consumers”.

We need to know a good many things. How do financial institutions interact? How do they operate in relation to other sectors of the economy? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current regulatory structure? Not only will these answers reveal whether true competition exists within the banking sector and thus whether they should be allowed to expand into other financial services, the answers will determine the veritable strength of the financial sector as it heads into the 21st century.

As lobbyists from all sides pressure members of Parliament to take sides and others try to frame the issue within the overtly political constraints of a war between big and small business, the challenge will be to keep our eye on the ball, to ensure true competition exists and is free to function within the marketplace, that stability is maintained in the respective financial sectors and a prudent regulatory structure is in place to protect the consumer. If the bottom line is met, Canadians and the Canadian economy will indeed emerge as winners.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

### ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 108, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development.

The committee has examined federal regulations on biotechnology and, in light of the testimony from various witnesses, has unanimously decided in the best interests of all parties concerned that:

[English]

The government defer any decision on the new biotechnology part of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and maintain the existing provisions regarding the Canadian Environmental Protection Act until such time as the committee has completed its study. A government response is requested pursuant to Standing Order 109.

• (1530)

I thank the witnesses who appeared before the committee and our staff and members on all sides who have worked in the spirit of true parliamentary co-operation.

[Translation]

### OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 81, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Joint Standing Committee on Official Languages concerning application of Part VII of the Official Languages Act.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests a comprehensive response to the report within 150 days.

I take this opportunity to thank the various witnesses who appeared before the committee.

\* \* \*

## JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

**Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), your committee has agreed to the first report of the subcommittee on national security.

I also have the honour to present in both official languages the second report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. Pursuant to the order of reference of June 18, 1996, your committee has considered Bill C-45, an act to amend the Criminal Code, judicial review of parole ineligibility, and another act.

Your committee has agreed to report it with out amendments.

*Privilege*

[Translation]

## PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I also have the honour to present the 23rd report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs concerning the evaluation of the pilot project on Part III of the estimates.

[English]

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 24th of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs in relation to consideration by the committee and through its subcommittee on the business of supply on the estimates process.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I rise today on a point of privilege. I feel it is incumbent upon me as a member of Parliament to bring to your attention a matter of the most serious importance.

The following description of events is lengthy and complex but will clearly show that actions taken by the Security Intelligence Review Committee are an affront to the House and amount to the utmost disrespect for Parliament.

Page 123 of the twentieth edition of Erskine May defines contempt as follows:

It may be stated generally that any act or omission which obstructs or impedes either House of Parliament in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any Member or officer of such House in the discharge of his duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such results may be treated as a contempt even though there is no precedent of that offence.

Furthermore, in Joseph Maingot's *Parliamentary Privilege in Canada* contempt respecting documents is defined as follows:

Similarly, should any person present documents to a committee of the House of Commons which have been forged, falsified, or fabricated with intent to deceive such committee or the House, or, to be privy to such forging or fraud, this will constitute contempt of Parliament because it is an obvious affront to the House of Commons to present it with such documents. The House of Commons is not only entitled to but demands the utmost respect when material is placed before it for its scrutiny, investigation or study.

The following description will show that SIRC's actions led directly to the Solicitor General of Canada's unknowingly tabling on December 15, 1994 a report contemptuous of the House.

On December 15, 1994 the SIRC report on the Heritage Front affair was tabled in the House of Commons by the Solicitor General of Canada.

• (1535)

In chapter 8 of the report the following is written: "On October 17, 1989 the service decided to formally investigate the alleged \$45,000 contribution. CSIS said that they could not go back to the informant, as all contacts had ended on December 31, 1988. The service authorized a three month, level one investigation entitled "LNU/FNU (Unknown Contributor(s) to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign)". The service cited section 12, paragraph 2(b) of the CSIS Act as the legal basis for the investigation".

On December 16, 1994 SIRC appeared before the national security subcommittee. I asked the following of SIRC. I quote page 5:32 of the *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence* of the Subcommittee on National Security: "Can you have your officials go back to CSIS and have them examine the hard copy of the original authorization of the level one investigation on the Reform Party and a foreign government, not just the corrected copy? Specifically, can your employees examine the caption on the file?"

SIRC member Michel Robert responded: "About this specific question, the last one, I do not know. I will examine that. I am not in a position to answer now but will certainly look at the files".

In other words, Mr. Robert mentioned nothing about knowing of any name change in the investigation entitled "LNU/FNU (Unknown Contributor(s) to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign)" when the SIRC report on the Heritage Front affair was tabled in the House of Commons on December 15, 1994 by the Solicitor General of Canada.

However, in a letter dated January 27, 1995 from Maurice Archdeacon, executive director of SIRC, Mr. Archdeacon informed the member for Scarborough—Rouge River, the chair of the committee on national security, that the file caption was indeed changed: "The caption she referred to for the targeting authority dated October 17, 1989 was Preston Manning. The caption was revised on March 30, 1990 to state: 'LNU/FNU (Unknown Contributor(s) to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign)'".

On March 30, 1995 the Solicitor General of Canada appeared before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs accompanied by his deputy ministers, including Ward Elcock, the director of CSIS.

Mr. Elcock was asked why SIRC was unaware that the file was originally in Mr. Manning's name. Mr. Elcock's response, according to the *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence* of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, Issue 95, March 30, 1995,

*Privilege*

pages 95:17 and 95:18 was: "I don't know that in fact that SIRC was unaware. I don't know why they would not have put it in their report or would have chosen not to do that. That is SIRC's business and you would have to address that question to SIRC".

After further questioning about whether SIRC knew about the investigation name change, Mr. Elcock went on to say: "My belief is that they did have that information, but I will certainly check that for the hon. member".

The following day, on March 31, 1995, I wrote to the hon. Jacques Courtois, chair of SIRC, asking for clarification of Mr. Elcock's comments of the previous day: "Was any member or employee of SIRC aware that the original TARC investigation launched on October 17, 1989 [was] in the name of Preston Manning and not "LNU/FNU (Unknown Contributor(s) to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign)" when the Heritage Front report was tabled December 9, 1994?"

Mr. Archdeacon responded for Mr. Courtois in a letter dated April 7, 1995. He said in his reply to my letter that contrary to what the SIRC report and committee testimony from SIRC members had led the House to believe, SIRC did indeed know of the investigation's name change at the time of the tabling of the report by the solicitor general: "SIRC staff saw the original title of the targeting authorization as well as the corrected titled and all other documents pertaining to this investigation".

The evidence presented bears witness to the fact that the actions taken by SIRC are in contempt of the House. SIRC deliberately omitted from its December, 1994 report the fact that the name of one of CSIS's investigations was originally entitled "Preston Manning".

• (1540)

For whatever reason, the caption of the TARC investigation was changed to "LNU/FNU (Unknown Contributor(s) to Preston Manning's Electoral Campaign)" two months after the expiration of the investigation.

These facts are by any measure crucial and their absence from the report is inexplicable and deliberately contemptuous. The actions taken by SIRC amount to an attempt to mislead a minister of the crown and to obstruct the House by offering admittedly incomplete information.

This should have been the conclusion of my question of privilege, as the evidence is clear. However, over the past two months SIRC and CSIS have provided new information that is completely contrary with their own evidence to this point.

In a letter sent to CSIS on November 9—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Could the hon. member please be brief and show the House how her privilege in the House has been breached.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I am trying to but the evidence is on record in minutes of meetings. I would like to bring it to the attention of the House. The Solicitor General of Canada has been mislead and tabled a report that is misleading to the House. If I may continue, Madam Speaker?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Does the hon. member consider that her privileges have been breached?

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I do I am trying to outline the reasons and the evidence that support that breach.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I remind the hon. member to please be brief.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, in a letter sent to CSIS on November 9, 1995 the subcommittee asked questions about the caption on October 17, 1989 targeting authority, originally entitled "Preston Manning".

Among the many questions asked were: "How was a caption change made on the form 4002? Was the original form altered or was the original form destroyed and a new backdated and reinitialled form created?" The subcommittee also asked questions about the November 10, 1989 transit slip, form 3040, from the chief of counter-intelligence, general desk, to the general director of counter-intelligence.

Specifically, questions were asked about item five of the form which stated: "Caption is considered appropriate under policy provisions". Among questions asked were: "Can you provide the subcommittee with an explanation of this assertion in light of the fact that at the time the caption read 'Preston Manning' and was not changed until March 30, 1990? If the caption was"—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** This is the second time I am asking the hon. member to please point out immediately how the point she is raising occurred.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I did not realize there was any limit on a question of privilege.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Can the hon. member put forth her question of privilege now.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I am trying to put forward my question of privilege. If you want—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The House will now resume with presentation of committee reports.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

**Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade in relation to small and medium size enterprises and their access to export markets.

\* \* \*

### PRIVILEGE

#### SECURITY INTELLIGENCE REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I wish to point out that in my two and a half years here I have heard many questions of privilege. Each member has been given the courtesy, the time, the respect and the silence to present their question of privilege.

Members of both the government and the other party are concerned about the length, although it was never brought up before. I do not think the power of the Chair is being applied fairly and evenly. I would expect the Chair to interpret the rules on our behalf in the same way as was done for previous members. We should be given the same respect. I feel that our colleagues should be able to—

• (1545)

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The Chair applies the rules equally, period.

We will now return to Orders of the Day.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I would like to know where in our rules there is a time limit on a point of privilege and why I have been denied my privilege of giving the evidence to support my point of privilege.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The Chair has ruled. You had limited time and I have asked you, at least twice, to be direct and to point out in a succinct way your point of privilege.

We will now go to Orders of the Day.

**Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge):** Madam Speaker, I rise with respect to a matter of privilege in the House. It is stated very clearly in Beauchesne's that one of the responsibilities of the Speaker on a matter of privilege is that the Speaker must carefully hear the total story with respect to the privilege so that a judgment can be made whether a question of privilege exists. In order to do that, full and detailed information must be provided.

### Privilege

The hon. member who is making the presentation has to go into the details of the matter in order to completely describe the point of privilege. I know that in her presentation so far she has presented some of the preliminary information, but has not clearly indicated what the privilege is.

Madam Speaker, I refer you to citation 26(3) of Beauchesne's where it states:

When a question of privilege is raised the Speaker's function is limited to deciding whether the matter is of such a character as to entitle the motion, which the Member who has raised the question desires to move—

That means you must look at it in its entirety. Therefore, I would appreciate the Speaker's reconsideration.

**Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, under the rules the Chair has to be satisfied on a number of issues. First, notice has to be given to the Chair describing briefly the essence of the point of privilege. The Chair will decide whether that has been properly done. The exception is if the event occurred as a result of something that was going on during the current deliberations of the House, in other words, immediately prior to the raising of the question of privilege.

As I understand it, this is an event which occurred in a committee. We do not have before the House a report from that committee in which the committee itself alleges that there was a contempt. None of that was produced before the House, except a long speech by a member before the House and before Madam Speaker today, without satisfying in a brief way and in the customary manner, what the question of privilege was.

Citation 114 of Beauchesne talks about raising a point of privilege and citation 865 tells us the procedure to be utilized when such a point refers to the proceedings of a committee.

If something is generated from a committee, it seems to me that we should have before the House a report from that committee which attests to the fact that there has been such a breach and then the House can judge on the contents of the report which makes that allegation.

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I will be very brief. Standing Order 48(1), which covers this question, states very clearly that a written statement shall be given to the Speaker one hour prior to making the point of privilege, which was done, as I understand it.

• (1550)

The rest of the procedure is contained in the custom of this Chamber. The custom of the Chamber is that the statement must be brief when it is presented to the House. I presume that the hon. member would be brief in presenting the statement.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I will go back to the question of privilege from the hon. member, requesting for a

*Routine Proceedings*

third time that from the start she demonstrates how her privileges were breached; from the start.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, are you asking that I start over? You said from the start.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I am reminding the hon. member for the fourth time this afternoon that when she rose on a question of privilege that from the minute she starts talking, she points out immediately how her privileges were breached.

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, my privilege was breached when information was provided to a committee of the House of Commons that was incorrect. That information is documented and I will provide written copies of what I would have said so that the Speaker can go through it for the evidence.

The information that was provided to the committee a year ago was contradicted by the same individuals one year later. The information that they provided to the committee showed that the report which has just been tabled in the House of Commons is inaccurate, that it deliberately has information in it that is not true, that documents have been changed and falsified to support the report that is in the House.

It is a breach of my privileges and is a breach of the privileges of all members in the House of Commons when the information that is provided to us as members of Parliament is not treated with the respect that is due.

I would like permission of the members of this House to table the comments I would have made had I been given the time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Do we have unanimous consent of the House for the tabling of the documents?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** We do not have unanimous consent.

The statement just made by the hon. member contains pretty serious charges. The Chair will accept clear documents to prove her point. The Chair will consider these documents and come back to the hon. member. You have 30 seconds to wrap up your case.

● (1555)

**Ms. Meredith:** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity for me to at least provide this information to the Table and to the Speaker for their review. I am very disappointed that this House has denied me the opportunity to present my position, my concern and what should be the concern of the total House.

I want to go on record as being outraged at being prevented from giving my side of the story.

[Translation]

**WHISTLE BLOWERS PROTECTION ACT**

**Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-318, an act respecting the protection of whistle blowers and to amend certain other acts in consequence thereof.

He said: Madam Speaker, the bill I am introducing today has two objectives. The first is to encourage federal public servants to disclose any actions or institutional practices which would constitute an offence under a public service act or directive or would represent a risk to health, safety or the environment, or a significant waste of public funds.

The second objective, which sets the framework for the first, protects federal public servants against reprisals by their employer for any whistle blowing that takes place under this bill.

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

\* \* \*

[English]

**CONSUMER PACKAGING AND LABELLING ACT**

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-319, an act to amend the Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act (recombinant hormones).

She said: Madam Speaker, basically this bill states that no prepackaged food product shall be sold that contains an ingredient derived from an animal to which a prescribed recombinant hormone has been administered unless that product has applied to it a label containing a declaration of this information.

Recombinant growth hormone or rBGH is a genetically engineered hormone sold by Monsanto Chemical Corporation. Dairy cows injected with rBGH every two weeks produce 10 to 20 per cent more milk than untreated cows.

Since Canadians have yet to be assured that the use of the recombinant growth hormone injections into dairy cows is safe for humans and animals, it is up to elected legislators to make sure laws protect the consumer.

Therefore, if Health Canada issues a notice of compliance to Monsanto, Canadians must know if the milk and milk products they are buying contain the recombinant growth hormone. It is with concern for all Canadians, especially women and children who are major milk drinkers, that this bill is put forward.

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

• (1600 )

## COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

### SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON A CODE OF CONDUCT

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the Special Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct has not been able to complete the work that was expected of it by the end of this month. Accordingly, there have been discussions and I believe you would find consent for the following motion:

That, in relation to the order of references adopted by the Senate on March 21, and by the House of Commons on March 12, 1996, the House extends the reporting date of the Special Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct to Friday, November 29, 1996, and that a message be sent to the Senate requesting that House to unite with this House for this purpose.

Madam Speaker, I should say that in this respect the committee is in the course of preparing a draft of its report. I fully anticipate that a rough draft of its report will be available for distribution to members of the committee before the end of August so that in autumn caucus meetings the matter may be discussed further. We then anticipate meeting, completing the work and tabling a report in the House in due course and before November 29.

(Motion agreed to.)

\* \* \*

## PETITIONS

### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have the privilege to present on behalf of constituents in Ottawa West and other ridings throughout this region a petition opposing the inclusion of sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act.

### WARTIME MERCHANT NAVY

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have a further petition to present on behalf of people primarily from British Columbia who point out that the wartime merchant navy was the fourth arm of the armed services. They call upon Parliament to consider the advisability of extending benefits or compensation to the veterans of the wartime merchant navy equal to that enjoyed by veterans of Canada's World War II armed services.

### TAXATION

**Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have a final petition calling on Parliament to eliminate tax discrimination against those who choose to provide care in the home for preschool children, the disabled, the chronically ill and the aged.

## Routine Proceedings

### PROCEEDS FROM CRIME

**Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I too have a number of petitions which I would like to present today.

The first petition is from constituents in Steinbach and St. Pierre. They call to the attention of this House that the current laws do not prohibit criminals from profiting through crime from such things as copyright, books and movies. They pray and petition Parliament to enact Bill C-205 presented by the member for Scarborough West.

### PORT OF CHURCHILL

**Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the second petition is signed by constituents of my constituency from the community of Tolstoi. They draw the attention of the House to the fact that the full utilization of the port of Churchill will improve the life of rural Canadians, particularly western Canadians and that the Russians want this port utilized. They call upon Parliament to exercise its rights in transportation to include 5 per cent of the transported wheat out of Canada through that port.

### MINING

**Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I also have a petition from a number of constituents regarding mining. They call to the attention of this House the need to increase the investment and tax rules to make mining and exploration more profitable in Canada.

### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the final petition, having to do with sexual orientation, is signed by a number of my constituents in Niverville. They call upon this House not to pass any amendments to the human rights act or the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms in this respect.

[Translation]

### GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT

**Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure of submitting a petition signed by 480 constituents in my riding of Bourassa.

The signatories raise the issue of the serious hold ups which occur when retired persons apply for the guaranteed income supplement, or for its renewal. They suggest steps the government could take to solve these problems, which impact particularly on those whose retirement income is lowest. I support this petition.

• (1605 )

[English]

### PROCEEDS FROM CRIME

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have a petition with 439 signatures. The petitioners observe that since Canadian law does not now prohibit convicted

*Routine Proceedings*

criminals from profiting from the sale of books, movies and videos, et cetera, they therefore ask the House to support Private Members' Bill C-205, an act to amend the Criminal Code and the Copyright Act, to ensure that these criminals do not profit from their crimes.

## DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition which is signed by residents of my constituency of Burnaby—Kingsway. The petition was co-ordinated by Step by Step Enterprises of Kingsway and voices concern about the federal policy of mandatory supervision. It notes concern about high risk violent offenders and that the protection of our citizens must be the highest priority of Parliament and Canada's criminal justice system.

The petitioners urge that Parliament change the law to ensure high risk offenders are detained past the end of their sentence where protection of the public requires such action; that we extend BC's dangerous offender tracking system across the country, ensuring such offenders are monitored coast to coast; that we set longer sentences for criminal harassment or stalking. Finally, the petitioners urge that violent young offenders be tried in adult court.

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have a petition from citizens of Peterborough who are concerned about the resolution that the House received from the province of Newfoundland and Labrador to change the denominational school system in that province.

The legislature of Newfoundland passed a resolution calling for a constitutional amendment to remove the rights of denominational classes of persons to operate their own schools following a provincial referendum. These petitioners pray and request that Parliament not amend the Constitution as requested by the Government of Newfoundland and refer the problem of educational reform to that province and back to the Government of Newfoundland.

## PROCEEDS FROM CRIME

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have two petitions which I will summarize together, also from the citizens of Peterborough, concerning the profits made by criminals.

Currently Canadian law does not prohibit convicted criminals from profiting financially from writing books, setting up 1-900 numbers and producing videos, et cetera. Therefore, the petitioners pray that Parliament enact Bill C-205 introduced by the member for Scarborough West at the earliest opportunity so as to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have two petitions. The first one is from Emily township and deals with term 17, the Newfoundland school issue.

## AIDS

**Mr. John O'Reilly (Victoria—Haliburton, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, my second petition is from residents of Victoria—Haliburton and calls on Parliament to renew the commitment to the National AIDS Strategy to at least its current level of funding.

## COD FISHERY

**Mr. George S. Baker (Gander—Grand Falls, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have a petition signed by 39,550 people from 114 communities in Newfoundland and Labrador.

The petitioners ask the federal government to either open a food recreation fishery for cod in Newfoundland and Labrador on the same terms as that announced for Quebec, the maritimes and St. Pierre et Miquelon. Or, if the federal government refuses to treat everybody the same on the east coast of Canada, then to cancel the food recreation cod fishery for Quebec and the maritimes and to terminate the agreement the federal government has with France allowing a recreational cod fishery in the waters around St. Pierre et Miquelon.

The petitioners do not want an answer to this petition. All they want is action from the government.

## UNPASTEURIZED CHEESE

**Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my pleasure to present a petition from 170 of my constituents. They pray and request that Parliament direct Health Canada to amend its proposal in order to allow the production and sale of unpasteurized cheese to continue in Canada.

## PROCEEDS FROM CRIME

**Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have a further petition. Some 25 petitioners pray that Parliament enact Bill C-205 introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West at the earliest opportunity so as to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

## HEALTH AND DENTAL BENEFITS

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have two petitions to present to the House today on behalf of my constituents.

The first one asks Parliament to not implement a tax on health and dental benefits and to put a hold on 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.



• (1610)

THE JUDICIARY

**Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the second petition asks Parliament to conduct a full public inquiry into the relationships between lending institutions and the judiciary and to enact legislation restricting the appointment of judges with ties to credit granting institutions. The petitioners are concerned about the practice of charging loan interest in advance.

THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have three petitions to present on behalf of residents of Souris—Moose Mountain and Regina. The petitioners call upon the government not to support the Newfoundland school issue.

BOVINE GROWTH HORMONE

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I have several petitions which I wish to present. They contain approximately 4,000 signatures from all across Canada. The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that Canadian consumers are against the legalization of rBGH for injection into dairy cows.

PEDOPHILE REGISTRY

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present two petitions on behalf of my constituents of Calgary North.

The first petition has nearly 500 signatures and asks for the establishment of a pedophile registry.

THE SENATE

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the second petition calls for an elected Senate.

PROCEEDS FROM CRIME

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present today from my constituents.

The first petition calls upon Parliament to enact Bill C-205 introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West at the earliest opportunity so as to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

UNSOLICITED MAIL

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP):** Madam Speaker, the second petition requests that the federal minister responsible for Canada Post consider bringing in legislation requiring all unsolicited mail and flyers to use recyclable materials and post consumer fibre and to amend the Canada Post act so that Canada Post would have to comply with “no flyer” signs at personal

*Routine Proceedings*

residences, with the exception of material from political parties and charities.

PROCEEDS FROM CRIME

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, it is my honour and privilege to table today, pursuant to Standing Order 36, petitions from residents of the riding of Bruce—Grey. The petitions have to do with proceeds from crime.

The petitioners pray that Parliament enact Bill C-205 introduced by the hon. member for Scarborough West at the earliest opportunity so as to provide in Canadian law that no criminal profits from committing a crime.

ABORTION

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I have a large number of petitions to present. I have grouped them into four categories. The first group contains 64 petitions signed by 1,424 concerned Canadians primarily from the provinces of Saskatchewan and Ontario.

The petitioners wish to draw to the attention of Parliament that over 100,000 therapeutic abortions are performed each year in Canada at a cost of over \$50 million per year. Since Canadians deserve a say in how our scarce health care dollars are spent and which health care procedures they consider essential, the petitioners call upon Parliament to support a binding national referendum to be held at the time of the next general election to determine whether or not Canadians are in favour of federal government funding for abortion on demand.

HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the next group contains 67 petitions signed by 937 Canadians from Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

The petitioners are opposed to the inclusion of the term sexual orientation in the Canadian Human Rights Act. The petitioners feel that homosexuals are already protected by law and that the inclusion of that term would only lead to special rights for homosexuals.

BOVINE GROWTH HORMONE

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I am also presenting a petition opposing the approval of the synthetic bovine growth hormone known as rBGH or BST. The petition has 35 signatures representing constituents from my riding of Yorkton—Melville.

The petitioners call on Parliament to stop the use and sale of rBGH in Canada until the year 2000. The petitioners also ask that an independent study be conducted to examine the effects of the drug in order to answer some serious health and economic concerns.

*Routine Proceedings*

## THE CONSTITUTION

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, the last group of petitions which I wish to present contains seven petitions signed by 97 people of Yorkton—Melville.

The petitioners pray that Parliament not amend the Constitution to remove the rights of denominational schools. They ask Parliament to refer the problem of educational reform back to the government in Newfoundland and not to set a precedent for other provinces.

## WARTIME MERCHANT NAVY

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today on behalf of constituents from British Columbia's lower mainland, including many from the Canadian Merchant Navy Association in my riding of New Westminster—Burnaby.

• (1615)

The petitioners call upon Parliament to consider the advisability of extending benefits or compensation to veterans of the wartime merchant navy equal to those enjoyed by veterans of Canada's World War II armed services.

Fewer than 3,000 of these veteran merchant seamen are asking the Minister of Veterans Affairs to recognize their past service and extend benefits enjoyed by other wartime veterans.

\* \* \*

## QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 20, 21, 22, 23 and 38.

[Text]

Question No. 20—**Mr. Rocheleau:**

Can the Minister of Human Resources Development indicate what recommendations were made by the committee analysing the restructuring of service points in Quebec, on the advisability of locating the regional Human Resource Centre of Canada in Shawinigan or Trois-Rivières?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** All Department of Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) points of service were studied during 1994 and 1995 as part of the review of government spending announced in the 1994 and 1995 budgets. A committee was established in each of HRDC's 10 regions to review all points of service and recommend a new service delivery structure.

The committees considered all relevant factors in forming their recommendations, and all recommendations were subsequently approved by the Minister of Human Resources Development.

As a result of the committees' recommendations, HRDC's new service delivery structure will have 308 offices across Canada, some of which will be administrative centres. Quebec will have a total of 78 offices, of which 28 will be administrative centres.

The Quebec regional committee recommended that HRDC's administrative centre for the Mauricie be situated in Shawinigan. The committee chose Shawinigan because this location provided the opportunity to share space and services with Revenue Canada, thus meeting the government's objective of reducing costs and ensuring the least possible effect on HRDC client service resources.

The committee used the same approach for the Saguenay-Lac St-Jean area, where it chose Jonquières as the site for HRDC's administrative centre because the regional taxation data centre was already there.

Question No. 21—**Mr. Rocheleau:**

Can the Minister of Human Resources Development indicate whether representations or interventions were made by officers, employees or other persons from the Privy Council Office or the Office of the Prime Minister to officers, employees or officials from Human Resources Development Canada, in order to ensure that the regional Canada Human Resources Centre would be located in a municipality in the constituency of Saint-Maurice, rather than Trois-Rivières, and, if so, who were the persons who intervened, and what reasons were given for the move?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** To the best of the department's knowledge, no representations were made to officials of the department by political staff from the Prime Minister's office or personnel from the Privy Council.

Question No. 22—**Mr. Rocheleau:**

Can the Minister of Human Resources Development Canada indicate whether, as part of its restructuring of service points in Quebec, Human Resources Development Canada carried out comparative studies on the advisability of locating the regional Canada Human Resources Centre in Shawinigan or in Trois-Rivières and, if so, what were the findings of those studies?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** In the organization of the Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) service delivery network, the important element was maintaining high quality service for clients. The committee recommended four Human Resource Centres of Canada (HRCC) be located in various areas of the Mauricie region—Trois-Rivières, Shawinigan, Louiseville and La Tuque.

The location of the administrative centre had to be put in a place that was accessible to all offices and that offered the best opportunity for realizing savings in overhead.

The taxation data centre in South Shawinigan met these requirements as it is centrally located in the region and is a federally owned building. In addition to maximizing utilization of Government of Canada space, this choice enables the department to continue the reduction of costs by sharing services, systems and resources with other departments. The Mauricie region has no other Government of Canada sites that offer similar advantages.

The committee also discussed establishing the administrative centre in Trois-Rivières, primarily because of the department's existing lease commitments in the area. Given the lease expiry date (1999) and the need to plan for longer term reductions that were set for the Quebec region, it was obvious that administrative resources had to be concentrated, as soon as possible, in sites that were owned by Government of Canada. The location of the administrative centre for the Mauricie region in Shawinigan will enable the department to save a minimum of \$3.7 million over the next 10 years.

#### Question No. 23—Mr. Rocheleau:

Can the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Human Resources Development indicate the rent and rent-related costs of the Human Resources Development Canada premises in the Bourg-du-Fleuve building on rue des Forges in Trois-Rivières, as compared with the anticipated costs of that department's moving to, arranging, and settling into new premises to be located in the Shawinigan area according to the government's plan?

**Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Further to the federal government's mandate to reduce space and accommodation costs, Human Resources Development Canada (HRDC) is proposing to combine and relocate the Trois-Rivières and Shawinigan Human Resource Centres, the Réseau Office, the InfoCentre and Unemployment Insurance Telecentre to the Shawinigan-Sud Fiscal Centre on April 1, 1997. The relocation provides the opportunity to share space and services with Revenue Canada which is currently located in the Fiscal Centre.

The relocation to Shawinigan-Sud results in a requirement for reduced space at a combined annual rent of \$490,451.00 (a saving of \$386,279.42 per year over the current rental costs). All fit-up, moving and renovation costs are estimated to be \$633,180.00; however, the long-term savings will offset these costs to the Government of Canada. Please see chart shown below for breakdown of costs and savings.

Office Location	Current Space m <sup>2</sup>	Estimated Space m <sup>2</sup>	Annual Rent Current	Annual Rent Estimated	Relocation Costs \$
CEC * Bourg du Fleuve Trois-Rivières	1,627.90	584.63	\$399,121.86	\$126,926.00	**
Réseau Bourg du Fleuve Trois-Rivières	884.80	0.00	\$224,989.55	\$0.00	\$0.00
CSC Bourg du Fleuve Trois-Rivières	198.70	0.00	\$48,185.69	\$0.00	\$0.00

#### Routine Proceedings

Office Location	Current Space m <sup>2</sup>	Estimated Space m <sup>2</sup>	Annual Rent Current	Annual Rent Estimated	Relocation Costs \$
UIT 100 Lafontaine St. Chicoutimi	58.34	0.00	\$11,875.96	\$0.00	\$0.00
UIT 2014, Boul Charest Quebec	355.53	0.00	\$45,730.36	\$0.00	\$0.00
CEC 395 de la Station Shawinigan	908.30	0.00	\$146,827.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
HRCC Fiscal Centre Shawinigan	0.00	1,965.00	\$0.00	\$363,525.00	\$633,180.00
Total	4,033.57	2,549.63	\$876,730.42	\$490,451.00	\$780,507.30
Annual Savings (Current—Estimated)		m <sup>2</sup> 1,483.94		\$386,279.42	

Note: \* An HRCC (staff complement of 25-40) will remain in operation in Trois-Rivières.

\*\* This figure reflects the downsizing of that office for the remaining staff.

#### Question No. 38—Mr. McClelland:

With respect to the government's potential \$ 1.5 billion liability to settle pay equity complaints dating back to 1984: (a) what provisions has the government made to fund this potential liability going back 12 years, to 1984 and (b) how are private sector compensation and benefit levels for persons performing similar functions factored into the Treasury Board's evaluation when considering "equal pay for work of equal value" in the public service?

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** (a) In the 1995 budget, cabinet instructed the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Justice to negotiate a settlement with the Public Service Alliance of Canada (PSAC) on terms similar to the agreement with the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC). Funds have been set aside to resolve pay equity complaints and any overlap will be offset through reallocations as per the expenditure management system regulations.

(b) The legislation does not require the government to consider the wages paid in the outside labour market for similar occupations. Equal pay for work of equal value focuses on the compensation and benefits relationship of male and female workers who are performing work of equal value within the same establishment. Pay equity is about internal equity.

[English]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** The questions as enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

*Supply*

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I wish to inform the House that, because of the ministerial statements, Government Orders will be extended today by 12 minutes.

It is my duty, under 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 Burnaby—Kingsway—fisheries; the hon. member for New Westminster—Burnaby—hazardous waste.

\* \* \*

[English]

**MOTIONS FOR PAPERS**

**Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**SUPPLY**

## ALLOTTED DAY—CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.)** moved:

That this House urge the government to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to include a special two year opting out provision permitting those prairie producers who believe they are missing market opportunities the flexibility and choice to market their wheat and barley outside the jurisdiction of the board.

He said: Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to move the motion in the House today that this House urge the government to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to include a special two year opting out provision permitting those prairie producers who believe they are missing market opportunities the flexibility and choice to market their wheat and barley outside the jurisdiction of the board.

The Canadian agriculture sector has proven over the years that it is prepared for the challenges it faces. We have seen this in the past and we will continue to see it in the future. If there is a need for a disease resistant breed or variety of seed, Canadians develop it. If there is a need for better farm equipment, Canadians invent it. If there is a need for an irrigation system, Canadians build it. If there is a need for more soil nutrients, Canadians apply them. If there is a need to produce more food, Canadians work harder and longer.

There have always been doubters and naysayers when it comes to agriculture in Canada. When Palliser was surveying the prairies in the 1800s he said the land in southern Saskatchewan and Alberta was too poor and dry for farming. Today that land has turned into a bread basket for the world. Why? Because farmers saw the potential.

Today the doubters are saying we cannot grow this type of wheat because the growing season is too short, or we cannot produce grains from the land because it is vulnerable to wind erosion when it is cultivated, or we cannot water our stock because it is too dry. Canadian know-how has resulted in the development of varieties that mature more quickly, the invention of no till drills to combat erosion, and the development of some of the best irrigation systems in the world. Apply a little Canadian ingenuity to a problem and 99 times out of 100, Canadians can fix the problem.

● (1620)

Therefore why does the minister of agriculture listen to all the negative whiners who cry that the Canadian Wheat Board will be destroyed if prairie farmers have a choice as to whether they market their own wheat and barley through the Canadian Wheat Board or outside of the board? Frankly, I do not know the reason other than the obvious conclusion that they have no confidence in the board which is a conclusion I do not share.

I could focus my speech on the past and in great detail explain past shortcomings and failures of the board, such as the creation of the board as a wartime act to keep prices to producers low, or how the board literally missed the boat on barley sales last year, or how the board fails to serve niche markets adequately. In all fairness, others could point to the successes of the board, such as large sales of wheat to communist China, the former Soviet Union and Brazil.

The point and purpose of this debate is not to see which side of the ledger can chalk up the most impressive total. The purpose of this debate is twofold. We need to ask and answer the questions: Can dual marketing work in the Canadian prairies? Should producers be compelled against their will to market wheat and barley through a state run marketing agency? This is the crux of the matter. This is at the root of the debate that is gripping the prairies at the current time. It is important that this House come to grips with those two questions.

I want to address the question of whether or not a dual market will work. A functional dual market in Canada is a workable and viable option. Just to define what a dual market is, it really means the right or the ability to market in a pooled account where farmers share together the proceeds from the sale of that grain or to market their produce individually, either through a marketing agency such as the Canadian Wheat Board or outside of that directly on a cash for purchase or cash sale basis.

Dual marketing could be accomplished in Canada. It would be far more easy to accomplish that than it was to put a human on the moon, or to split an atom, or to get an NHL hockey team for Saskatchewan, or perhaps even a bit facetiously, to get a winning team here in Ottawa.

We currently have dual marketing for feed grains. It is a matter of fact. Farmers have the option to go through the board to market their feed grain or they can do it independently from the board. There has been a dual market for barley in the past. On August 1, 1993 the Government of Canada removed from the control of the Canadian Wheat Board the sole authority over barley sold into the United States.

Although a continental barley market was a short lived 40 days, it showed that a dual market system was in fact viable. During those 40 days it was estimated that between 500,000 and one million tonnes of barley were sold into the United States. Prior to this 40 day record level of sales, the most feed barley the Canadian Wheat Board ever previously sold in one entire year was 240,821 tonnes and the average annual sales were close to a mere 98,000 tonnes. While other factors played into the increased barley sales to the U.S., such as the severe weather, it still illustrated the important market for prairie barley in the United States.

There is also a form of dual marketing in Australia under the Australian wheat board. This is not a concept that has not been proven and tried. The domestic grain market in Australia is now deregulated. The Australian wheat board pricing options offer a range of pools for wheat and other grains. It also offers forward contracts for a fixed price or a minimum price requiring active involvement in overseas futures markets. With Australia's move toward a deregulated system, the Australian wheat board has assumed many of the characteristics of private grain traders in the services that it offers to its suppliers and customers. As well, the greater flexibility of the operations of the Australian wheat board has increased the commercial orientation of grain growers.

Can a dual grain marketing system work in Canada? I believe the answer is yes. There is no doubt that some reforms to the Canadian Wheat Board Act will be required. This is not a negative option but a constructive one. The board needs to be reformed regardless of whether or not grain marketing moves to a dual system.

Should farmers be able to opt in and out of the board at will? This is a question I hear debated across the prairies from the grain elevators to farm meetings that I have attended. Maybe or maybe not.

Today's motion simply calls for producers who wish to market outside of the board to have that choice for two years. We are not talking about opting in or out. We are talking about producers

### *Supply*

opting out and staying out for two years, out altogether, no holds barred. It would be a test case allowing both sides in the argument a chance to prove their point. If dual marketing works, let it continue.

● (1625 )

The minister has not allowed a prairie-wide plebiscite to decide this issue. Having broken his promise on this issue, I urge him to save face and allow the simply worded plebiscite: Do you want to continue having the choice to voluntarily opt out of the Canadian Wheat Board for a two-year period voted upon at the expiry of the first two years?

There was a plebiscite on this issue but it was not initiated by the minister of agriculture or the current government. It was initiated by the province of Alberta. I believe some of my colleagues from the province of Alberta will elaborate on whether or not farmers knew what the question meant, what it actually stood for, and what the consequences of a yes or a no vote would mean.

In that plebiscite the participation was high. Nearly 16,000 farmers cast their votes, a far greater number than in the vote for the advisory board elections which were held a couple of years previous to that. These are the percentages of producers who wanted marketing choice, to be able to market outside of the Canadian Wheat Board: barley producers were 66 per cent and wheat producers were 62 per cent.

Members opposite could say that is just Alberta and not all of the prairies. The province of Saskatchewan also initiated a poll which surveyed Saskatchewan producers. Saskatchewan is a province that strongly supports the Canadian Wheat Board. I want it on record in the House that I support the Canadian Wheat Board.

The first question asked whether or not the participants in the survey supported the board. About 80 per cent of the respondents said that they did support the Canadian Wheat Board.

They were also asked: Does the Canadian Wheat Board generally get the highest prices for Saskatchewan producers? Forty-three per cent said yes and 47 per cent said no. Saskatchewan producers were divided on whether or not they thought the Canadian Wheat Board got them the very best prices available.

They were also asked if they agreed that participation in the Canadian Wheat Board should be made voluntary, which is what we are talking about today in terms of whether we should permit dual marketing. Fifty-eight per cent said that participation in the Canadian Wheat Board should be made voluntary. This was in the province of Saskatchewan, the province that the minister of agriculture resides in. Thirty-six per cent disagreed. We now have the minority ruling the majority. The 36 per cent group has its way and the 58 per cent group of Saskatchewan producers surveyed is being left out in the cold.

*Supply*

Other questions in the survey included the level of support for allowing the direct sale of grain to a domestic food market. I outlined the scenario which occurred in Australia. About 70 per cent offered support for the concept of dual marketing at the domestic level. If they asked about a continental market, in other words a dual market into the United States, support dropped. In Saskatchewan it was about 50 per cent. Half of producers wanted to be able to market directly into the United States outside of the board and the other half did not.

The last question I will put on record was the question: Should the federal government have less control and influence over the Canadian Wheat Board? That is another whole subject. A resounding 67 per cent of respondents felt the federal government should have less of a hold over the Canadian Wheat Board. Only 25 per cent of the respondents disagreed with that position.

It seems clear there is growing support in the prairies for the concept of a voluntary nature to marketing wheat and barley. The minister of agriculture on several occasions has stated that once there is a dual grade marketing system we cannot go back. He has mentioned that in this very House. Can the minister supply the evidence that would support his claim? I believe the minister is more interested in maintaining and expanding his empire than allowing farmers the option to market their own grain as they see fit.

Are farmers prepared to meet the challenges of marketing their grain independently from the Canadian Wheat Board? The unequivocal answer is yes. Can dual marketing work? Again the answer is yes. Let us at least try it.

This leads me to the second question I asked earlier: Should producers be compelled against their will to market wheat and barley through a state run marketing agency? The answer to that question is obvious. It should be no. It is not morally right and perhaps it is not even constitutional. The case has never come before the courts because the wheat board has used delaying tactics to prevent dealing with this issue.

Let me use a hypothetical case to prove my point. What if all of the authors in Canada had to market their books through a state run publisher? I can hear the argument the state run publisher would use to support his existence: "A single book seller will get the highest price. There is no way a mere author could know who wants to buy his or her books, so he would be at the mercy of the multinational publishers who would underprice his book. There would never be any censorship, even if the book blasted the state run publisher or the government that controlled it. Trust me".

• (1630)

They would say: "By the way, we will sell your hard cover, illustrated, well written book and we will sell that cheap paperback

novel to the customers and then we will average the return and give you half the proceeds after we subtract our selling commission and shipping and handling costs. Oh, no, we must not tell you what our costs are. That may give those other cheap shot publishers some sort of an unfair advantage. An advance? Oh, no, not an advance, not until the first books hit the stores. We will settle up after the final copy has been sold, both yours and the cheap paperbacks".

Members know full well that Canadian authors would scream at 100 decibels if they were subjected to such an unreasonable marketing scheme for their product. Yet farmers are branded as greedy and ignorant if they question the monopoly powers of a single desk seller.

Farmers realize their wheat or barley is not really their property. Farmers realize they have to share the return of their labour in a pool account with other producers. Nobody lets them share the cost of producing these commodities. That is never considered.

Some farmers protest. They are scorned by the minister. They are harassed by Canada Customs and the RCMP. If need be, the law is quickly changed to keep them in check.

The rigidity of the Liberal government is making martyrs out of those who challenge the current system. The minister and the Liberal government are the ones threatening and weakening and potentially destroying the Canadian Wheat Board. I want to reiterate that fact.

It is not the Farmers for Justice, those who cross the border, who are destroying the wheat board. It is the minister of agriculture and the unwillingness of the Liberal government to reform the board which is causing the board to fall into disrepute.

I know there are many people who work within the Canadian Wheat Board who want to see it reformed. I wonder why the minister is dragging his feet. Why will he not enter the 20th century—we are almost into the 21st century—and build a marketing agency for the 1990s and not be stuck with one designed for the 1930s?

It is those with the courage and confidence to propose constructive change who will secure a future for the Canadian Wheat Board and also provide farmers with the choice they are demanding.

Farmers know they can market their own produce. Talk to the canola, oats or potato growers and the cattle producers. Give those who wish to market wheat and barley the same freedom to do so, come what may. Let those who are happy to market through the Canadian Wheat Board pool their returns free from the worry or stress that comes from the pressures of the traditional market.

I was asked by a reporter today that if this measure passed would I market my grain through the wheat board or would I market it outside the board. I said it would depend on who gave me the best options. I think that is wonderful. Right now there is no competi-

tion. The wheat board can basically do whatever it wants. If I had an option to market through the board or outside the board, I would look at what was proposed and what the final pool return was and what the buyers of the grain outside the board offered. Then I would make a decision which would provide me with the best bottom line in my business. That is what farmers are asking for and that is what a responsible government would provide for prairie producers.

In a free and democratic society there are treasured freedoms and rights as well as responsibilities and requirements. We should obey the law but the law should guard our rightful freedoms. Our laws should respect the rights of Canadians to market legal goods to whomever they choose.

The Western Grain Marketing Panel will soon be providing its report to the minister. Conveniently the report will be tabled after the House recesses for the summer. The tabling of this report will not be an excuse for inaction on the part of the minister. If the minister fails to remove the monopoly powers of the Canadian Wheat Board he fails to respect the principles of ownership, democracy and fairness, and the principle of keeping his word. Simply put, if he does not act, he fails. That is why the Reform Party moved the motion:

That this House urge the government to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to include a special 2 year opting out provision permitting those prairie producers who believe they are missing market opportunities the flexibility and choice to market their wheat and barley outside the jurisdiction of the board.

• (1635)

We will have an opportunity to hear a response from the minister. I would like to see a positive response which looks at reform of the board, that has confidence in a board that can function in a continental market or an international market and in a domestic market, one that is open to competition, one that would roll up its sleeves and face the challenges ahead of it, not one that would bury itself away in a defensive little corner in a shell and not be open to the challenges facing us in marketing our products in the 21st century.

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, we really have to stretch our imagination to come to any kind of conclusion to support this kind of motion. The member talks about if the minister acted on the motion. If the minister acted on the motion we would be irresponsible as a government in terms of what the member is proposing.

The member talked a lot about choice. What Reform is really prepared to do in terms of the choice here is throw an entire industry with a worldwide reputation for reliability and quality into chaos. That is what it is prepared to do with this motion in order to satisfy the short term demands of a few law breakers.

### *Supply*

His proposal would not take us forward, as he is proposing. He should learn a little from history. It would move us back to the late 1800s and 1920s when the grain robber barons and the railway monopolies were able to take advantage of farmers. That was why the Canadian Wheat Board was created in the first place. I think the member knows this.

I have have a unique experience in that I am from eastern Canada and when I was president of the National Farmers Union I could not at first understand why western farmers were so enamoured with the Canadian Wheat Board. They were so supportive of it. I examined in detail the Canadian Wheat Board. Perhaps the member should examine in detail the Canadian Wheat Board.

He talked about dual marketing. He talked about moving barley to the United States. Does he not recognize that yes, there was more barley moved but in the final analysis it was shown it was sold at a lower price.

Does the member not recognize the advantage of single desk selling? We cannot have orderly marketing and dual marketing working side by side. It does not work that way.

If we move away from the single desk selling of orderly marketing what we are really allowing is Canadian farmers to compete against each other in terms of driving prices down. The orderly marketing of single desk selling gives strength and marketing power to producers, and the hon. member should recognize that.

Does the member not recognize that the pooling system allows all producers to take advantage of the booms and to limit bad prices when they occur and that the nation as a whole benefits?

I want to table some facts. We did not get many facts from the member in his presentation. I encourage him to read the Kraft, Furtan and Tyrchniewicz report. It concluded based on the analysis of the Canadian Wheat Board performance that additional revenues for wheat sales averaging \$265 million per year, or \$13.35 per tonne, would be lost if the single desk were replaced by multiple sellers.

It estimated that the Canadian Wheat Board added between \$557 million and \$690 million per year, or \$27.84 per tonne to \$34.50 per tonne over what multiple sellers would have realized in wheat marketing between 1985-86 and 1993-94. The member should realize those are some of the facts.

• (1640)

Dual marketing, to which the Reform Party's proposal would lead, would destroy—

**An hon. member:** It scares the hell out of you.

*Supply*

**Mr. Easter:** The member says it scares the hell out of me. It scares the devil out of farmers. There is no question about it because they support strongly the Canadian Wheat Board system.

The Reform Party's proposal would destroy the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to work effectively in producers' interests. Anybody with any sense in terms of economics knows the lowest seller establishes the price.

Does the Reform Party not realize this motion will destroy the ability of the Canadian Wheat Board to operate effectively in producers' interests, thereby undermining farmers as a whole in terms of maximizing returns?

**Mr. Hermanson:** Madam Speaker, I hope I have as much time to answer as the member had to rant and rail.

I addressed most of the answers in my speech. I was very clear to underscore that I did not want this to become a spitting match to see who could run up the highest score. Obviously we can talk about a lot of ways the wheat board has failed. That is not the purpose of the motion. The purpose of the motion is to break the log jam we are currently in.

The hon. member for Malpeque talked about his great experience with western agriculture—I am sure, coming from Prince Edward Island. He suggests that only through the Canadian Wheat Board do we have reliability. That is a slap in the face to canola producers who have had to leave wheat to keep their farms above water. They would have gone broke during the tough years of the eighties and nineties had they not been able to market outside the Canadian Wheat Board.

My father was a pioneer on the prairies. When he was a lot younger than I am now he had to load 60 bushels into a wagon and pull it 26 miles with horses. There was one buyer at the end of that trip. Whatever that buyer offered him for the grain was the price he had to take. If he did not want to take it, he had to drive the 60 bushels all the way back to the granary. It did not make sense. He could not even phone ahead. There were no fax machines. There was no modern method of communication. That was in the 1920s.

Now we are almost in the 21st century. We have fax machines. We have more marketing options available than my father could have dreamed of when he was driving those bushels to market.

Dual marketing has been done and it can be done. The member has the attitude that it cannot be done. I guess he cannot do it. That is fine. That is his problem, not the problem of the prairie producers. I mentioned that Australia uses dual marketing. It has been done in Canada. It has worked. It has not been a problem.

The member said that if we do not market through the Canadian Wheat Board the mark will be set by the lowest price. That is not

the case in other commodities. It certainly was not the case with canola. It certainly was not the case with peas. It certainly is not the case with potatoes. I wonder why it happens to be the case with wheat. It does not make sense. What is it about wheat? Is it because it is a different colour than potatoes or flax? Is it because it is a different weight than barley or oats? Is that why it will draw the lowest price? I wish the member would get his facts together and be a little more forthright with members in the House.

I mentioned there is a log jam. There is a big fight going on in the prairies. The minister of agriculture is upset because people are crossing the border without getting wheat board permits as required under the wheat board act.

Why do we not do something positive to fix this mess rather than continuing the fight? Why do we not let these people out of the wheat board if they want to market elsewhere?

There was a member of the Liberal Party who was not very happy with what the Liberal Party was doing about the GST. That member had the right to get out of the Liberal Party and sit as an independent member, but the Liberals will not allow prairie producers in western Canada the option to market on their own. If they do worse, that is their problem but they should at least have the same right as the hon. member for York South—Weston who got out of the Liberal caucus.

• (1645)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to my colleague and I am delighted to see almost all the members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture in this House. As you are indicating I have very little time left, I would like to ask a question of my colleague in the Reform Party in order to really grasp this afternoon's issue.

Can a farmer, who has opted out for two years, return to the fold within the Canadian Wheat Board?

In other words, suppose I regularly pay my life insurance premiums and I am bursting with good health. Suddenly I decide to take a chance for the next two years and not pay my life insurance premiums in order to save a little money and then, two or three years later, pick up my life insurance policy again without penalty.

Could my Reform Party colleague enlighten me so I might really understand the issue? Can the wheat grower return to the Canadian Wheat Board after a two-year hiatus?

[*English*]

**Mr. Hermanson:** Madam Speaker, the member for Frontenac makes an excellent and very valid point. I thank him for the question.



Simply put, the motion calls for a two-year opting out period, at which time we would review whether the member for Malpeque was right that dual marketing could not work or whether in fact the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster was right that dual marketing could work.

Some people would suggest that once they are out they should be out for life. Others would say they should be able to hop back in and market through the board or out of the board at will. We think that probably something in between is the right option. We are suggesting a two-year opting out period after which we can evaluate the effectiveness of a dual market and allow those who were out back in if they wanted. Others could opt out if they wanted after the two-year period.

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate today. It is one of those very rare occasions when the Reform Party has turned its attention in the House to an agricultural issue.

Until very recently, day after day, week after week, month after month would go by when the Reform Party would hardly even mention anything having to do with agriculture. Suddenly in the last couple of weeks its members have asked a flurry of farm questions and have proposed this opposition day on the Canadian Wheat Board.

I suggest it is no coincidence that all this sudden attention follows a rather scathing article in the *Western Producer* newspaper on the prairies which tore a strip off Reformers for ignoring their agricultural constituencies.

I welcome whatever woke them up. I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss a serious and complicated matter, the serious and complicated business of western Canadian grain marketing.

This is a hugely complex and important topic. It involves a multi-billion dollar sector of the Canadian economy and the backbone of the prairies. It involves the livelihoods of 130,000 farm families across western Canada. They are spread across four provinces on over 80 million acres of farmland, in a dozen different land quality zones, producing upward of 35 million tonnes of wheat and barley every year, the best quality in the world, and delivering that grain to over 900 individual country elevator points, to hundreds of exacting Canadian buyers, and by truck, rail and ocean freight through at least five different ports to loyal customers in over 70 countries around the world. All that is in the face of always tough and sometimes fiercely predatory global competition dominated by some of the biggest transnational corporations in the world and all too frequently distorted by the meddlesome subsidies of foreign treasuries.

### Supply

This business is no child's play. It is big business. It is deadly serious. It is a business in which despite all the odds Canada has established an absolutely unmatched reputation for excellence, especially in the last 50 years since the second world war. It is no accident that period of global success coincides with the existence and the longevity of the Canadian Wheat Board.

• (1650)

The board is not a buyer of grain. The board is a seller of grain. It sells wheat and barley on behalf of all prairie producers. Through the board farmers maximize their marketing clout so they can compete effectively around the world from a position of combined strength backed by the world's best grain standards, the world's best quality control system, the world's best market intelligence network, the world's best weather surveillance system, the world's best market development techniques, and the world's best before market and after market customer services.

These characteristics which are part of the Canadian Wheat Board system have generated remarkable customer loyalty and respect. They have helped to earn premiums from the marketplace. They have gained and retained market share for Canada.

In total prairie farmers account for about 6 per cent or 7 per cent of the world's grain production, but they occupy about 20 per cent of the world's grain markets. The board has accomplished this within the confines of world trading rules and regulations.

At the behest of the United States, the activities of the Canadian Wheat Board have been investigated not once, not twice, but at least three different times. Each time the board has been vindicated as a fair trading organization.

Our global customers have strong words of support for the Canadian Wheat Board. I have met with them in person in places like Beijing, Tokyo, Singapore and Sao Paulo. They have told me how they value their longstanding relationship with the CWB built on quality, reliability, consistency, mutual trust and respect.

They have told me that if Canada did not have the CWB but had a system like the one in the United States, for example, we would lose much of our distinctiveness. We would not have many of the qualities which set us apart and put us a cut above the rest. We would not have the key element of product differentiation which now helps us stand out in the marketplace. They might as well buy their supplies from Minneapolis, Kansas City or New Orleans.

This same sentiment about the board was echoed not long ago in Canada by Mr. Ken Beswick. A couple of months ago Mr. Beswick resigned as a Canadian Wheat Board commissioner in a dispute with the board about barley pricing. He was forthright in his criticisms that are clearly on the public record, but he was also forthright in his praise.

*Supply*

Just to balance the record, let me quote from the May 9 edition of the Manitoba *Co-operator* newspaper:

Beswick says he is, and always has been, a staunch supporter of the Canadian Wheat Board as a single desk marketing agency for export wheat and barley. He also says the so-called continental market proposed by some is just another word for an open market. While the feed and barley trade would likely see little effect of an open border, Beswick said he has become convinced it would be bad news for the malting barley producer.

The dynamics of the marketplace would probably cause Canadian prices to fall going into the U.S. market, Beswick said. We saw that, (during the brief time the border was open in 1993) and I think it would happen again.

I was one of the people who said it wouldn't happen and I was wrong—In a candid interview last week, Beswick condemned the extreme views which have polarized the industry between those who want no change to the board and those who want it eliminated. I have no patience at all for the lunatic fringe, he said. I think they do not help and I really lament what has happened to the industry I have spent my entire life in.

I think there are people out there who are not talking about the right things, he said. There are people who are taking my resignation from the board as something it was not.

I am in no way saying the board is not an effective marketer, he said. I think that it is among the best in the world at marketing grain. It stands toe to toe with the heavy weights out there in the global environment and I think from my window at the board I would not advocate the elimination of single-desk status.

• (1655)

The article concludes with the following quotation:

The single-desk seller is a powerful way to be. It is a powerful, powerful marketing tool in the world.

A number of questions obviously occur in the course of the debate. Do farmers on the prairies readily acknowledge the strengths in the marketing system we now have in place? Do they maintain the collaborative will to combine their strength through single desk selling? Or, would they prefer to go it alone as 130,000 individual sellers? What is precisely and commonly agreed upon as the definition of dual marketing? Is it physically possible to have the best of both worlds? Is it feasible to have two quite different marketing systems functioning effectively side by side without the one interfering with or undermining the other?

What about those apparently attractive spot market prices that appear from time to time across the border in the United States? The Canadian Wheat Board system now captures those prices for distribution among all prairie producers, together with all returns received by the board from every other market worldwide. In this day and age is that pooling principle still valid in the minds of farmers? Or, should individuals be enabled to collect those spot prices by themselves and for themselves, leaving a somewhat diluted price pool for everyone else?

In any given year the volume of wheat and barley we can move into the U.S. market is in the order of approximately two million tonnes, but we produce over 30 million tonnes. Relatively speaking, then, how much should we be preoccupied with the American market that obviously has some access problems for us? How much

should we change our system to seize U.S. opportunities when they present themselves if that in some way compromises our global capability?

Are there distinctions to be drawn among wheat, durum, feed barley and malting barley in the way in which each of them is marketed? What about wheat board corporate governance, accountability, audit procedures, public information, flexible pricing, flexible pooling, value added processing or niche markets?

These are among the many questions in the debate about western grain marketing which require a thorough and thoughtful airing. They do not require bombast and bluster, not rumour and innuendo, not abusive language from the Reform Party or from those who would wilfully ignore the law. The issues are too serious. The consequences are too profound to play fast and loose on questions about grain marketing.

I know different groups of farmers hold widely differing views on these very serious issues. They hold their respective views with a great deal of conviction. The debate among farmers about these issues has been unfolding across western Canada for the better part of 25 years with varying degrees of intensity from time to time. The debate has become particularly acute in the past three or four years.

I hear from each side in the debate virtually every day. I listen very carefully to farmers on all sides. Last summer it was clear the debate about western grain marketing was quite literally going around in circles.

One day last year two opposing groups of farmers of equal size turned up at my constituency office in Regina to picket against each other. They formed a big circle and went around and around the office building, all of them picketing against each other together.

• (1700)

The debate lacked focus and structure. It lacked the most rudimentary foundation of a common base of factual information. It generated far more heat than light. It was all geared to lobby me and the government to a particular point of view when it should have been aimed toward farmers themselves, to persuade one another.

In these circumstances in July of last year I established the western grain marketing panel to give the whole discussion some reasonable framework. The panel consists of nine very strong individuals. Bill Duke and Avery Sahl from Saskatchewan, Jack Gore, John Pearson and Wally Madill from Alberta, Owen McAulay and Jim Leibfried from Manitoba, John Neufeld to provide the national grain trade perspective, all under the able chairmanship of Mr. Tom Molloy from Saskatoon with Murray Cormach from Winnipeg as executive secretary.

Anyone with any familiarity with western grain would recognize and acknowledge the vast depth of knowledge and experience represented by this eminent group of Canadians and their broad diversity of personal opinions from one end of the spectrum to the other. They have worked diligently and constructively together, taking on what was admittedly a very tough assignment. They have conducted themselves throughout this assignment with the utmost of integrity.

I asked the panel to do four things. First, to research, prepare and publish the necessary information to provide farmers and other stakeholders with all the facts about everything that is involved in the complicated business of grain marketing.

Second, to conduct a prairie wide series of open townhall meetings to ensure that everyone has reasonable access to all the relevant facts and figures and a full and fair opportunity to ask questions and express their opinions.

Third, to hold formal public hearings at which all of the various sides in the marketing debate can advance their arguments, present their supporting evidence and be examined and cross examined to draw out all the options, all the pros and cons, all the benefits, all the consequences of one marketing system versus another.

Fourth, to submit a report indicating what the panel has heard from farmers, what areas of consensus exist and what might be done to deal with those issues on which there is no consensus.

The first three of those tasks have been fully and successfully completed. The fourth and final task, the report, is in its final stages of preparation. It should be available within a couple of weeks.

This brings me to the peculiarity of the Reform motion that is before the House today. To have this marketing discussion can be useful but the Reform motion does not make a lot of sense, calling as it does for an arbitrary, pre-emptive strike by way of a legislative amendment on the eve of the western grain marketing panel report in just a couple of weeks.

We should not now pre-empt the process. We should not now cast aside the panel, ignore the input and the hard work of all of those who have participated, including several hundred farmers across western Canada. Even the Reform Party itself and the member who is sponsoring today's motion appeared before the panel and did not at that time make the proposal that he is advancing today.

When I set up the panel it was a serious initiative. It was not smoke and mirrors. It was and is intended to produce sound results. I hope and expect it will do so when we see the report very soon. Should there be changes in the grain marketing system? The answer to that question is obviously yes. Many ideas have been put

### *Supply*

before the western grain marketing panel. The Canadian Wheat Board has suggested several kinds of change. Strong board supporters in other political parties, like for example the premier of Saskatchewan, have also acknowledged the need for change and modernization. The important thing is to get it right. That is what the western grain marketing panel is all about: changes that make sense to the largest possible number of farmers in a fair, conscientious and thoughtful way.

• (1705)

When all of the facts have been aired, when everyone has had an opportunity to have their say, when all the arguments have been weighed carefully and all the information is in and analysed, that is what the western grain marketing panel is supposed to do. Once it provides its report we will all be in a position to make the kinds of decisions that are needed for the future.

Madam Speaker, may I conclude with one final thought? In making those decisions, let us be prudent and let us make sure that we do not end up throwing the baby out with the bath water.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Madam Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food is partially right, and I can therefore state that the Bloc Québécois will support this opposition motion 80 per cent, if I may put it that way.

The minister must, however, admit along with me that, over the years, the Canadian Wheat Board ought to have given some thought to modernizing itself a bit, to bringing in some improvements as the year 2000 approaches. For example, the political appointment of its membership ought to be re-examined. I have looked at the CVs of the president, the vice-president and the three members. Impressive as they are, there is something missing.

Grain producers need to have some say over the operations of the board. Board membership ought to include people involved hands-on, the person who ploughs, the person who seeds, the person who harvests, the farm owner, who are best placed to offer suggestions and play an effective role on the board. You will, of course, reply that there is already an advisory committee made up of 11 farmers appointed by them, but it must be admitted that this committee is only advisory in nature, and often little heeded.

There would also need to be an examination of the aggressiveness of the Canadian Wheat Board on the international market. It seems that a number of farmers, not the majority, but 35 or 40 per cent of producers nevertheless, are questioning the board's aggressiveness in seeking new markets and therefore better prices, and that is a big enough number to raise some questions. If it were 1, 2 or 5 per cent, you could say: "It is always the same malcontents

*Supply*

complaining", but if one-third, or more than one-third, of the membership is involved, it is time to start asking some questions.

The same thing applies to shipping. Shipping could do with improvement, to raise user satisfaction.

Finally, the Department of Justice—and this is my final point—shares some of the blame. It seems a few growers sell their grain overseas on their own. There have been a few court cases here and there, but the government has dragged its feet in enforcing its own legislation. The legislation needs to be adhered to by everyone.

I would ask my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, in closing, if it is his firm intention to make improvements to the Canadian Wheat Board, in order to make it modern, efficient, and as acceptable to users as possible, in other words to the 120,000 western grain producers.

• (1710)

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I could not help overhearing certain comments about restricting the member from making some comments in the House. I would like to remind hon. members that the rule pertaining to this motion is 20 minutes for a statement and 10 minutes of comments and/or questions.

**Mr. Goodale:** Madam Speaker, that verification is very timely and very helpful, thank you.

The question asked by the hon. gentleman from Frontenac is very important. As I said during my remarks, I have placed a great deal of faith and confidence in the integrity and hard work of the western grain marketing panel. We are now, quite literally, within a few days of receiving the panel's report. I expect it to be a very useful document.

Once I receive the report and we have all had a few days to digest it and come to understand it, it would be my intention to move as rapidly as possible to respond to what the report recommends. I believe that would be useful.

On the various topics that were covered in the hon. gentleman's comments, he referred to the modernization of the board. Of course that issue is before the western grain marketing panel, as well as issues related to corporate governance, issues related to accountability, issues related to public information.

It may well be that the panel would recommend some kind of method of electing a board of directors. That is a possibility. I do not know. That idea was recommended to the panel by some of the groups that appeared before it. Perhaps on reflection, the panel members will embrace that idea. They might not, but I am sure they are going to turn their minds to the general issues relating to corporate governance and accountability.

I imagine the panel will also have some things to say about the information needs and requirements of farmers to ensure that they have all the facts, figures and ongoing information about what the board is, what it is not, what it does, what it does not do and so forth, which is obviously to make sure that the board's clientele is fully informed about what it does on their behalf.

It is worth noting, as a final comment in response to this question, that four or five years ago, the Canadian Wheat Board commissioned a management study by the management consulting firm of Deloitte & Touche. Deloitte & Touche provided the board with a report on how the board, even within its current system of corporate governance, could improve a number of areas of management. The board has informed me that virtually every one of those recommendations from Deloitte & Touche have been implemented in the intervening years, and the board's operations have improved as a consequence.

While I may disagree with the hon. gentleman on the fundamentals of a few other issues, I appreciate the tone that was involved in his question on this particular topic. What I hope we are all seeking to do is to achieve the very best possible marketing system for farmers.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I think some of the frustration of my colleagues was over the fact that they thought when an opposition party put forward a motion on a supply day they might have been given the courtesy to question the minister first.

However, I agree with the minister's comments about going around in circles. Farmers have been going around in circles over these issues for a long time. The reason this is happening is simply because of the inaction on the part of governments to correct the problem, which is to reform our marketing system.

The minister went to great lengths to laud the qualifications of the members on marketing panel, and I am not going to challenge or dispute those remarks.

• (1715)

However, I question whether we will see much or any new material put on the table as a result of their deliberations. It would surprise me if they did not recommend a change in the structure of the board. If they do not do that, they have completely misread the industry. I suspect they would suggest some freedom in the domestic market if not broader.

I wonder why the minister went to great lengths to quote one person, Mr. Beswick, but seemed to ignore the polling results and the surveys and plebiscites I mentioned in my presentation which are as high as 66 per cent in Alberta and 58 per cent in Saskatchewan in favour of changes to the board and dual marketing. Why did the minister not address the concerns of the tens of thousands rather than the praises of one?

*Supply*

I would like an answer to the two fundamental questions I ask in my speech. First, does the minister believe dual marketing is impossible? He has talked about the philosophy of it and what he hears. I have said what I believe. I would like to hear what he believes.

Second, does the minister believe that a farmer should not have the right to sell his or her wheat or barley either to a pooled return account through the board or individually on a cash sale inside or outside the board? I would like to know his personal stand on those two issues. It is very important to the debate.

**Mr. Goodale:** Madam Speaker, those are the types of questions the Western Grain Marketing Panel has been addressing in the course of its hearings and town hall meetings across western Canada and in all of its deliberations.

I think it is import to first have a process by which everyone can participate in a full, open and transparent way and then allow the panel to do its work, conduct its analysis and provide the very best possible advice.

On the issue of polling, it is my understanding that market research in western Canada has indicated that if the board is at stake, if it is not an issue of having your cake and eating it too, if it is clearly a case of one or the other, to pick or choose one marketing system or another, often the support for the Canadian Wheat Board rises to over 65 per cent or 70 per cent.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I am delighted to rise in the debate on the motion by the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster in this opposition day.

First, we should stress the importance the Reform caucus appears to be giving to the Canadian Wheat Board, since last week there was a full dress debate in this House, a very technical one, however, on the operation and the internal workings of this para-public organization.

We are forced to acknowledge that the spirit of this motion transcends the confusion and incoherence reigning within the Reform Party, which is even hoping to form the government at the time of the next elections. It is rather distressing to see what the Reform members in their efforts to defend the interests of the people in the west. It is a bit like having a member for Quebec or Ontario demanding an end to supply management in the case of eggs, poultry or milk.

The member for Lisgar—Marquette last week tabled a bill to change the internal audit system of the Canadian Wheat Board. Overall this bill was in response to an obvious need for the CWB to be transparent and efficient to the thousands of farmers it repre-

sents and who depend primarily on its actions and marketing expertise.

• (1720)

So here we have one of his fellow party members introducing a motion that nullifies the member's commendable efforts to directly help farm producers, who simply swallow the decisions made by the Canadian Wheat Board more often than not.

We are well aware that this organization's basic aim is to promote Canadian wheat in the international marketplace and thus obtain the best possible prices. In these terms, the direct effect of today's motion would be to cause greater damage to producers wanting to make their own way in this jungle of grain speculation, more than it would be to really provide profitable wheat and barley marketing opportunities, as the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster would have us believe.

The motion undoes, after many long and difficult years, the considerable efforts put out by the industry to maximize profits in the sale of Canadian wheat with the simple aim of maintaining production standards. The reforms proposed for the internal operation of the Canadian Wheat Board bear witness to the desire of all interested parties to find a better commercial niche for wheat producers.

I have a question: would it really benefit producers to free up the market so that each of them could go as far as their ambitions would take them? Knowing the vulnerability of this industry personally, and particularly all the factors outside of simple grain production, I can only say that this measure would mean financial suicide for any individual wanting to go it alone.

How can we consider making a special provision whereby producers could choose not to have their crops marketed by the CWB for a two-year period, when this marketing is the board's essential function? How will we explain the return to the collective of farmers who, having tested the market, recognize that the real profits to be made arise from the marketing efforts of the Canadian Wheat Board?

This alternative defies understanding. It would allow producers to compete, to a certain extent, with their colleagues, until such time as they understand that the real financial advantage lies in agricultural and commercial union. Is this morally acceptable? I strongly doubt it.

If we looked for a different image to express the same idea, the first one to come to mind would likely be the parable of the prodigal son, for this situation is rooted in the frustrations of a number of producers operating businesses along the Canada-US border. The temptation to sell their harvest directly to local mills is strong, given the attraction of on-the-spot payment in American dollars.

*Supply*

This practice is completely acceptable in a period of prosperity and economic growth. But what would become of this mercenary attitude if, overnight, the price of wheat fell dramatically?

• (1725)

It is important to remember that this situation is entirely plausible and that one of the reasons the Canadian Wheat Board was created was to play a stabilizing role. The Canadian Wheat Board's monopoly on the sale of wheat creates a significant balance for producers, who can thus count on an income that is constant and independent of market fluctuations.

During prosperous periods, it is legitimate to question the relevance and benefit of remaining within an organization governing all areas of production, which, to make matters worse, do not correspond to current modern practice. However, it is becoming essential to take a much more moderate, and often much less dramatic, approach to the issue. And, while we are on the topic, I would like to reiterate my scepticism regarding the rationality of such an initiative. The financial security of many grain producers is involved, without mentioning the impacts that will result from the coming passage of Bill C-38 on mediation in the case of farm debt. We will see a tightening of conditions of eligibility for government support in cases of debt. We should not mistakenly plunge farmers into a situation that could drive them to bankruptcy.

For the benefit of farmers and members of the public in Quebec, I would like to give a brief overview of the Canadian Wheat Board, because it has authority over four provinces only, three in their entirety and one partially.

Grain producers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and some parts of British Columbia are affected and governed by the Canadian Wheat Board.

The board exports 23 per cent of all world exports. 23 per cent of world exports of wheat and barley are governed and exported by the Canadian Wheat Board and have passed through its hands. It is the granary of the world.

The objectives of the Canadian Wheat Board are important and are comparable to those of the Canadian Dairy Commission, which is well known to everyone in Quebec. It is the Canadian Dairy Commission which is responsible for marketing and buying all the industrial milk produced in Quebec, which represents 47.4 per cent of Canada's total production.

The primary purpose of the Canadian Wheat Board is therefore to maximize the revenues of 130,000 grain producers, whose harvest it sells.

The Canadian Wheat Board obviously needs certain powers, and is, for example, the sole marketing agency for wheat and barley destined for export or for human consumption. Clearly, this means that each bushel of wheat Canada exports must go through the CWB. Bushels of wheat destined for human consumption in Canada must go through the CWB. Therefore, wheat and barley that will be fed to animals, for example, is not governed by the Board.

Sales, to put this in context, vary between 3 and 6 billion dollars annually, so the Board is an important economic power.

The Board's composition upsets me a bit, because of the notorious political appointments. You know how these go. Members of the board of referees of your local CEC, or members of the unemployment insurance office, now the employment insurance office, are political appointees. Usually they are good friends of the regime. The Board is composed of a chairman, a vice-chairman and three commissioners appointed by the government through an order in council.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** I must apologize to the hon. member for Frontenac but, it being 5:30 p.m., I will allow him a few seconds to sum up. He will have eight minutes more when we resume debate.

**Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac):** Madam Speaker, I bow to your directive. I shall resume and complete my address in a few minutes with the eight minutes left to me.

In closing for now, I will say that the advisory committee can play a significant role, since it is made up of 11 members appointed by the producers. These are, generally, 11 grain producers and they know what grain production is all about. Unfortunately, their power is virtually nil. More on this later.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** It being 5:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Member's Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

[*English*]

**Mr. Milliken:** Madam Speaker, a point of order. I think if you sought it you might find unanimous consent that the House proceed to deal with Bill S-8, standing in my name on the Order Paper under Private Members' Business and deal with it in all stages today.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

### QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.)** moved that Bill S-8, an act respecting Queen's University at Kingston, be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to the committee of the whole.

He said: Madam Speaker, I rise to give a very brief summary of the relevant provisions of this bill so that members may be aware of what is going on here.

This is a private bill that was introduced in the Senate to amend the charter of Queen's University. Queen's University was established by royal charter in 1841. As the result of a complicated series of interpretations of the British North America Act and various other acts of Parliament and legislatures, it is an act that is amendable by the federal Parliament and not by the province of Ontario, in which province the university is situate.

The charter has been amended from time to time by various acts of Parliament that have passed through this House. The current bill is the latest such amendment, and deals with various items. If members have questions about any of the items I would be pleased to review them during the committee of the whole if members wish to hear more about it.

Basically, the purpose of the changes is to permit students, staff and faculty of the university to participate in the board of trustees which is the principal governing body of the university. The changes have been adopted in the Senate already where they were reviewed in committee. I do not believe there is any particular difficulty. There was no opposition expressed. The changes are all ones requested by the university to its charter.

In my submission I think they are all ones that would commend themselves to all hon. members. I ask for the adoption of this bill today.

• (1735)

[Translation]

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to committee of the whole; bill reported; bill concurred in at report stage. Ringuette-Maltais in the chair.)

[English]

**Mr. Milliken** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

**Mr. Harper (Calgary West):** Just a point of clarification. Several times, Madam Speaker, you referred to Bill C-8. Is it correct that we are discussing Bill S-8?

### Private Members' Business

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais):** Yes, it is S-8.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

\* \* \*

### FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-270, an act to amend the Financial Administration Act (session of Parliament), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of this bill is fairly straightforward. It is to prevent the kind of abuse that the House suffered under the former government in 1989 when Governor General's special warrants were used and the regular supply proceedings available to the government were avoided.

• (1740)

I believe this bill finds support in all parties. I am delighted that is the case. It is one which I introduced in the previous Parliament, following the unfortunate events that I am about to describe. I understand from one of my colleagues from Edmonton this circumstance also took place in the early sixties when another Conservative government was in office.

This is an unusual bill. Perhaps I could explain it briefly.

Governor General's special warrants are available to a government to use during election time. That part is fairly clear. It has always been the case. When Parliament is dissolved and is unable to be called together to vote supply to enable the government to defray expenses of the public service, it is normal to have a mechanism in place whereby a government may access public funds from the treasury for the purpose of paying the bills. The method by which this money is made available is by Governor General's special warrant. It has been commonplace to make those warrants available between sessions of Parliament.

Members will recall there was an election on November 21, 1988. Parliament was convened on December 12 of that year. The session lasted for about two weeks. Aside from the speech from the throne and a brief debate on it, which was never completed, no supply was voted during the two-week session. The free trade bill was introduced and passed in all stages with the multiple use of closure.

The passage of that bill ended the session. The Commons adjourned for Christmas to a fixed date in February. Parliament was then prorogued immediately before the fixed date in February until a date in April. Since no supply had been voted, no final supplementary estimates had been approved and, indeed, no mid-term supplementary estimates had been approved, the government

*Private Members' Business*

chose to help itself to the funds in the treasury by way of Governor General's special warrants.

Three special warrants were granted. The first was for \$80 million in January 1989. The second was for \$500 million and change in February 1989. Then, on April 1, since Parliament was sitting on April 3 and interim supply was urgent and required, a third warrant was issued for \$6.2 billion. When the House got together, supply was finally voted, although a special order was adopted in the House delaying the approval of main supply.

[*Translation*]

I raised a question of privilege on the legitimacy of special mandates on April 6, 1989. In ruling on May 2 of the same year, the Speaker's finding was that "—the government has respected all the procedures required by the House".

[*English*]

The question is whether this practice should be allowed to continue.

I drafted an amendment to the Financial Administration Act which defines the time when Parliament is deemed to be not in session. These are available when Parliament is not in session only. Therefore, the deeming section will say that Parliament is not in session from the date of dissolution until the day two weeks prior to the first day fixed by the proclamation summoning Parliament to meet for the dispatch of business.

In other words, up to two weeks before a new Parliament begins warrants will be available. Once that two-week period starts running, warrants will no longer be available. The date will be fixed at the time of dissolution. Every dissolution proclamation includes not just the date of the dissolution, which is the date it is issued, it specifies the date for the summoning of a new Parliament. That date will be the one on which the government must attend for the purpose of helping itself to supply during the election period.

Of course, a government would be free to vote supply for the full year before an election is called and obviate the necessity for further recourse to the House for additional assistance. However, the fear is that if we do not put in place such a procedure as this, we may find ourselves in a situation where a government could call Parliament together, have a speech from the throne and announce that it does not need any legislation from the House, adjourn the House of Commons and then one year later call the House back and spend the rest of the year thriving on Governor General's special warrants.

• (1745)

It would have to prorogue the House before it could do that under the current law, but prorogation could occur whenever the govern-

ment ran out of money. From then on we could run on warrants until the House was called back into session.

In my view this would be a flagrant abuse of the Constitution and quite improper. Under the current law which is so open ended that is exactly what a government could do. Frankly it is the exact procedure followed by the previous government in the period between February and April 3, 1989 when Parliament reconvened.

In my view it was an abuse of the rules. It is something that we as defenders of parliamentary liberties ought to act on and bring to an end. The bill is designed to bring it to an end. It will prevent the situation that occurred in 1989 from recurring. It will also prevent a government from feeling that it has the right to step into a situation such as I have described and do without the House of Commons sitting for an extended period of time.

It is not in the interest of Canadians. It is certainly not in the interest of representative democracy. It is not in the interest of any opposition and not in the long term interests of any government.

I am pleased to propose the bill today. If the wording of bill causes any members concern, it is something that could be looked at, at committee stage of the bill where it can be studied thoroughly and the wording gone over with some care.

Some members have raised the issue of using these special warrants for borrowing purposes. It could also be examined if the draft bill impinges on that area. I am unaware that it does but it may. If so, I would be happy to have a full discussion of the issue in committee.

When the procedure was last used in 1989 there was some attempt by me and a few other members to raise the matter in committee and look at the way funds were used based on the reports tabled by the government following the use of the warrants. The questions were put before one of the standing committees of the House, but they were treated contemptuously by many members on the government side who regarded them as improper and as interfering in what they regarded as an unfettered right of the government to use this kind of discretion.

It is time a limit was placed on this kind of discretion. The limit proposed in the bill is fair and reasonable to government and to opposition. I hope it commends itself to all hon. members.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands for brilliantly defending his Bill C-270 before the Sub-committee on Private Members' Business so that it was declared a votable item.

My analysis of the bill, which contains only one clause, was made easier by the member's kindness in sending me an article he published in the *Canadian Parliamentary Review* in the summer of 1990 on supply bills and the Governor General's special warrants.



The article is quite detailed and refers to the particular situation of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands described earlier.

I will not linger over the 1988 and 1989 precedents, which I read. Rather, I will try to situate this debate in terms of the cardinal principles of the parliamentary system.

The debate on the sole clause in Bill C-270 means basically going back over the whole of British parliamentary history. In my opinion, we have to go as far back as 1215 to discover the rules governing us today. The issue being raised today was raised in other terms in the baronial rebellion of 1215, which led to the signing of the Magna Carta.

• (1750)

What were the barons after? The possibility of being judged by their peers and the power to control spending by the crown. The year was 1215. Nearly a thousand years later, we are faced with the same problem, the intensity is different and the context is different, but the same thread runs through it.

King John, nicknamed John Lackland, was not without land for no reason: he had sold it for his war effort. The barons did not want to finance him any more; hence his name. Most of his French possessions had been sold and he found himself in a position where his name went into the history books.

King John conceded the Magna Carta in 1215. It was the forerunner of our parliaments and gave the barons the right to control spending. It did not last very long. When the king's situation improved somewhat, he tried once again to impose his priorities. In 1256, new rebellions broke out, and the Provisions of Oxford essentially renewed the Magna Carta's control over spending by the crown and the individual freedoms of the nobility—to be sure. At the time, little if any attention was paid to the ordinary folk, who were in a state of considerable servitude. We have come a long way.

Then what happened? Of course the crown gave the barons and then Parliament the right to control public spending, except no sessions of Parliament were planned. If it had no spending to approve, Parliament was not required to meet. This gave rise, over the centuries, to some strange situations where Parliament did not convene for 20 or 30 years at a stretch. Pressure was again brought to bear, and the people's elected representatives again demanded that Parliament be required to convene at least once a year. That was four or five hundred years ago.

The Constitution Act, 1867 flows directly from these, I was almost going to say medieval, struggles to have Parliament's sittings enshrined in law. Today, section 20 of our Constitution states that Parliament must sit at least once a year, and, since 1982, this obligation has been extended to the provincial legislatures.

### *Private Members' Business*

Need I point out that another section of our Constitution, section 53, which is based on what was happening in Great Britain at the time, also deals with these questions? When we say that any bill involving financial expenditure or allocation of public money must originate in this House, we are recognizing clearly the control and decision making power of elected representatives over the management of public finances.

Naturally, the government sets its budgetary priorities. This is one of the primary responsibilities in its budgetary policy statement. But in our system of Parliamentary democracy, the government cannot remain in power without the support of members for its budgetary policy statement. One may or may not be in agreement with policies, but one rule that is a well established part of our constitutional conventions, although it is not written down in any text of law, requires that in financial matters, the government must always have the confidence of the House. Over the years, ministerial responsibility has become more relaxed, but certainly not to the extent of not applying when it comes to spending public money.

Of course, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands has mentioned, the provisions which make it possible to govern by special warrant of the governor general are set down in law as being measures that must be applied in case of emergency, when there is a requirement to act rapidly and Parliament is unavailable. The best example of Parliament's unavailability, if I may put it that way, Madam Speaker, is when the House has been dissolved. The government cannot summon a Parliament that no longer exists once a writ of election has been issued. It must wait until Parliament has been reconvened, on the date set out in the writ of election.

• (1755)

Outside of these periods, are there any exceptional situations in which government use of Governor General's warrants would be applicable, knowing full well that the government can indeed recall Parliament, even during recess? This is what we shall see in committee, what we must examine in committee. At the second reading stage, we must stick to the principles themselves which underlie this bill, and these are extremely valid ones. When we have heard the witnesses, we will probably be able to re-examine whether the hon. member's bill is too restrictive or not.

I will recall to mind a precedent in 1985-86, when using Governor General's warrants led to a rather odd situation, namely having to borrow money to use the funds authorized by the Governor General's warrant, but since the time allowed to function under Governor General's warrant is very limited, the lending rate reflected this and we had to pay a higher rate of interest. It would have been far simpler to recall the House and get the supply voted.

My concern, which will be addressed in committee, is that adoption of this clause must put us into a situation like the one that prevails in the U.S. There, virtually every year, or every year there is a legislative or presidential election, sometimes both, there is a road block between the White House and the Congress. This means

*Private Members' Business*

that, overnight, government employees start to wonder if they will be paid, if social services can be provided and, in many areas, whether such essential services as the administration of justice, police services, airport services can be provided.

These will be some of the questions we will need to address in committee, but in principle I am pleased to support Bill C-270.

[English]

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the very important topic of the power of Parliament to control public spending.

The Constitution Act, 1867, stipulates that all financial legislation including government expenditures must originate in the House of Commons. Standing Order 80(1) states:

All aids and supplies granted to—the Parliament of Canada are the sole gift of the House of Commons, and all bills for granting such aids and supplies ought to begin in the House, as it is the undoubted right of the House to direct, limit, and appoint in all such bills,

This brings about an interesting question I should like to ask colleagues on both sides of the House. When was the last time as elected representatives of the people of Canada were they able to direct or limit spending in the country? It is an interesting question. Perhaps we could investigate it further.

When was the last time a bureaucrat or a cabinet minister came to a member of the House and asked for help in figuring out what tax dollars could be spent on? When was the last time members of the House other than cabinet members were able to make a choice and say no to one project and yes to another? It is our right in the House under the Constitution.

Let us look at the problems we have had with the estimates. The Prime Minister says that it is confidence: "You have to vote for it. Hold your nose. No questions allowed. Otherwise the government will fail". That type of arm wrestling should not be tolerated by members of the House elected to ensure that Parliament controls the public purse. This House, not the government, controls the spending and the raising of taxes in this country. You would hardly think so on many occasions.

• (1800)

Unfortunately, as I have indicated, seldom is the answer that we can influence or reduce public spending but never has this government trusted us enough to allow us to do our job, which is to represent the will of Canadians and to make the choices on how the government spends tax dollars. What I am trying to point out is there is a clear, complete and absolute separation between this

House and the government for this House approves and gives to the government money for it to spend.

Over the last 100 years in Canada the power to control government spending has moved farther and farther away from Parliament. The executive power over the public purse has been expanded. Cabinet and senior civil servants have slowly but surely increased their ability to control what money is spent, where it is spent and why it is spent.

This concentration of power over the tax dollars is wrong. It goes against everything that democracy stands for. Perhaps the ultimate manifestation of the Prime Minister and cabinet's control over our tax dollars lies in the use of Governor General special warrants which the member for Kingston and the Islands has introduced his private members' bill to curtail.

When Parliament is not in session and there is an urgent need for funds, the Financial Administration Act allows for a special warrant in the name of the Governor General to be prepared. We are talking about an urgent need for funds, not a convenient need for funds without recalling the House. There must be a clear and separate difference between the two.

It is not for government to end run Parliament if it finds it inconvenient and it would rather not bring us back here and request us to donate and give to it and it uses the special warrants to circumvent Parliament's authority. In theory the special warrants are to be issued when some unforeseen need arises and Parliament cannot be recalled to deal with the issue. Certainly in the case of war, famine or in an emergency situation the government must not be left without recourse to funding. I think we all agree with that.

History tells us that special warrants are often used as a way to circumvent Parliament. In 1989, as my hon. colleague from Kingston and the Islands pointed out, the Conservative government issued four special warrants to obtain regular appropriations rather than use the supplementary estimates. At the time the House was adjourned and not prorogued.

Special warrant, as we pointed out, is essentially decreed by the Prime Minister's office. It gives the government power to take money from the consolidated revenue fund and use it for whatever reason it so desires. After the special warrant has been issued, there is nothing Parliament can do to recapture the money. Nothing. No checks and balances apply to a special warrant. Clearly the restrictions on the use of the Governor General special warrants need to be tightened.

The role of Parliament in spending tax dollars is crucial. Legally it is Parliament and only Parliament that can approve the spending by appropriating funds. Often this fact is overlooked or explained away by ministers and their officials but it is paramount to a democratic system. Canadians go to the polls every four or five

years because they want to influence the future of our nation, yet the people they elect to express their will have very little input into how decisions are made and even the approval of these decisions. Their input is silenced, avoided or limited.

This bill would be a step in the right direction. It is a direction the Reform Party has been talking about for years. The Reform Party wants to reverse the centralization trend. Reformers want Parliament to exercise its power to control government spending right from the start. This bill reinforces the power of democratically elected representatives. It is an important bill because it enhances accountability in government. It is an important bill because it reinforces the Reform Party principle of accountable government.

The issues addressed in this bill are issues the Reform Party has always been concerned about. Reformers believe that elected representatives should have the final say in government expenditures. We believe in the common sense of the common people and their right to be consulted when we spend their money. Our constituents have a right to directly influence spending. The Reform Party, when it forms a government, will enhance this right. I can see my colleague from Kingston and the Islands is already starting the process.

• (1805)

Raising and spending tax dollars is the lifeblood of Parliament. It is the reason Parliament came about. Reform members take this responsibility seriously. When we spend money and approve expenditures of money in this House, we should all remember that tax dollars are funds held in trust by Parliament and are given to the government to provide services to Canadians.

I support the bill. The Reform Party supports the bill. It will enhance the accountability of Parliament. It will help to remind the executive that the people of Canada still control government expenditures.

There is also a subcommittee of the procedure and House affairs committee, of which I have the privilege to be a member, which deals with the whole business of supply and accountability. I hope we will see in this 35th Parliament a return of powers back to the House which have been allowed to slip away into the hands of the executive, into the hands of cabinet, into the hands of government. They have taken the liberty of expecting us to rubber stamp their initiatives and their requests for money. That has to stop.

I am glad to see this issue being recognized by individual members on the government side through this private members' bill and through the creation of the subcommittee of the procedure and House affairs committee which was formed a year ago. The subcommittee has been doing valuable work. Let us not forget that the subcommittee was formed at the instigation of the Reform Party. The only reason the subcommittee was formed a year ago

### *Supply*

was that we created enough noise about the approval of the estimates saying that we needed more input.

Canadians and their elected officials need more input into how the House approves money. The House is not a rubber stamp. That message has to be put forth forcefully and clearly in order for this government, the next government and every government thereafter to realize the primacy of this House. We, as the elected representatives of Canadians, are the people who approve the expenditures of government. They are to be held accountable.

Therefore, as I mentioned earlier, I heartily congratulate the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands for bringing forth this private members' bill which will curtail special warrants being issued by the government. Those special warrants circumvent the House. They prevent the House from expressing its democratic opinion on what the government intends to do. The bill will ensure that the House regains responsibility and its primacy over the spending of funds.

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Colleagues, since Private Members' Business is completed, I would ask for your consent to revert to orders of the day, the opposition motion, rather than suspending the Chamber until approximately 6.30 p.m. Is there agreement?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1810)

[*English*]

### SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

**Mr. Hoepfner:** Mr. Speaker, the Bloc member was not finished. Will he speak after me or does he intend to finish?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** In consideration of the fact that we are proceeding somewhat ahead of schedule, I would hope that the House would permit at a later hour this evening if the member should return to the House and wish to complete his

*Supply*

remarks, that I might have your co-operation in allowing him to complete those remarks. We are proceeding ahead of schedule somewhat, through unanimous consent.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to speak in favour of the motion brought forward by my colleague from Kindersley—Lloydminster.

Canadian farmers who are the most efficient and progressive and provide the highest quality food in the world are restricted from locating or accessing markets that are more lucrative than those provided by the Canadian Wheat Board. Farmers would have liked to have had the opportunity to at least elect the wheat board commissioner so they would have more input into the Canadian Wheat Board.

A few minutes ago the minister of agriculture more or less intimated he had a lot of support and that there were articles written in favour of the issue he was addressing. I will also quote from the *Western Producer*:

Wheat board supporters have not used the time Goodale has given them to mobilize their own show of support. He looks isolated, leading up that phantom army of alleged Board true believers who do not appear to care enough to join the political battle.

That does not sound like very solid support.

Even inside his own government, Goodale likely has few enthusiastic allies.

I would like to go on record saying that the one strong ally Mr. Goodale has is the member for Malpeque.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Order. Colleagues, only one of us can speak at a time here. Traditionally when the Speaker is standing you will find that your microphone will be turned off and respectfully, the Chair will have some preference.

I rise to simply remind the House that we cannot do indirectly what we cannot do directly. In other words, even though we are quoting from a document, we cannot name the member or the minister as so stated in the article one might be quoting from.

I know sometimes it is just a bit of a slip and this may be the case. But I do not want us to go down that road which could be somewhat treacherous by referring to each other by name and not in fact as the tradition the parliamentary debate wants us to maintain, by riding or portfolio.

**Mr. Hoepfner:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the correction. I was reading from the article and I did not consider the minister's name was involved. I retract that and apologize for it.

A recent Toronto *Globe and Mail* article accurately identified the government's paradoxical approach to monopoly. On one hand the article states the government believes that a "coven of oil compa-

nies are conspiring to defraud consumers through backroom deals creating a secret gasoline cartel". The industry is now under investigation by the Bureau of Competition Policy. "The message is monopolies are bad". Or is the message that monopolies are good? Which way do we really want it?

Then we have the government's desperate attempt to defend the statutory Canadian Wheat Board monopoly on the export of western grain. When farmer David Sawatzky was acquitted on charges of illegally exporting his crop to the United States, the federal government moved swiftly to close this loophole in the Customs Act.

• (1815)

The minister of agriculture is working overtime to keep this monopoly intact. This time the message is monopolies are good. Which way do we really want it?

I will read from the wheat board act. This is what both judges and both court rulings stated: "In the case of a producer convicted of an offence relating to the delivery of grain—to a fine of an amount equal to one-third of his initial payment for the grain in relation to which the offence was committed, but the amount shall not be less than \$50 or more than \$350".

The minister and the people know very well that with that kind of penalty farmers will continue to cross the border with their grain because they make way more profits than \$350 on each load.

After my election to Parliament I was approached by farmers who provided compelling evidence of serious irregularities in the marketing practices of the wheat board or grain companies. Since then I have endeavoured to secure a response to those allegations.

I embarked on the runaround of a lifetime. Every time I held a news conference and provided the documentations, I talked very honestly to the people. I told them I had sent the information to the ag minister, to the wheat board and to the grain companies telling them: "Here are documents farmers have provided me with. Would you refute them or would you at least determine whether they are legal and whether they are practical documents that were issued in the exportation or the selling of grain".

Initially I raised this issue with the solicitor general and the RCMP. They lost the file. On my insistence they retrieved the file but took no investigative action. They arbitrarily decided there was insufficient evidence to proceed with an investigation. Interestingly this decision was made by the RCMP division that aggressively investigated Mr. Sawatzky.

It has now come to light that an officer of this division was so anxious to prosecute that he falsified information to mislead a provincial court judge in establishing a basis for issuance of a

search warrant to raid the Sawatzky home. Is this the way a justice system should work?

The time limitations of this debate prevent me from fully disclosing the extent of resistance I have faced from the government and the wheat board since attempting to have these farmers' allegations investigated.

Briefly, since contacting the RCMP I have requested assistance from the solicitor general, the minister of agriculture and the customs minister. Most recently I requested a judicial inquiry to be launched by the justice minister. This is due to the fact that the former assistant wheat board commissioner, Mr. Beswick, openly and quite fervently admitted and pointed out western barley producers lost at least \$180 million last year because of the inefficiencies and inadequacies of the Canadian Wheat Board in its marketing policies.

I am wondering if this should go on. Should farmers really have to carry these losses when it is openly admitted they are there? When one looks at \$180 million of losses to farmers, it means it takes about a billion dollars out of western Canada's economy.

During the three press conferences I sought information through the Access to Information Act. When I did not get any response from the ministers I tried the information act. What I did I get for my attempts to represent farmers? In the two and a half years since I have tried to secure some answers, I have been expelled from the House. My life has been threatened twice. The wheat board has tried to intimidate me through court actions, the intimidation of detractors being its modus operandi. It has threatened to sue me. It has threatened to do all kinds of other things, even to take legal action against the party and have me expelled.

• (1820)

That sounds to me like something is being covered up. Why is it so determined to shut me down? All I have done is provided documents which farmers have given to me. They are legal documents of grain transactions and grain sales. If these people are not willing to verify they are false, why would they put the pressure on me to quit bringing more evidence before the wheat board and probably before the ministers?

The minister always wants to say the western wheat marketing panel will solve the issues. The minister has tried to hide behind this bogus marketing panel. We have seen that the wheat board, together with the advisory board, has held secret in camera meetings half an hour before the marketing panel was to hold its hearings. It was trying to direct attention in some way to make it look like farmers were totally supportive of the panel and the CWB.

*Hansard* records will verify the agriculture minister has answered every legitimate question posed by Reform members with deference to the western grain marketing panel. It is as if the

### *Supply*

minister has no idea what is going on in the agricultural industry until the Western Grain Marketing Panel tells him. The minister needs a wake-up call. The problems with the CWB and our western grain marketing industry are evident to everyone but him.

The marketing panel was asked by a presenter: "Whose grain are we talking about? Is it the farmers' grain, is it the grain companies' grain or is it the government's grain? Who owns it? Who should have title to it?" The panel's response was that is too political to answer. Why is it too political to answer who owns the produce farmers' grow?

In my book when somebody manufactures a product, pays the expenses, has the product inspected and gets it ready for distribution, it is his product. Nobody in this free country of ours would accept what is being done by the Western Grain Marketing Panel which will not even identify who are the legal owners of the product. To me it is almost like heresy.

As an elected representative I have not only the right but the duty to put these irregularities before the government, before the wheat board and before law enforcement officers. When I am intimidated and when I get death threats I get very upset and I get very determined. I will make sure that sooner or later the people doing this will be brought to justice.

I would like to pause for a minute and put this question to the House. In the case of Sawatzky I have heard people say he was a criminal, that he did something wrong and broke the law. He probably broke the wheat board act but he never broke the Customs Act. When I saw the way the appeal read in the paper it really distressed me. The appeal claims that Judge Conner made several errors in law, including reopening the trial by calling an interpreter to translate the French version of the law. It was the wheat board solicitors who demanded they prosecute Mr. Sawatzky under the French version of the Customs Act.

• (1825)

In my experience in the House the law, whether it is in French or in English, is supposed to be the same. The interpretation is supposed to be the same. Now this wheat board solicitor is using that angle in an appeal. Bond says the appeal is necessary because order in council would not apply to anyone charged before the loophole was closed. There are a significant number of charges still out there, about 100 farmers.

Is that the way to treat western farmers who are doing their utmost to produce the best grain for the least cost to feed the most people? Is that the type of treatment and publicity they deserve?

The problems have become very serious and we have no leadership from the government. Farmers are being aggressively pursued and prosecuted by the government for attempting to freely market their own products. They have caused harm to nobody.

*Supply*

They have only brought extra dollars into the economy, which helps create jobs, which does not deter jobs.

These farmers have found an avenue to increase their revenue so they can hang on to their property and honestly make a living. If it is dishonest to sell grain for the best price available, I wish the government would come out openly and say so. There are a lot of other people in the country who are doing it and they have the right to do it. If the only ones who do not have the right are farmers, let us hear it from the government.

The Canadian Wheat Board is the last bastion of monopolistic control in a free enterprise country which holds something sacred, which holds competition sacred. We are used to that in a democracy. Competition is sacred. In socialist countries every monopolistic country has gone down the drain. Now we are trying to enforce that system. Why are the attempts to chip away at this protective wall met with such heavy artillery by the feds? One has to wonder what the government and the wheat board are trying so desperately to hide.

Yes, the time is long overdue for the Canadian Wheat Board to be opened up and held accountable to Canadian taxpayers. The agriculture minister must wake up and provide leadership.

The Canadian Wheat Board has long term debt of \$6.8 billion and when we try to find out where that debt is, what the interest rates are or what is happening to it, who it is being written off to, we are stonewalled. Neither the auditor general nor the people from the estimates committee can fill us in on what is going on.

If democracy does not succeed in this issue, what will be next under attack? When governments find vehicles to pamper their ledgers, pamper their own pocketbooks, it becomes very dangerous.

If democracy loses, not only the Canadian farmers lose but the Canadian consumer loses and world customers lose, the world's people who are dependent on the supplies we as western grain producers produce. Producers have come to the point where they are becoming fewer and fewer because of government manipulation of practices of selling and marketing our grain and not bringing a true price to the farm community.

• (1830)

If the threats and intimidation continue, I firmly believe that we still have a justice system and that these people will eventually be caught and brought to justice. I sincerely hope the inaction of the government has not aided the individuals in their actions. The intimidation and threats I have received are some of the worse signs just before a democracy loses its power and influence over a country.

I appreciate these comments. I hope the government and the minister listen to farmers instead of to bureaucrats and take the interests of farmers first, not those of wheat board commissioners or bureaucrats who try to run it.

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the member for Lisgar—Marquette.

The debate today is about hundreds of thousands Canadian men and women who directly or indirectly depend upon the grain sector for their livelihood. Today's debate is not just about political politics and political party posturing. It is about a western organization that has built the country and has done a tremendous job in making the prairies a better place to live. It has built an economy that does not just stop in the prairies but goes on to grain shippers in Montreal and to bakers from Vancouver to Halifax. They all benefit from the system.

When I hear some of the comments being made I question if some Reform members really understand the implications and strengths of the Canadian Wheat Board and what it has done for the nation.

Experts make it very clear that the Canadian Wheat Board has been a vehicle by which we have become world renowned. We have become a very great nation, the bread basket of the world, as was quoted by the Reform Party earlier.

I see hundreds of thousands of Canadians who rely upon a very good system. As a matter of fact it is among the excellent of the world. I am concerned that for some cheap political points there are shots and attacks on the wheat board.

I do not believe for one minute that any of the claims made by the member a couple of moments ago have been substantiated. The RCMP looked at some of the questions he raised and has tried to investigate the claims that have been put forth. To my knowledge there has not been at any point during the investigation any concrete evidence of the claims that have been put forward.

The Canadian Wheat Board is a very important institution. It has served a great purpose. As we start debate on the wheat board or whether dual marketing is the direction to go, I do not believe we should at any time pre-empt a process that is in place.

The government has set a panel in place to listen the concerns of every group involved in the way the Canadian Wheat Board operates and in the way we market grains in the country, listening to all opposing and supporting points of view.

• (1835)

There is absolutely no question the panel is to make certain it hears from all sectors of the economy, every interested group, and reports back to the government. It is critical if we spend this much time listening to the people publicly on what the panel is attempt-

ing to achieve that we should allow the panel to report back to the minister and make certain all stakeholders are involved in the final decisions that are, made.

The minister will receive those comments from the panel at the end of this month.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I ask the parliamentary secretary either to choose to put a question or questions to the hon. member during the question or comment period or bring his comment to a close so that I might give an opportunity to the member from Lisgar—Marquette to respond.

**Mr. Pickard:** Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate that and would like him to respond to my question. I will pose it directly.

A panel was put in place that had 13 round table discussions across the country. Three hearings were formal and allowed all people in the industry to comment. Why do you come forward with a motion at this time just before that panel reports to the government? Why are you not waiting for the results of that panel to hear what the industry has to say?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Before I give the floor to the hon. member, I remind the House in terms of procedure—and I know we are winding down—that we are best to conduct our debates in a parliamentary fashion. As direct as questions may be, they still must be placed through the Chair.

**Mr. Hoepfner:** Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the hon. parliamentary secretary. He tries to be honest and objective.

I will address a few of the issues he raised. I have raised the issue a number of times that I do not think the marketing panel is that credible any more because of the in camera meetings that were held. Only a few representatives were invited to attend: certain grain companies and certain farmers who supported the wheat board. That is one reason, whether or not the decision is good, the marketing panel will not be as credible as it should be.

The parliamentary secretary raised another issue about political gain. During the last Conservative government there was a debate on whether we should have a dual marketing system or single debt. People who are familiar with it will know what I am talking about.

The Prime Minister and the wheat board critic before the election promised western farmers that there would be a plebiscite on the dual marketing issue of barley and that farmers would be given that choice. Farmers have now been stymied for three years not having that choice. Now there is supposed to be credence and credibility on a marketing panel that has heard the issues time and time again.

The marketing panel knows the issues. When it is not prepared to openly indicate whose grain is being marketed, I am very uneasy about the results of the marketing panel. When a farmer pays the

### *Supply*

bills, owns the land and produces the crop, it is his grain. He should have some type of input into how it is marketed.

I challenge the parliamentary secretary and the member for Malpeque to agree to have their operations run by people hired by somebody else, pay the bills, pay the pension plan and never squawk a minute about not having enough profit left over at the end of the year. I will put my farm up against theirs that they will not agree to that. It is an even bet.

• (1840)

When I have an operation, pay the price, own the property and do not have any input into how it is marketed, it is bogus. It does not belong in a democracy. It belongs in a communist country. It has been tried time and time again and it has failed. People have overthrown those systems. Sooner or later western farmers will overthrow that system if they are not given some input into how their grain is marketed. They will not continue to raise it year after year and take for profit whatever somebody else decides to give them. They want some input into it.

My bet is on against the Malpeque constituency and against the parliamentary secretary's assets that they will not agree to have their businesses run by somebody else and have no input into how stuff is marketed.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Dear colleagues, earlier today, when we suspended the business of supply to go back to private members' business, the hon. member for Frontenac had about eight minutes left to speak. Therefore, we will resume at that point in the proceedings and then carry on as usual.

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I congratulate you on your good memory. Indeed, I had eight minutes left when we ended the debate at 5.30 p.m.

Since I delivered the essential part of my speech on the motion of the Reform Party member, I will take the few minutes I have left to discuss the creation of the CWB.

First, let us not forget that western Canada would be totally different had it not been for the Canadian Wheat Board. When the board was first set up in 1919, immediately after the first world war, agriculture in western Canada was going nowhere. All Canadians tightened their belts and the Canadian Wheat Board was established.

The board lasted barely a year, but it helped improve somewhat the sales of wheat and barley produced in western Canada. The Canadian Wheat Board was abolished immediately after that. In 1935, during the depression, again nothing was happening in western Canada. Wheat crops were burned in the fields.

*Supply*

It became vital to have an agency that would look after the sale and supply of grains. The Canadian Wheat Board was re-established. However, between 1935 and 1943, membership was optional. Farmers were free to join or leave the CWB. When the second world war broke out, in 1939, there was a shortage of supply and membership became compulsory for all farmers. The situation has remained the same since.

Mr. Speaker, I saw you react when, a moment ago, I talked about 1919, 1935 and 1943. You are still a very young man and you were not even born in 1943, but it must be said that the Canadian Wheat Board provided enormous services to all western farmers. In other words, everyone benefited from it.

However, for the benefit of our Quebec constituents, I would like to draw a comparison between supply management in the dairy, egg and poultry sectors, and the Canadian Wheat Board.

• (1845)

Take, for example, supply management of milk. In Quebec, as in Ontario or any other province, wherever a farm is located, the farmer receives the same amount for his milk as if he were right next to the town or the processing plant. It is the same, in the West, for grain producers.

In Quebec, we must respect our quota, just as my colleague from Prince Edward Island must respect his quota or pay the penalty. Obviously, a farmer who wants to be difficult could say that supply management is not good and that he would like 10 more cows, that he has a large farm, that he could buy out his neighbour and feed 10 more dairy cows, and thus substantially increase his net revenue. But if he does that, he will interfere with supply management. Since we are living in a society, we must play by the rules of the game.

If too much milk is produced, prices will drop and the market will be flooded—no pun intended. There must be self-discipline. A farmer could well say that it is more profitable to produce milk in the summer because the cows go to pasture and do not need as much feed as in the winter, and no supplement. It costs much less to produce milk in the summer, cows give the same in the summer as in the winter, so let us produce more milk in the summer and less in the winter and our net revenue will go up. But you drink milk in the winter as well as in the summer, so dairy producers must produce milk 12 months a year, 365 days a year.

The West is using the same principle that led to the creation of milk pools. You have the quality of the wheat and barley, the percentage of nutritional fibre, and so on. So, the Government of Canada created the Canadian Wheat Board, which would appear to be the equivalent of the Canadian Dairy Commission.

Supply management has the advantage of regularizing farmers' revenues, and the same is true for the Canadian Wheat Board in the

West. What is good for all Canadians, consumers, producers and also processors is that a quality product is produced year round at a very competitive, very reasonable price.

What is offensive in all this is that today's debate focusses essentially on western grain producers. I would like to draw your attention to this, Mr. Speaker, and to call on your objectivity. Quebec has 24 per cent of the population and represents 17 per cent of Canada's agricultural scene, which grows by 25 per cent if we take into account the value added in the processing of such things as milk into yogurt, butter and cheese. However, Quebecers paid and continue to pay the cost of the Western Grain Transportation Act, which varied between \$560 million and \$1 billion depending on the year. Quebec paid its share of 24 per cent.

When the WGTA was repealed in the west the government released \$2.9 billion in compensation and adjustment allowances of all sorts. Quebec is paying 24 per cent of this generous subsidy. The department of agriculture, the Minister of Finance, are preparing to cut subsidies to milk producers in this country over five years. Quebec is home to 47.5 per cent of Canada's industrial milk producers. No compensation is being provided.

Do you realize that Quebec receives barely 8 per cent of the budget of the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food, if we take away the \$107 million in subsidies to industrial milk producers? The budget of the department of agriculture for Quebec—8 per cent. We produce 17 per cent, so it is less than 50 per cent, and if you include the value added, we top 24 per cent. So, we receive barely a third of what we should be getting.

• (1850)

This then is another example of the double standard that may be found very often in this country. I am taking this opportunity to criticize it before you, Mr. Speaker, knowing that this is the right time in this opposition day when we can talk about all agricultural matters.

In closing, as regards the Canadian Wheat Board, the subject today, the fact of people opting out temporarily for two years, is, in my humble opinion, twisted, even sick. Imagine a milk producer who wants to opt out for two years, test the waters, check things out elsewhere, and who realizes that it is not worth the effort and comes back to the pool with his colleagues. No.

Mr. Speaker, you are in good health. There is a group drug insurance plan that costs you \$1,000. You say that in any given year you pay \$50 for medications, because you are never sick. You are not in the group plan. After a year or two, you become terribly sick. You go and ask whether they will let you in so it will only cost you \$1,000. It does not make sense.

I think this motion is not votable. If it were, the Bloc Quebecois would not support it because it lacks thought.



*Supply**[English]*

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I was pleased earlier to hear the member for Frontenac talk about the objective of the Canadian Wheat Board which is to maximize the sale of Canadian wheat and the return to producers. It is good to hear one of the opposition parties talk in a positive way about a couple of the great institutions we have in this country: the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canadian Dairy Commission and hear him put a proposal to build on those institutions rather than destroy them.

Earlier I raised a question with the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster who would in essence destroy the wheat board with this motion and I could not seem to get through to him that the lowest seller sets the price.

I will put the question of the member for Frontenac. When one is selling products and people are competing against one another to bring down the price structure—the member for Frontenac is well aware of the beef industry and how sometimes prices are brought down in that industry by the fact that one producer wants to undermine another—and I wonder if he could tell us if the same thing might happen to wheat growers.

The ultimate impact of this motion would be that we could in essence have greater than 100,000 producers competing against each other and trying to undercut the price structure. The hon. member claims that would not happen. A producer might be in some financial difficulty—and I know the Reform Party does not seem to be concerned about that—who when the option is there for that producer to say to his banker that there will be a final payment in which returns are maximized under the Canadian Wheat Board, but now under this motion he would be forced to sell now and undermine the price structure.

I wonder if the member for Frontenac has any concerns that the negative competition being promoted by the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster might undermine the price structure and force farmers into greater financial difficulty?

• (1855)

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from Prince Edward Island, the hon. member for Malpeque, is right. All things considered, I must admit he is right. But I would like to remind him that the Canadian Wheat Board, like the Canadian Dairy Commission, is not without fault.

I would also like to remind my distinguished colleague that, because he plays a major role on the agriculture committee, he could suggest to his minister, to his government, improvements to

the Canadian Wheat Board, because you cannot be unaware that the Canadian Wheat Board is criticized, reviled and hated by almost a third of western farmers.

So it must be admitted that there is a malaise, the initial malaise. Farmers have no role at all on the advisory board, the one that was created and on which 11 members sit. They are listened to out of politeness, when in fact they are the most directly concerned.

You know, when I see the chairman, even if his curriculum vitae is 12 pages long, if he has never driven a tractor, if he does not know what one is, even if he has gone to school for years and has two or three doctorates, he does not know anything about agriculture or growing grain, and he is going to fall on his face.

Those best qualified to manage are farmers. Why do co-ops work so well in Quebec? Because the president is a farmer in the co-op. In fish co-ops, the president is usually a fisherman. He is not the village doctor, he is a fisherman.

So, whether it is under the present government or the one before it, it does not matter. When I look at the appointments made in my riding to the joint committee to examine complaints regarding unemployment insurance, now known as employment insurance, I think political patronage is involved. When you look at the list of these appointments, I think it would be good if one of them had seen an unemployed person or had had to fill out a time sheet at least once in his life.

Take the issue of improving transportation. The hon. member for Malpeque feels that a little improvement in transportation is required. You know, Mr. Speaker, Canadian wheat and barley account for 23 per cent of all exports sold throughout the world. We are therefore important, because close to one quarter of the world's exports come from our country. We have a major role and we should be a little more aggressive on foreign markets and go after other parts of the market and eventually, as the member for Malpeque said so eloquently a few minutes ago, increase, maximize prices, with the result that farmers would get better prices.

I will conclude by saying that the government could improve the operating method of the Canadian Wheat Board, and thus satisfy, I am sure, a large number of the 120,000 western grain producers. Obviously, not everyone can be satisfied, but when close to a third of grain producers are unhappy and would like to opt out for two years, something is wrong.

Once again, in closing—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** If you would not mind, I am trying to encourage debate during the period for questions and comments. As more than one member rose when I asked whether there were any questions or comments, I am going to give a member of another political party a chance to ask a question.

*Supply**[English]*

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the hon. member for Frontenac. I know he is not extremely familiar with the Canadian Wheat Board since its jurisdiction is the west and the prairies, but he is very familiar with the dairy industry.

If the dairy industry were run the way the Canadian Wheat Board is run and affects western Canada, would he support having to market through a milk selling agency if the producers had no voice on how that milk marketing agency functioned, had no producer voice, no democratic process to choose the directors on that milk marketing board? Would he support that board if there was no public accounting for how it marketed what the profit was, how much it cost it to market the milk on the producers' behalf?

- (1900)

That is what western farmers have to cope with because of the secrecy and the unaccountability of the Canadian Wheat Board. I do not believe that is in the dairy industry. Perhaps his attitude would change a little bit if the dairy industry was burdened with this undemocratic and secretive marketing agency.

The second question is an inspiration by the member for Malpeque who seems to think that the lowest bidder always gets the commodity. I would love to go to the member's auction sale if he ever has one because the lowest bidder is going to buy the items at his farm sale.

Do farmers in Quebec accept the lowest bid for their goods or do they accept the highest bid for their goods, the milk, the wheat or whatever they want to sell? What do they accept, the highest bid or the lowest bid?

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac):** Mr. Speaker, I would need about ten minutes to answer this question from my distinguished colleague, who is, moreover, the sponsor of today's motion.

The milk producers have disciplined themselves. I remember, for example, that ten years ago you would see four different milk tanker trucks on one concession road, picking up milk from the various farms, because there was competition between dairies at that time.

The dairy farmers got together and today there is one truck, just one. A bigger truck, of course, and it comes more often, so the milk is of better quality and this is the truck that will deliver the milk to the processors, according to their needs. If one needs three quarters of the tank, that is what will be delivered there. If another needs a quarter tank, that is what it gets, and so on. This has lowered production costs, therefore, and dairy producers have increased their incomes without increasing milk prices.

What I would like to say to my distinguished colleagues is that, in my region, when there is a sectorial meeting, 68, 72, or 75 of the 90 members will turn out. Dairy producers look after their own affairs, and if something is not working, they tell their sector president, and he passes the word higher up, and so on, until it reaches the top.

Are the western grain producers united? The 120,000 producers should form a basic union, because if they wanted to unite, these 120,000 or 125,000 farmers, they would have immense political and economic clout. That is worth nothing if they are not united.

I think that if they start to break apart—someone stays out for two years, another six months later, stays out for two years as well, so comes back six months after the first—fragmented like this, as my distinguished colleague from Malpeque has said so aptly—there would be competition between the producers themselves and no good would come of it for stabilizing prices and ensuring income stability for the producer. There would be no impact whatsoever.

Take the price of beef, for instance. I remember on the farm I sold feeder calves at the same price after ten years as I did when I started out farming. Beef prices have gone down. For the past 24 months, for example, they are practically giving beef away. The farmers listening to me today know very well that we get nothing at all for our cull cows and practically nothing for our butcher cattle.

**Mr. Canuel:** Reform cows.

**Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac):** My colleagues are making a pun about Reform cows, because the word in French for cull cow is *vache de réforme*, which means, as you know, Mr. Speaker, dairy cows who are no longer good producers.

The price of beef at this time is rock bottom, but if there were an organization similar to the Canadian Wheat Board, possibly the beef producers would have regular and stable prices.

- (1905)

*[English]*

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my support for the Canadian Wheat Board.

Contrary to what some critics contend, the Canadian Wheat Board is not a monolithic dinosaur out of touch with Canadian producers. It is a viable, state of the art company that does an excellent job in marketing western Canadian wheat and barley for its customers, the men and women who work in the Canadian grain sector.

The board was set up in 1935 under pressure from farmers. It has become in the words of Dan Morgan in his study on trade,

“Merchants of Grain”, the most powerful and prestigious marketing board in the world. The board has earned respect throughout the world for providing a quality product on time and as contracts specify. Its credibility in the world markets has been built over the years and it has delivered tremendous customer service.

The board is an example of an orderly marketing structure that best serves both Canadian farmers and Canadian grain customers. It markets all western Canadian wheat and barley products for export and domestically for human consumption. It costs the wheat board only 4.5 cents per bushel to market farmers' grain. All profits from the sales go to farmers. Because all western Canadian grain goes through a single desk, the Canadian Wheat Board can offer specific, consistent quality and supply to customers. As a result it can get the best price for western grain farmers.

The Canadian Wheat Board, like all organizations, is changing with the times. In an effort to maintain its competitive edge the Canadian Wheat Board commissioned the consulting firm of Deloitte and Touche Management Consultants in 1992 to take an outside independent critical look at the Canadian Wheat Board and how it operates. The fact that the Canadian Wheat Board took the initiative to do an in depth independent study proves the importance it places on proper management and accountability and its desire to strive to serve all customers' needs and to continue to be more efficient.

The study noted a number of areas for potential improvement. I am pleased to say that the board has implemented all the major recommendations handed down to it in the study. For example, the consulting firm noticed that the board needed to improve its long term planning. The board responded by developing a corporate vision, mission and a set of goals and strategic objectives. It has also streamlined and made improvements to its budgeting, management, planning and reporting system and has introduced a new performance evaluation system.

The Canadian Wheat Board's efforts have not stopped there. It is continually striving to make improvements in planning, management and operational aspects of its business. To ensure it operates efficiently, the Canadian Wheat Board also conducts an ongoing department by department audit of expenditures.

The level of service provided by the Canadian Wheat Board has greatly improved over the years. The Canadian Wheat Board has responded to demands for more market information beyond the annual report by providing a number of services and initiatives to keep its client producers well informed.

The board now issues regular pool return outlooks which give producers a good indication of where markets are heading. It also holds annual grain days meetings across the prairies where its staff

### *Supply*

meet producers to bring them new ideas and information and to listen their concerns.

The board is also using the tools of technology to become even more accessible to farmers. It has a 1-800 number and an electronic bulletin board. These initiatives show that the board has become proactive in its efforts to respond to customers' needs.

The board has also established price forecasting, undertaken new market development initiatives and developed enhanced risk management tools.

To help farmers tap into one of the most promising foreign markets, the board has opened a new office in Beijing. It also has a branch office in Tokyo and an excellent information network worldwide. This information network goes well beyond the scope of information available to individual grain producers or individual grain companies.

#### • (1910 )

For all these reasons, the wheat board has proven that it is adapting to changing times and that it is providing a valuable service to farmers. This is not to suggest that everything is perfect. Everyone agrees that some changes are needed to continue to improve the grain marketing system.

That is why the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food set up the Western Grain Marketing Panel last summer. This panel will report very soon. The minister hopes to have legislation in place by the fall.

The panel worked hard for many months to provide a vast amount of very useful public information. It held 15 public town hall meetings across the prairies to provide information and to receive input and feedback from farmers and farm organizations.

The panel conducted three sets of formal hearings in Winnipeg, Edmonton and Regina. These hearings provided a formal opportunity for all those holding differing points of view to come forward with their best arguments, their best evidence to put the case for one system or another to be subject to examination and cross-examination to get all the facts on the table and a thorough analysis of all the pros and cons, all the benefits and all the consequences. The panel had that full, open, transparent hearing process so that everything could be examined in a calm, rational and intelligent way.

The panel is now in the final stages of finishing its report. We expect to have it at the beginning of July. Once we have that report from the panel, which consists of nine very well respected individuals that represent every shade of opinion on the subject, we will be in a much better position to make whatever decisions are necessary with respect to grain marketing.

*Supply*

I would encourage all members of this House to lend their support to that board. It is Canada's best marketing tool to help farmers compete in global markets and get the best prices for their products.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I wonder if I could ask the parliamentary secretary for some guidance here. Am I to understand that the parliamentary secretary is sharing his time with a colleague?

**Mr. Pickard:** Mr. Speaker, I am sharing my time with the member for Souris—Moose Mountain.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Then there will be five minutes of questions or comments for the parliamentary secretary.

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I certainly listened to the parliamentary secretary's comments regarding the wheat board. He spoke so eloquently of this board and all the things that were accomplished through it that I wonder if we are even talking about the same board that our supply motion refers to.

I would like to list some facts. The member stated clearly that the board could guarantee large scale delivery to all its customers. Then the member also pointed out that farmers would get the best possible prices through the board.

If the member recalls correctly, and he should since he is parliamentary secretary to the agriculture minister, he would look at the first point here, the wheat board's ability to guarantee large scale delivery. I do not believe that is quite true.

Last fall the board had to apologize to Japan for its inability to deliver contracted barley. In April the wheat board then reneged on half of the future barley purchases promised to farmers. Without that sale to Japan, the grain was no longer needed. There was a slap in the face to the farmers as well as an inability to deliver to Japan.

Another inaccuracy from the parliamentary secretary is to deliver the best prices to farmers. Barley prices in the United States are American \$4.85. The same barley through the board in Canada is \$2.35. For durum the Canadian price offered stateside is \$8.50 and the board is offering between \$4 and \$4.50.

I would like the parliamentary secretary to address those discrepancies as he points out that the board is delivering when in fact it is not.

• (1915)

**Mr. Pickard:** Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board is structured so that it takes all of the product from all of our industry here in Canada.

We should look closely at the size of that industry and where these products are sold. The industry sells some 30 million tonnes of wheat around the world to markets in Japan, Asia and throughout the United States.

Sales to the United States are in the area of about \$2 million. What I am hearing from some spot pricing at very specific times is in fact that little market in the United States, which represents only 7 per cent of the sales of Canadian grain into the United States, may blip up from time to time.

When the price in the United States goes up the Canadian Wheat Board gets that price. There is absolutely no question that the board picks up that spot price in the United States. It also picks up all the prices throughout the rest of the world. Not only will that two million tonnes be sold in the United States for a higher price when the spot price is high, but also the other 28 million tonnes that is sold in other regions of the world. As a result every farmer that sells wheat to the wheat pool gets the benefit of that high price and the average of all the other prices put together. That is how a pool works.

When we are talking about how that pooling system operates, we are talking about selling in. Each person does not get one price from the United States, a different price from Japan, but an average or pooling price. As a result, they get the best price because the wheat board keeps no profit. All of the profits go back to the growers, the producers. Some grain is sold at higher prices and other grains are sold at lower prices. The average is what the Canadian Wheat Board pays.

When we talk about the delivery system and because we have a huge inventory of product, we have large growers co-operating with the wheat board, we know very clearly that their reputation throughout the world has been fabulous. It has the best reputation of any grain selling operation anywhere in the world.

As a result the board has a reputation for being able to supply. There may be niche markets where at one point it could not supply product, but in general it is recognized around the world that the wheat board has enough product to supply the markets to which it is selling. It has done a very good job and has a super reputation with the product it is selling. The Canadian product is above all others.

When we look at that operation it is very clear that producers do get the best average price and they do sell at a pretty secure market throughout the world.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a brief comment and a short question.

The comment is with regard to the Deloitte & Touche report to which the parliamentary secretary referred. He said that all the recommendations have been fulfilled. In fact that is incorrect. One of the recommendations dealt with the structure of the board and

the fact that it had five equal commissioners. Deloitte & Touche called it a 1930s structure that does not work in the 1990s. That is still in place and cannot be touched until the Canadian Wheat Board Act is amended.

My question is for the hon. member from Ontario. We have not had one prairie farmer from the Liberal side speak yet. I think they only have one farmer.

Ontario corn producers can sell their product to whomever they choose. They can sell it across the line. They can load their trucks, go across the border into the states and sell their corn, or sell it domestically or export it around the world. But barley growers who are producing an equivalent product in western Canada do not have that same privilege.

Does the hon. member think it is fair that corn producers can market to whomever they wish but prairie barley producers are not allowed to do that because of the Canadian Wheat Board Act?

**Mr. Pickard:** Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party continually brings up this idea of the ability to sell and you can always get the highest price. That seems to be the question that they are really coming down on. How do you get the highest price?

• (1920)

I believe without question that there is a terrible difference between this idea of buying and selling. If one is a buyer and there is only one person selling a product and there are many buyers, then yes, the buyers will bid against each other. That is not the situation that we are talking about. It is just the opposite.

We are sellers and if we have many sellers they are going to be bidding against each other. What my hon. colleague suggested is that bidding process, one against another, will lower the price. Obviously everyone knows if we have 10 people selling and one person buying, the person who is buying is going to get the best deal. That is the difference between buy and sell.

**Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the motion put forward today by the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster appears reasonable on the face of it. Indeed, it sounds reasonable that for a two-year period the Canadian Wheat Board could allow farmers, if they choose to do so, to sell their wheat and barley outside the jurisdiction of the board, if they thought it was a good idea at that particular time.

Let me point out that this motion represents a piecemeal and a cavalier approach to the serious business of marketing Canadian grains around the world, and the serious business of one of the top four or five sectors in the Canadian economy, agriculture and food.

There is a lot of good news in agriculture and food these days. First, prices for wheat and barley are higher than they have been for

### *Supply*

some time. After years of low prices, competing with the treasuries of the United States and the European Union which used massive amounts of export subsidies to keep the price of wheat down, prairie grain farmers are reaping the long overdue rewards of good prices.

Prairie grain farmers are reaping these rewards and that is good news for all Canadians. The world stocks of wheat are low, lower than they have been for a long time. Compounding this situation is a less than average winter wheat crop in the United States. That means low inventories and strong prices.

For the coming crop year which begins August 1, 1996, we are forecasting the price of a tonne of spring wheat at more than \$260. That compares with just \$134 a tonne in 1991-92 and \$157 a tonne in the 1992-93 crop year.

Barley prices too are near record highs. The average price of feed barley for the three years between 1991 and 1994 was about \$100 a tonne. For this coming crop year we are predicting the price to range from \$135 to \$155. Those good prices are benefiting all grain farmers, not just those who live along the 49th parallel. Perhaps it is the bonanza atmosphere after so many years in the doldrums that is fueling some of this short term, quick response from the other side.

Second, there have been many important and dramatic changes in agriculture over the last few years: a new world trading agreement and major policies changes within Canada, such as the end of the western grain transportation benefit. High grain prices, coupled with these changes and others are creating a real sense of optimism for grain farmers.

In fact, there is a groundswell of optimism throughout the agriculture and food sector as a whole. Between 600 and 700 who live, work and influence the agriculture sector will be gathering in Winnipeg next week to celebrate the excellence of Canadian agri-food and to collectively work on a business plan that focuses on maximizing the opportunities that abound for Canadian producers and companies at home and abroad. Good prices and good times do not necessarily last very long and now is a fortuitous time to work on those long term plans.

• (1925)

Turning specifically to grain marketing, any changes in the Canadian grain marketing system should be thoughtful and carefully reasoned with an eye on the long term prosperity of grain farmers, the prairie economy and to the overall benefit of all Canadians.

My colleague, the hon. Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food has taken a thoughtful approach in pursuing through the establishment of the western grain marketing panel an exclusive process

*Supply*

that has given all farmers a chance to put forward their views on the marketing of grains. It will be a thoughtful approach that will consider the benefits for that economy across the prairies, not just for those in a particular backyard when it comes to making changes in the marketing system that has served prairie farmers very well for more than half a century.

We are not squandering good times by making rash choices about the future. We are carefully exploring all points of view, all of the relevant facts, before proposing changes to the marketing of Canadian wheat and barley. No change will be made in an isolated, vague way which responds to the issues of the moment or the issues of one set of lobbyists.

It is a curious time for the opposition to bring this matter to the floor of the House of Commons when the western grain marketing panel is so close to completing its task.

The minister expects the panel to deliver its report in the next couple of weeks. He is eagerly awaiting the panel's report and will respond in his usual judicious and thoughtful manner. I urge members to defeat this motion.

As I travel throughout my riding, a rural agricultural riding in Saskatchewan, I do not get the response that some of the members from the third party suggest, that the Canadian Wheat Board should be destroyed. That is absolute nonsense.

A gentleman from Minnesota talked about one concern which he wrote about in a letter to the *Western Producer*. He said: "I sure would keep the Canadian Wheat Board if I were a Canadian. I have been on the Minnesota Wheat Growers Board for the last three years. Not one board member was in favour of working for a fair price for wheat in Washington. Your farmers in Canada should work together to protect your own interests. By the way I don't like those Canadian farmers hauling their wheat across the border in violation of your laws".

It seems passing strange that our American counterparts who have tremendous opposition to the Canadian Wheat Board are now finding solace in our friends in the third party. If it were such a poor system, do you think they would be complaining? In objecting to our Canadian Wheat Board, I doubt it very much.

I know the leader of the third party was in the United States. He suggested they should remove the irritant, the Canadian Wheat Board. However, when he returned home he suggested that a party based in the prairie provinces would not side with U.S. grain growers. I wonder how our friends in the third party are going to set the record straight. Either they are in favour of the American system and Canada abandoning our excellent wheat board or they are suggesting that we wait until the minister comes through with the report and he will take the appropriate action.

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with rapt attention to the hon. member's comments even though they are absolute nonsense.

This member is saying that the third party, the Reform Party, is out to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board which is absolute nonsense. We are getting sick and tired of trying to initiate a sensible, realistic debate on this subject only to be subjected to that kind of nonsense. I do not know whether the hon. member has ever farmed in his life but I have farmed most of my life. I am not as young as I once was but I can remember very low barley prices.

• (1930)

To hear the hon. member talk of an average price of \$100 a tonne for barley and suggest as he did that it is a bonanza price, I would like him to tell farmers that. The bit of profit on \$100 per tonne barley does not go very far toward paying for a \$200,000 tractor or combine. The hon. member should know that when he represents an agricultural riding.

The hon. member is saying that the average pooling price should be good enough. Studies have been done. Al Dooley of the Alberta Grain Commission, analysis branch, has done a 15-year study of the barley price f.o.b. Vancouver, shipped from Great Falls, Montana, as compared to Lethbridge, Alberta. It was a fair comparison. He found over the 15-year period that the American price was \$23 to \$30 per tonne more.

How can the member stand in his place and say that Canadian farmers are getting a good deal from the Canadian Wheat Board when that is the reality of a 15-year study?

**Mr. Collins:** Mr. Speaker, it is likely that he wanted to report on Tom Dooley rather than Al Dooley. The hon. member made a reference to studies. We told him that three independent people took a look at the Canadian Wheat Board. One was from his province of Alberta, one from Manitoba and one from Saskatchewan. They said the Canadian Wheat Board was doing an excellent job and gave the facts. They do not want to listen. Talk about nonsense. He certainly captured that event very well.

If he does not know Al Dooley he should check with Tom Dooley because they are likely in the same boat. I am suggesting the Canadian Wheat Board is a very capable and honourable approach to marketing.

When the committee comes forward with its report we will make changes to move into the 21st century. The minister said he would. If we are patient and listen to the proposals, we will see some positive, constructive changes to the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the debate since it began today. Four glaring questions remain unanswered by the government which I would like to pose at this time. I would prefer to do them one at a

time but I will probably have only one chance to rise. I hope the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain has a pencil handy.

Is it fair that corn producers can sell their corn in Ontario wherever they wish? Is it fair that Quebec farmers can sell their wheat for \$9.50 a bushel to the mills in Ontario but a Saskatchewan farmer cannot access that? Saskatchewan cannot sell their wheat in Ontario but other people can. Does the hon. member think that is fair?

Is it fair that farmers cannot have a direct say in what happens to their product? The Liberal government promised a plebiscite in the last election on barley marketing and never carried through with it. Farmers have had no direct say in this question. Is it fair that they are not allowed a direct say in this question?

I have a third question.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** With the greatest of respect, I have time restrictions. I ask the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville to hold questions three and four in reserve. I will go to the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain on the first two.

**Mr. Collins:** Mr. Speaker, let me say something about the marketing system. They can sell into Ontario but they will go through the Canadian Wheat Board. They can go through the Canadian Wheat Board. That is the system set in place.

If the members wants to set up a new system as he is suggesting, it will not happen while we are around. We support the Canadian Wheat Board. If the hon. member does not like it, it is too bad.

• (1935)

I likely travel more than most of them. That is not unique. I go about my riding. I can assure the House that the vast majority of farmers, and my son-in-law is a large scale farmer, support the Canadian Wheat Board and single desk selling.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Vegreville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to the motion presented by the hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster.

Actually it is not what I feel at all. It is not pleasure that I feel to be speaking and to be in the House today. As I listened to the agriculture minister give his presentation I felt frustration. He really has not learned a thing over the past many years.

He was involved as parliamentary secretary to the wheat board minister in the early eighties when a plebiscite was held on whether canola should go under wheat board jurisdiction. He lost that plebiscite. Farmers did not want that to happen. I thank God that it did not happen. The canola industry has been a saviour in my part of the country without a doubt.

### *Supply*

I felt frustration as I listened to the agriculture minister demonstrate that he really has not learned anything in that regard over the years. I felt sadness when I came to realize that as long as the government is in place the wheat board will not be changed in any meaningful way. The member for Souris—Moose Mountain has confirmed it. For that I feel sadness.

For me it has been many years of struggling. In my own farming career of 20 years, my father's before me and my grandfather's before him, we struggled to change the system to give farmers control over marketing. It is sad to see that it will not happen under the government. However it sure as heck will under Reform when we get into power.

I will speak today about what the motion is about and what it is not about. Then I will speak about what the wheat board is. I will not get technical. I will just explain what it is. Then I will give a bit of selective history because I do not have the time to go into the full history of the wheat board. The history will start in 1935 and go up to the present. Then I will speak briefly about what is likely to happen in the future.

My colleague reminded me that I only have 20 minutes. Probably I will not get through half of what I want to speak about but I will give it a good try.

The motion is about giving farmers the choice in marketing their grain. It seems sad that we need to have debate on giving farmers the choice to market their own product. What other business persons in the country allow government to market their products for them? Why has this archaic idea hung around so long? I do not know the answer but the motion is about giving farmers a choice over marketing their grain.

The motion is not about destroying the wheat board. It has nothing to do with that. It is not about making a list over here of what is good about the board and a list over there about what is not so good about the board. That is not what it is about. We do not want to get into that debate.

Farmers can debate those issues in the debate leading up to the plebiscite on the wheat board. That is the time for that debate. It has certainly taken place over the last many years and should continue, but that is not what this debate is about.

I will read the motion so there is no doubt:

That this House urge the government to amend the Canadian What Board Act to include a special 2 year opting out provision permitting those prairie producers who believe they are missing market opportunities the flexibility and choice to market their wheat and barley outside the jurisdiction of the Board.

That is what the debate is about. It is an honest debate. Every Reformer debating the issue is doing it in all seriousness from the heart and from an immense pool of knowledge on the issue. Many of us have lived under this system of marketing grain for a long time.

*Supply*

• (1940)

It is certainly not about pinning labels on people, as the member for Souris—Moose Mountain is doing to deflect the debate. It is about giving farmers a choice and that is what it should be about.

Earlier the Minister of Agriculture read very selectively about a commissioner in an article from the *Western Producer*. I will respond by reading from a more recent article in the *Western Producer* written by Barry Wilson. When referring to the Minister of Agriculture he wrote:

—strategy of defending the Canadian Wheat Board from its critics by stalling for time has one underlying, and perhaps fatal, flaw.

Again referring to the minister he continued:

Wheat board supporters have not used the time—given them to mobilize their own show of support.

He looks isolated, leading a phantom army of alleged Board true-believers who do appear to care enough to join the political battle.

Barry Wilson covers agricultural issues in the House and in committees continually. He is saying that perhaps the following is not there. Later on in my presentation I will demonstrate that is absolutely the case.

I want to talk a bit about the wheat board. I have heard some discussion about the subject. The wheat board is not a selling monopoly. There have been arguments that because the wheat board has monopoly power as a seller it will get a better price for farmers. That is not what it is. It sells into the world market. Literally dozens and dozens of major sellers sell competitive commodities into the market. It is not a monopoly seller; it does not have monopoly powers on the sell side.

Let us make no mistake that the wheat board has monopoly power on the buy side. I want the same people who talk about the benefit of monopoly power to answer why on earth they would want our farmers kept under the monopoly on the buy side. There is only one buyer to whom we can sell our wheat and barley for export and our wheat for domestic use. That is where the monopoly is on the buy side. That is to the disadvantage of farmers and there is no doubt about that.

The wheat board is also an organization which has proven to be unaccountable to farmers who pay the bills. The wheat board is totally funded by farmers from proceeds from the sale of their grain. Why on earth can farmers not see what goes on inside the organization? Why did it take a leaked document to show there was a severance package for commissioners of \$290,000? It is nonsense. It is a closed organization and that has to end. It has to become accountable.

I will give a bit of history. I am not going back to 1917 when it was first put in place or to 1920 when it was put in place again. I will go back to 1935. My grandfather had been farming in Lloydminster for 15 years when it was reinstated in 1935. At that time a dual marketing system was in place. Farmers had a choice.

They could either sell through the board, on their own or through a grain company. That is the way the board was set up in 1935. My grandfather said the wheat board was a saviour for him at that time. He was right.

I will talk a bit about the situation at that time. When my grandfather hauled his grain on a wagon, maybe 50 or 60 bushels at a time, to an elevator it was a haul of seven miles. At times he had longer hauls. He never knew what the elevator agent would do. He never had good market information. He lived a long way from a community where he could find out what the market was doing. Even then the information was very localized. There was not good market information. There was a cumbersome transportation system.

• (1945)

The wheat board was a saviour for my grandfather, but he lived and he farmed long enough to curse the wheat board because of its monopoly powers. There is no argument. It was an excellent organization. It had great value to farmers when it was put in place. It probably still does. However, that is not what this debate is about.

Then we go to 1943. During the war the Canadian government was concerned that wheat prices were going up dramatically and it wanted to get the grain cheaper for the war effort in Canada and in Britain. The government put the monopoly power in place through an order in council. That is something we would expect from this government. It was never debated and put through the House. It was established by order in council during the war in order to get cheap grain. As soon as it was put in place the prices dropped dramatically.

I have some prices for comparison between Canadian towns in the prairies and U.S. towns across the border. The comparison shows consistently that wheat was 70 cents a bushel higher in the United States than it was in Canada under the wheat board monopoly. That is \$1.80 compared with \$1.10. We are looking at a price difference of more than 40 per cent.

The government told Canadian farmers to accept it because it was for the war effort. Farmers are and always have been loyal citizens. They were willing to help the war effort. They were promised the difference would be paid back later, but they never saw a penny.

That is when the wheat board got its monopoly. The monopoly ended later and then returned in 1948 or 1949. We have to ask why. The only reason a government would want a monopoly in an organization such as this is so it can buy grain cheap because it has the monopoly on the buy side.

Then we get to 1980-81. The wheat is still being sold under the monopoly of the wheat board. The current minister of agriculture tried to have canola put under the board and he failed in the



plebiscite. I believe that is why the minister is so shy about holding a plebiscite now. He knows he will lose it this time as well.

I move now to the last four years. In 1993 Charlie Mayer, the minister responsible for the wheat board at the time, decided barley should be sold on the continental market. That meant farmers would have a choice to either sell through the board or directly, through a grain company or by themselves, to the United States. I would like to read a few things members of the Liberal Party said at that time.

I will read from an agriculture committee transcript of April 1993. A motion was put before the committee: "In view of the concerns that have been expressed by barley producers across the prairies with the government's plan to establish a continental barley market, the Standing Committee on Agriculture calls on the Minister of Agriculture to have a plebiscite of producers before the government takes any actions to establish a continental barley market and remove the exclusive marketing of barley exports from the Canadian Wheat Board". The hon. member for Winnipeg St. James, who sits in this government, argued there should have been a plebiscite on giving farmers the choice in marketing power.

The Conservative government, which was no more democratic than this government, refused to have a plebiscite. It wanted to ram the change through. That was not right. There should have been a plebiscite at that time.

A little later in that year, leading up to an election campaign, the Prime Minister promised a plebiscite on giving farmers a choice. The agriculture minister promised a plebiscite on giving farmers a choice. Many Liberal members promised a plebiscite on giving farmers a choice in marketing their own grain.

● (1950)

It is interesting how the Liberal position has changed from the time they were in opposition and how democratic they were then to now and how undemocratic they are now.

I want to get even a little closer to the present. I want to talk about what the farmers and the Government of Alberta have done about this Liberal broken promise to hold a plebiscite on the dual marketing of barley, the exact motion we are talking about, except we are saying we should try it for a two year period.

In the fall of 1995 the Alberta government held a plebiscite on dual marketing, on giving farmers the choice to market their grain in any way they saw fit, either through the wheat board or on their own. The result of that plebiscite was that 66 per cent were in favour of giving farmers a choice in barley marketing and 62 per cent in wheat. The results were clear.

### *Supply*

I have heard the minister of agriculture and others saying it was not a fair plebiscite. To heck it was not a fair plebiscite. I voted in that plebiscite. I took part in the debate on that plebiscite. The only thing that was not fair about it was that my money, the money I paid to keep the wheat board operating with every bushel of grain I sell, although I sell very little through the board anymore because I do not find it profitable, and all the money spent by farmers on the board, what did the wheat board do? It sent all of its best sales people out to the meetings to tell farmers that change was not good for them, that mama government should control marketing their grain. It sent its best sales people, and they were good, top notch sales people. I was at some of those meetings. However, they failed. Farmers clearly want the right to sell their grain.

As far as I am concerned, the issue has been decided in Alberta. The farmers have spoken and the Alberta government has spoken. The issue is over and done. We still have to decide in Saskatchewan and Manitoba as to whether farmers should be given the choice and freedom to market their grain as they see fit.

That is what this motion would do. It would give farmers right across the country the freedom to market their own grain, the product they put their money and sweat into. This motion will give them that choice.

**An hon. member:** Like the Prime Minister promised.

**Mr. Benoit:** Like the Prime Minister promised and like the agriculture minister promised.

That is where we are today. Alberta has decided the issue, case closed. What will come out of this committee? Nothing. I could have told members that. As soon as the minister said he was to hold this committee on grain marketing, I wrote down what the results were to be. I will be right and there will not be substantial changes. It will be just enough, they hope, to placate farmers. It is tinkering and it is typical Liberal law making.

He is the minister of procrastination, as he is called in my part of the country. I do not call him that, although maybe from time to time, but other farmers call him the minister of procrastination, and that is earned. He has not done a thing on this issue which is so important to Canadian farmers.

Where to from here? The government, and this has been backed up by the member for Souris—Moose Mountain, goes nowhere on this issue. Nothing substantial is to happen. We keep this anomaly of farmers' not being given control over marketing their own products. No other businessman would accept that, but that is what it will be under the Liberals.

However, I can absolutely guarantee the change will happen. The farmers will be given the choice. It will only happen under this government if it has a change of heart. I would not put the probability very high on that. However, after the next election it will change when the Reform Party forms the government, as I

*Supply*

believe we will. It will change and it will change fast. It will be done in a short time and that is a pledge I make to farmers right across western Canada. The farmers will have a say.

• (1955)

A plebiscite will be held and I am very confident the results of the plebiscite will be that farmers will choose to have the freedom to market the grain as they see fit and finally be given equality with the rest of Canadians.

**Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to follow the member for Vegreville. In some respects he seems to be an expert on plebiscites. He seems to be an expert on systems. I would like him to answer a couple of direct questions. What is the system he is proposing? I would like him to define how that system would actually work, if he is actually saving the wheat board while bringing forward his new system.

**Mr. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, that is a good question and I am very pleased to see the member takes this debate seriously.

Farmers will decide what question is asked. Farmers will decide what they want to choose from in a plebiscite. Then farmers will vote and that is the system they will operate under. That is a straight answer and I thank him for the question.

**Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the member for Vegreville's comments concerning the Canadian Wheat Board. In my former life I also farmed, admittedly in Ontario. I also grew wheat and I also shipped it and was quite happy to ship it to the Ontario wheat marketing board.

I listened with great interest to the member talking about the need for flexibility. I live in an agricultural community. Most of my farmers are involved with the marketing board. They are all happy. They fought long and hard to establish those boards. There was one basic reason. Generally speaking in agriculture there are many producers and there are very few buyers.

The member talked endlessly about the international market and so forth. The reality is that with 125,000 producers there will not be that many buyers. Invariably what happens when that situation occurs is buyers start to conglomerate and pick off these producers. That has actually been the history of prairie grain farmers and farmers throughout the country. That is why so many farmers, whether out west or in Ontario or Quebec or whatever, have formed producer organized marketing systems.

It seems the member wants to go back in history and create a free market economy where there really is none. There is none because we do not have the same number of buyers as we have producers. All the profits from the Canadian Wheat Board go back to the farmers. It is obvious to me and I do not know why it is not obvious

to the member. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot have a pool marketing system on the one hand and also have a whole bunch of other farmers outside of it.

**Mr. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. On his statement that there are so many sellers, 125,000 farmers, and so few buyers, under the system we are operating right now in the Canadian Wheat Board area and in Ontario there is only one buyer. That is true under the system we are under.

However, if we give farmers a choice there are many buyers. There are buyers around the world. The problem in the past and the reason we have had a build-up of wheat in the past is that the market signals are not getting through this Canadian Wheat Board bureaucracy and its secretive behaviour and operations to the farmers.

Farmers were not getting the signals as to how much grain they should be growing. For years they grew too much wheat for the market. As a result anywhere between two thirds and a third of the wheat they grew was being dumped on the world market, dumped below the cost of production and dumped at a price lower than the selling price in Canada. That is what happened because of the lack of market signals due to the secrecy of the Canadian Wheat Board. That is part of what we are asking to change. Open it up, give farmers the signals and let farmers find their own markets because they will have the signals then. They will know what they should be producing.

• (2000)

Farmers are very flexible now. They can go from wheat to other grains. They have shown that. They have done it. In our area they grow specialty crops, canola, lentils, peas, hemp, and I am not talking about cannabis; I am talking about the legal stuff. They will grow whatever they can that is legal to make a living. That is part of the answer.

In Ontario they are still unfortunately affected by the Canadian Wheat Board. The Ontario Wheat Board however has elected people running the board. Elected directors run the board. That is one of the things I think farmers would ask for with the Canadian Wheat Board. Let us fix the Canadian Wheat Board by giving farmers control over their own organization as they have in Ontario.

I have been down to southern Ontario quite a few times over the past couple of years. I have found a revolt in southern Ontario against the monopoly of the Ontario Wheat Board. It is just as strong there as it is in the west. The problem is their democratic system is not working very well but they are going to make it work. They are replacing one by one the old directors with some new directors who really want to open up the market which is exactly what we are asking for in this motion.

I think farmers in Ontario want exactly what farmers in the west want. I think we are speaking for farmers in Ontario as well farmers in the west.

**Mr. Glen McKinnon (Brandon—Souris, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have such a knowledgeable audience in the House this evening. I will attempt to meet their expectations and then some.

Let me comment first on the material I was able to obtain on the Canadian Wheat Board. There are three basic pillars of the wheat board marketing system: single desk selling, there is a power in marketing in this particular approach which I have not heard discussed in comparison to a dual marketing process; price pooling; and a farmer-government relationship which, as the previous speaker mentioned, has served since back in the teens but became much more supported by western farmers from the 1930s on.

Also we need to mention the fact that there is a feeling by members opposite that the committee that has been put in place is lacking in credibility, is lacking in honesty in terms of how it has conducted its hearings and its processes. I wish to comment on that point.

The hon. member for Lisgar—Marquette mentioned that he took exception to the fact that there were closed sessions and that this therefore jeopardized the entire process. I do not feel that way whatsoever. One of the strengths of the wheat board has been that it will be coming forward with a report. The report will include information from those sessions which some of the presenters wished to present in private.

I will focus to some extent on the committee itself and will discuss very quickly, briefly and succinctly the fact that this panel is blue chip. It comes to the problem of marketing with impressive credentials. I support this assembly of people.

● (2005 )

The panel is comprised of a chairman and eight individuals who represent virtually every perspective on grain marketing from one end of the spectrum to the other. Two of the panellists were drawn from the ranks of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association. I know members opposite and some on our side have read some of the articles which have been put forward from associations which they represent. Four of the panellists are active farmers and one works in the milling industry. Three are from Saskatchewan, three from Alberta, two from Manitoba and one from Quebec.

The minister took great care in appointing this panel to ensure that the members represented a broad cross-section of backgrounds. If I may, I would like to review their qualifications for the House. I am sure members will agree they are well qualified for the job.

### *Supply*

The chief panellist, Mr. Thomas Malloy of Saskatoon, distinguished himself prior to this appointment as chief negotiator for the Government of Canada in land claim negotiations with the Inuit of northern Quebec and for the First Nations of British Columbia. He was also legal counsel for western Canada to the Royal Commission on the Marketing of Beef in Canada.

Mr. Bill Duke is a former president of the Western Canadian Wheat Growers Association. He farms 2,000 acres near Redvers, Saskatchewan, just across the line from where I live, an area which is well represented by the member for Souris—Moose Mountain. He has served on the Sectoral Advisory Group on International Trade and has participated on the Producer Payment Panel and the 1990 Canadian Wheat Board review panel.

Mr. Jack Gorr of Three Hills, Alberta is vice-president of the WCWGA, a former member of the Alberta Grain Commission and a former member of the Alberta Wheat pool. He participated on the Gilson Task Force on Transportation some years ago.

Mr. James Leibfried of Winnipeg is a former commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board and has extensive experience in the grains and oilseeds industry. He negotiated numerous long term agreements and sales contracts in his career.

Mr. Wally Madill of Calgary is a former CEO of the Alberta Wheat Pool. In addition to his distinguished career with the pool, he has served with numerous companies and associations in the agriculture and energy industries. He has served as chairperson for several agriculture committees, including the Senior Grain Transportation Committee and the Western Grain Elevator Association.

Mr. John Neufeld of Dollard des Ormeaux, Quebec is director of Canadian operations for Archer Daniels Midland (ADM) Milling Company and has extensive experience in the agri-processing industry, including flour milling, wheat starch manufacturing, canola crushing and brewing. He is vice-chairman of the Canadian National Millers Association and a member of the Minneapolis Grain Exchange.

Mr. John Pearson of Calgary is first vice-president of the Alberta Wheat Pool as well as vice-chairman of Prairie Pools Inc. and Western Co-operative Fertilizers. He is also a director of Prairie Sun Grains and Pool Insurance. He operates a 1,700 acre grain farm at Donalda, Alberta.

Mr. Avery Sahl of Mossbank, Saskatchewan has been active in the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and represents numerous organizations including the Grain Standards Committee, XCAN Grain and Prairie Pools. Mr. Sahl also served on the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee for 15 years as its chairman.

Mr. Owen McAuley of McAuley, Manitoba, served on the executive of the Keystone Agricultural Producers and is a member of the Grains and Oilseeds Safety Net Committee which worked to

*Supply*

develop the gross revenue insurance plan and the net income stabilization account.

These nine panellists have handled the entire process and have done so with integrity. I sat in on one of their hearings in Brandon. I thought it was conducted in an open and honest fashion.

Since January the panel has conducted a number of hearings across the country. The hearings took place in Winnipeg, Edmonton and Regina. There were 80 submissions from a wide variety of farm groups. Submissions from these groups will show that there is a common consensus, a willingness to come forward with, hopefully, a unanimous report. If it is not, it will have some integrity on why there are some dissenting comments.

• (2010)

I hope that the report with its observations and conclusions will be based on the views of the producers. The grain companies and other stakeholders of course will have an important voice as well. We look forward to constructive suggestions on how to move forward.

The wheat board has served us well. As any man-made organization, it is not beyond or above approach. I am sensing that the minister will take the recommendations and put them in place as quickly as possible.

**Mr. Jake E. Hoepfner (Lisgar—Marquette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to my comrade from Brandon—Souris. I know he has his heart in the right place and he likes to look at things objectively.

I have read a lot of the presentations made to the Western Grain Marketing Panel. I still have not heard one of those presentations state that it wanted to have the wheat board stay status quo. I wonder if the hon. member could identify one of those presentations which stated it wanted to keep the wheat board the way it is. I have not found one yet.

There is another question I want to ask the hon. member. I agree pooling is a nice way of doing things and getting good and equal prices. However, what would he do with farmers who are in a position of having land which is overtaxed and overpriced and who have to pay five times as much for their property tax as some of their neighbours? Should the cost not also be pooled so these farmers can continue to operate?

**Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not and I tried not to leave the impression that any of the organizations that were making presentations wanted the status quo to necessarily remain. As I said earlier, they are not totally above reproach. A lot of the organizations will be coming forward with some administrative or operational suggestions.

In all sincerity to my hon. colleague, if one is paying higher taxes in a building on Main Street, then one goes to another area

where the taxes are lower. Farmers are doing that. I know a farmer from my area who decided that his taxes or operating costs were too high and he was keeping cattle so he went to another area where he could carry on his operations.

I do not think we can answer this question in terms of apples and oranges, because that is the comparison the member is alleging.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I am anticipating questions three and four from the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

**Mr. Garry Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, finally I get to ask three and four. They will be from a different member, but if you do not get answers, I guess it does not matter who does not give you the answers.

Whose wheat is it? Does the wheat belong to the government, to the Canadian Wheat Board or to the farmer? The reason I ask that is why not let farmers control their own affairs? Why do we need to have the government intervene in their affairs and have this heavy-handed way of controlling absolutely everything that is happening in the wheat marketing situations?

In my third question, I would first like to know whose grain is it?

The last question I am going to ask comes because of the glaring contradiction in what the members are saying about the grain marketing panel and what they are saying about the Canadian Wheat Board. They are vehemently defending the Canadian Wheat Board and then say they have this open and accountable grain marketing panel that is going to deal with this situation. That is obviously a contradiction.

They cannot extol the virtues and say that everything has to be kept the way it is and only tinker a little bit and then say that it is a completely open and accountable process in the grain marketing panel. They cannot be impartial if they have already entrenched our position and appointed the people with no input from Reform as to who is going to sit on that panel and have input into that. Those are the two questions I would like to see answered.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** I am sure the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville will be working on questions five and six for later.

• (2015)

**Mr. McKinnon:** Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to be doing three and four for my hon. colleague.

Whose wheat is it? At the present time, as I understand the process, the farmer takes it from the combine, to the truck, to an agency which sells it or markets it. At that point he then loses control. It is his grain until such time as he markets it. Then it becomes the property of the person to whom he has sold it. It may be a feeder, it may be an elevator company.

In terms of the second issue on—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** Resuming debate.

**Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate and speak to the pivotal role of the Canadian Wheat Board and the role it plays in prairie agriculture.

It is important to remind members opposite that the Canadian Wheat Board came into being through a grassroots movement by Canadian farmers. They lobbied the federal government to put in place a marketing agency to help them access export markets. The Canadian Wheat Board exists because prairie farmers demanded it.

The Canadian Wheat Board continues to exist because by far the majority of farmers support it. This is very important for members to keep in mind. Farmers are in essence the board's shareholders. The mandate of the board is to get the best possible returns for Canadian prairie farmers.

As the farmer's marketing agency, the Canadian Wheat Board returns all sales revenues after the costs of marketing to the wheat and barley farmers of western Canada. Farmers do not have to split sales revenues with other shareholders. It is all divided among them based on deliveries and grades.

It is no secret that I have long been a strong supporter of the Canadian Wheat Board. As a farmer I know what the board means for the bottom line of our farms. The board provides me and farmers like me with consistently higher prices than we could get by marketing on our own. This was proven in an external performance appraisal conducted by three well known and well respected agricultural economists from the prairies.

The evaluation clearly stated that if single desk selling were ended prairie farmers would lose \$13.35 per tonne, which would amount to a total loss to prairie farmers of \$365 million per year. Is this what Reformers want? Do they want to take \$365 million out of farmers pockets every year? Farmers will not stand for it and neither will I. These are the facts. I do not know one farmer who would be willing to give up over \$13 per tonne.

The board's mandate is to make money for Canadian farmers, period. That is what the board has been doing very well for the past 60 years.

It is interesting that when we ask supporters of dual marketing for their facts, all they can provide are vague references to one time only limited niche markets, and the rhetoric goes on and on. They have never provided one shred of evidence that farmers would be better off financially in the long term with dual marketing.

The board is able to provide prairie farmers with high returns because it operates from a position of strength. It uses its considerable resources, its information on markets, crop and weather

### *Supply*

surveillance, and combines that with excellent customer service to create stable, long term markets for quality wheat and barley for farmers in my riding of Dauphin—Swan River and for farmers right across the prairies.

Members might not realize the Canadian Wheat Board is one of Canada's largest exporters, with annual sales revenues approaching \$5 billion. The board is constantly looking for new markets for new products farmers can grow to satisfy export market demands. AC Karma is an excellent example of this. The board is working hard to expand markets in countries throughout the world, including the Pacific rim.

● (2020)

There are plenty of reasons the wheat board is one of the most well respected grain marketers in the world and why the same customers come back year after year. The board's reputation for products of excellent and reliable quality is commonly recognized as Canada's trump card on international grain markets. Buyers from around the world ignore cheap grain to buy Canadian.

Why would they do this? They know it is consistent from year to year, load to load. Our export partners know they get the best quality wheat and barley in the world from the Canadian Wheat Board, and they come back year after year.

It is also important for members to know the Canadian Wheat Board is being responsive to farmers' needs and that it is being flexible. For example, improvements have been made to the delivery system, with extensive input from farmers and elevator companies, to address the delivery needs of farmers.

The board is also recommending a number of legislative changes which will put money into farmers' hands faster by changing payment structures. It will provide increased information to farmers to help them with their management decisions.

The Liberal government recognizes the importance of the Canadian Wheat Board to western Canadian farmers and it wants the board to be the best it can be. For that reason I commend the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food for establishing the grain marketing panel. He has pulled together panel members who represent a cross-section of the industry to look at our grain marketing system. One of the focuses has been the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Through the grain marketing panel we are consulting with farmers. Farmers are telling us how the system can be improved to serve them better. The minister has indicated that changes may be made. These changes will be to the benefit of prairie farmers.

I attended meetings of the grain marketing panel in Brandon and in my home town of Grandview. The clear message farmers from my riding of Dauphin—Swan River and from across Manitoba

*Supply*

were sending was they wanted the Canadian Wheat Board to remain the single desk seller for Canadian wheat and barley.

The Canadian Wheat Board is an important and highly effective marketing agency, and the majority of western Canadian farmers are anxious to strengthen the board, rather than weaken it. Every day my office receives calls from farmers in support of the board and single desk selling. They tell me the board and single desk selling are crucial to their survival.

The results of the election to the Canadian Wheat Board's advisory committee, in which 10 of 11 farmer representatives chosen were strong wheat board supporters, are proof that grain farmers from across the prairies firmly support the board. The evidence is clear. Farmers want the Canadian Wheat Board. They want single desk selling.

This motion is yet another example of shortsighted, ill conceived policy by the Reform Party that will hurt farmers. If the Reform Party is so interested in agriculture, I wonder why agriculture policy was not even on the agenda at its recent conference. That speaks volumes about where agriculture is on the Reform Party's priority list. It is nowhere on the list.

I can tell the House, for the record, that a strong Canadian Wheat Board is on the top of my priority list for the following reasons.

The Canadian Wheat Board, with its single desk selling, works with other players in order to achieve major objectives which would be difficult to accomplish in any other way. One, it maximizes returns to producers. Two, it ensures unparalleled quality control. Three, it provides ongoing customer service in the international marketplace.

The farmers of Dauphin—Swan River and many of the grass-roots farmers from across western Canada want a strong Canadian Wheat Board and I support them wholeheartedly.

• (2025)

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this debate is becoming so lively that a whole raft of my colleagues would like to have the opportunity to ask the hon. member a question.

Finally we have a western farmer making a presentation from the other side of the House. I congratulate the member for making her presentation this evening despite the late hour. I listened attentively.

When my hon. colleague for Yorkton—Melville asked the member from across the House who the wheat belongs to, the hon. member for Halifax stuck her head in the Chamber and heckled and said the wheat belongs to God. Perhaps as their leader would say it will take an act of God before we ever see any changes to the Canadian Wheat Board.

What is the answer they are proposing? We are proposing to give farmers some freedom, to give farmers the choice. We are not proposing to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. Far from it. We are saying give farmers the choice. Their answer is to defend section 745 of the Criminal Code, let first degree murderers out on early parole, at the same time as they throw farmers in jail. It is absolutely ludicrous.

What is their answer to the present dilemma facing grain farmers in western Canada where we see farmers being arrested, their equipment, their combines, their trucks being impounded at the border and the farmers being hauled before the courts? Is that their idea of settling this issue?

**Mrs. Cowling:** Mr. Speaker, I do not like what I am about to do but in order to answer the hon. member's question I will have to crawl to the depths of the Reform Party, to its rhetoric.

The rhetoric in the House in the last three or four hours is appalling. We have asked Reform Party members on several occasions what they mean about dual marketing. The Liberal government has provided them with the facts of what the Canadian Wheat Board is about, that we are listening to farmers. It is about time we heard some facts about where they would like the government to go with respect to dual marketing and Canadian farmers.

**Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the member who seems to know a bit about Reform policy. She should know if she listened to my speech that I did give a definition of what dual marketing was and I gave examples of how dual marketing had worked, but obviously she did not listen.

In resolutions passed at our recent assembly in Vancouver, 91 per cent of our voting delegates voted in favour of marketing choice, in others words dual marketing.

As well, there was overwhelming support for a resolution calling for final offer arbitration in settling these labour disputes that effect the movement of grain to port. The member is not paying a whole lot of attention and is not coming with the facts into this debate.

She said Canadians demanded that the Canadian Wheat Board be established and thought that was wonderful, but she neglected to note that Alberta producers democratically demanded the right to market outside of the board and she ignored the wishes of those farmers.

She referred to the Kraft report as being some wonderful and reliable document when in fact it was funded by the Canadian Wheat Board and based on a private, secret information provided to that study group by the board. It does not have a whole lot of credibility.

*Supply*

She said her constituents are supportive of the Canadian Wheat Board. I wonder what kind of response she received from her constituents regarding the commissioner's high salary, which was recently released, and the immoral severance package, well over \$250,000 over two years should they resign or retire from the board. Do her constituents support that? Does she think that if farmers want to market outside an agency that provides those kinds of exorbitant severance package to their commissioners, those benefits, they should have the right?

• (2030)

**Mrs. Cowling:** Mr. Speaker, there is an incredible difference between this Liberal government and the third party in this House of Commons.

The government is listening and consulting with the grassroots movement of the country. We are awaiting the results of a panel. A good majority of those grassroots people will in fact be coming from the third party of this House of Commons.

It is very easy to sit on the opposite side of the House and pull apart and dismantle a marketing system that works incredibly well for farmers. It is my understanding that the third party is on a crusade to destroy the most effective marketing system we have in this country, the Canadian Wheat Board.

**Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this is question No. 5. Surveys have been taken in my riding and over 80 per cent of the people want the Canadian Wheat Board. They like the Canadian Wheat Board but they see the Liberal government destroying the board by its inaction.

That same 80 per cent of the people want some very key and important changes made. Reform has been listening and addressing those changes. There is a great suspicion that some of the decisions that are made by the Canadian Wheat Board favour eastern interests and because the wheat board is not open and accountable we have no way of knowing. It is not controlled by farmers.

I will give you one example. Farmers suspect that a lot of the grain is shipped through Thunder Bay and the Lakehead and goes out through the east because it benefits eastern interests and is controlled by politicians and bureaucrats in Ottawa. We have no way of knowing whether that is true. Farmers would like to see the port of Churchill utilized a lot more because it has great advantages. This Liberal government has talked the talk but does not walk the walk in investigating and using the port of Churchill.

The buck stops right with this agriculture minister who refuses to address this issue and open up the wheat board, make it accountable and controlled by farmers. I do not see how they can argue against it. There is a glaring contradiction in the fact that they vehemently defend the status quo of the Canadian Wheat Board

and at the same time say we have an open marketing panel that is going to address the issue. You cannot have it both ways.

**Mrs. Cowling:** Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a group of people in this country that have had more change in the last 60 years than Canadian farmers. Canadian farmers are open to change and Canadian farmers who are shareholders of the Canadian Wheat Board are open to change.

With respect to the question about the confidentiality of the Canadian Wheat Board, the Canadian Wheat Board books are open every single year. What the Canadian Wheat Board cannot do is take it directly to the Reform Party and put it in front of their eyes. It is up to Reform members to make that kind of a decision. It is up to the third party to at least make some pretence to find out the quality of the best marketing system in the world which is in fact the Canadian Wheat Board.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have the honour of representing the riding of Lotbinière. This evening my riding association is gathered in my riding office, and I want to congratulate it on the good work done and the support I have been given. So, I say a big thanks to the whole team.

The riding of Lotbinière is one of the largest agricultural ridings in Quebec. Accordingly, agricultural matters are of particular interest to me because I want to be up on what my constituents are facing. Furthermore, I sit on the House Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food.

That said, although the farmers in my riding are not those most affected, the motion brought forward today by the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster has a much greater impact on farmers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and certain parts of British Columbia. Because of professionalism and my membership on the agriculture and agri-food committee, I consider it important to take part in this debate. When I refer to the prairie provinces, this is the territory served by the Canadian Wheat Board.

• (2035)

I certainly am not feeling a need to defend the Canadian Wheat Board at all cost, but it seems important to look at what it is all about. It may be considered a crown corporation, because it is responsible to Parliament. In legal terms, it comes under the Canadian Wheat Board Act, but in practical terms, it is responsible to the farmers, because it is funded by some 130,000 wheat and barley farmers in the provinces I named earlier.

Let us have a look, if you will, at the board's history. There are in fact two Canadian Wheat Boards. Let me explain. The first, the CWB, was established in 1917 to counter the major economic upheavals caused by World War I. Then, with the economic crisis

*Supply*

of 1929, Parliament had to bring it back definitely. This is what I call the second board.

Since then, there have been numerous changes, some of which I would like to point out, in order to illustrate the board's flexibility and ability to adapt.

First of all, in 1949 the board was given responsibility for marketing oats and barley. These two markets were added to the responsibility it already had for wheat.

It was not until August 1, 1989 that oats were removed from the board's mandate. Furthermore, four years later, on August 1, 1993, barley destined for the continental market was removed from its mandate by order in council. In this particular case, there was opposition, and the matter was referred to the courts.

Following a decision, and subsequent appeal, in which the government's decision was declared ultra vires, the board was left with responsibility for barley. The problem lay in the fact that barley had been removed from the board's mandate by order in council. And the Federal Court had to rule that the Canadian Wheat Board's mandate could only be modified by Parliament and not by mere order in council.

In conclusion, barley is therefore still under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board. The board relies primarily on the system of pooling. This system allows all producers to receive an initial identical payment year round. The final payment supplements the initial payment in order to reflect the value set by the market during a crop year.

In other words, the pooling system is used to level out price fluctuations. The pool price is representative of the price variations. The way the pool price is calculated results in each category of grains within a pool gaining neither advantage nor disadvantage from various factors.

It must be kept in mind that, although a pool system may attenuate the fluctuations that are inherent in any commercial transaction, the asking price remains subject to outside competition. Remember the strong downward fluctuations in grain prices in the second half of 1980. Some pools recorded marked deficits and these were absorbed by the federal government.

In normal circumstances, the Wheat Board balances its various pools, and this was a definite advantage during that time in the Eighties. It seems to me that memories are short on the Reform side about the advantages the Canadian Wheat Board has conferred in the past. It seems that the wind has changed, in that the present market offers advantageous prices, and that is what has prompted a group of barley and wheat producers to want to take advantage of greater flexibility in marketing their grains. Some will accuse the CWB of being timid in its actions and in its offers to develop new outlets, new markets. They focus on this in demanding changes, forgetting the advantages of the system. In fact, for them, it seems

more advantageous to pull out of a rigid system that is focussed on long term stability.

The hon. member for Kindersley—Lloydminster and his Reform colleagues are trying to make political hay with this motion. They too are feeling the gusts of electoral winds, which may well get stronger this fall.

• (2040)

The Reformers, lacking popularity and visibility, want to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to include a special 2 year opting out provision affording prairie producers the flexibility and choice to market their products outside the jurisdiction of the board.

When we look at the motives of the Reformers, we see they are working for themselves and not to really come to the aid of barley and wheat producers in the west. This motion raises a lot of questions in addition to those about the real motives and intentions of the Reformers.

I can understand, obviously, that certain barley and wheat producers want to get out of the CWB, but do they all? Should we give up a system that works relatively well for all wheat and barley producers for a small group?

They want to make money. The current economic situation is in their favour. I understand they want a special clause to opt out for two years. After that, will they have to return to the ranks of the Canadian Wheat Board? Who will keep track of things? The system proposed by the Reform Party is impractical. The new system will make the job of the Canadian Wheat Board difficult, I should say perilous.

In fact, this House should debate the whole existential issue of marketing boards such as the Canadian Wheat Board. Which is better, to stabilize the prices received by barley and wheat producers on a median basis, or to ride out market cycles? In general, everyone is seeking security and stability, both financially and materially, as well as emotionally.

Few people would like to see their salary drop, and yet three highly respected economists from western Canada took a look at what it would mean for western producers if the Canadian Wheat Board were to disappear. According to them, the loss of the pooling system would be accompanied by a loss in revenues for western farmers.

Try to imagine the scene. Things are fine, for the Canadian Wheat Board is no longer wanted. I spoke to you earlier about the present situation. Do you know that there was a decrease in world stocks of wheat in 1993-94, that there was a drop in production in the former Soviet Union countries, that there was a drought in Australia in 1994? These are all factors that influence price.

We are headed toward the global village foretold by Marshall McLuhan, a native Albertan. McLuhan thought that people had to be constantly clear-headed and aware of what was happening to them. Today, no one can deny what is happening on the other side of the planet, even from the point of view of climate, because we



feel the effects in our own environment. When money is not involved, it is another story. I am thinking here of the volcanic eruptions of Mount St. Helen.

The proposal by the Reform member is designed, in the medium and long term, to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board. The Reform tell us today that they want only to allow farmers not to lose any business opportunities by offering them flexibility and marketing choices for wheat and barley.

Taking note of their arguments, and faced with the imminent possibility of the PM calling a general election before long, one wonders if the Reform members are not making political hay with this. Yes, political hay. No one need fear calling things by their right name.

The Bloc Québécois position is clear. We are opposed to the motion the Reform is proposing today, for it is our opinion that the Canadian Wheat Board must, if it is to remain efficient, stay as the only body empowered to market barley and wheat overseas and in the United States.

• (2045)

Let us not forget that the CWB exported wheat to 69 countries in its last crop year. Nothing to be sneezed at. You know, in a trade negotiation situation, the Canadian Wheat Board with its monopoly is the only possible contact for anyone wanting to purchase Canadian wheat. We cannot play ostrich, with our heads in the sand, thinking that this means it can demand higher prices than would be asked if there were several suppliers. The CWB, if it had no monopoly, would find itself in direct competition with the other sellers of Canadian grains, and the market price would be in danger of plummeting rapidly.

Finally, let us not forget that the CWB can, at any time, set different prices according to the markets, without eating into revenues from preferred markets.

The Reform motion would also undermine the level of price pooling and risk reduction. In a sense, what is being said is: "The heck with the security and stability that the current Canadian Wheat Board provides". The Reformers, with their inappropriate motion, are simply trying to set up a parallel system wheat and barley marketing system. This new system would only limit the actions of the Canadian Wheat Board.

There is another not insignificant aspect. As you know, the Canadian government supports the funding of the Canadian Wheat Board when it borrows on international markets. Can you imagine the rate of interest the CWB would be able to negotiate allowing producers to withdraw for two years? Would it be able to negotiate rates as advantageous as those it gets now?

### *Supply*

In all loyalty, we owe it to ourselves to challenge a motion like the one by the member for Kindersley—Lloydminster. Even Prairie Pools, the strongest pressure group or lobby among western grain producers supports the continued existence of the Canadian Wheat Board.

As you know, there is no such thing as a perfect system or a perfect member of Parliament. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the board is by far and away the best marketing tool and an excellent partner for barley and wheat producers.

In another area, are you aware that the milk producers in my riding of Lotbinière, in Quebec and in Canada still prefer to live with the inflexibility of a system that provides for a stable income rather than challenge it.

I have a really hard time understanding the Reformers. They either head upstream in an effort to make political mileage or they divert attention from more important events that we as Parliamentarians should be paying attention to.

This is not the first time that Reformers have struck at the Canadian Wheat Board. They already called for a plebiscite to elect producers to the board of directors of the CWB. You know, allowing producers to choose whether or not to take part in decisions will always be an option when barley and wheat prices are high, but it is a much less attractive option when markets are saturated and prices fall because of production costs. Remember the second half of 1980 I was telling you about earlier.

Right now, there is an advisory board of producers elected by their peers that makes known its ideas, although it has no actual power.

The marketing of barley and wheat is a huge undertaking. Canadian Wheat Board sales are approximately four billion dollars. Operating costs alone are \$41 million, approximately one per cent of total sales. Over 500 full-time and temporary employees and some 16 regional representatives work daily on behalf of barley and wheat producers.

• (2050)

People may say that the Canadian Wheat Board is not perfect, but to scuttle it in this underhanded manner through the motion the Reformers are presenting today borders on Reform mania. After Liberal mania, we know what the new one is.

The Canadian Wheat Board is the institutional embodiment of a marketing system developed to truly help producers.

It rests on three fundamental pillars. The first is its exclusive authority in foreign sales of wheat and barley. In the case of the United States, it is for wheat only.

*Supply*

The second pillar is the pooling of resources with respect to prices. When we pool resources, we can do interesting things. Here, I am thinking of the Mouvement Desjardins.

The third pillar of the Canadian Wheat Board is the partnership between producers and the government. Grain producers individually have little leverage to sell their products and a lot less weight to penetrate foreign markets, where market forces are more or less fair.

In short, this is the essence of my opposition to the motion of the Reform Party member.

Do you know how the *Petit Robert* defines a reformer? It talks of a tendency to reform. Under the definition of the adjective, it provides "advocate of political reform, individual wanting to improve capitalist society through reform". Parenthetically, it provides that such people are the opposite of revolutionaries.

What they are after is in fact a step by step revolution. The first step is to destabilize the Canadian Wheat Board. The next is to claim the difficulties it faces as the result are a sign of its illness and to use this to demand nothing less than its abolition. Why not go directly to Go? Well, no, they will not, because basically they know the board plays a very important role.

Once again they are only after political mileage. I think it is shameful to go after it on the back of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Western producers need protection, and for years it has been provided. I have to say it must not be abolished. I said earlier that they want to abolish it for two years. But how, at the end of the two years, will they pick up again? I see the Prime Minister indicating his agreement with me. It is not easy. For sure nothing is perfect. But to go from there to knocking everything down and not providing an alternate structure or some other means is going too far in the opposite direction.

What I can say is that my party supports the Canadian Wheat Board and we will work hard to keep it and to have it continue to help western producers.

[English]

**Mrs. Marlene Cowling (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the House that I have had numerous letters from a number of farmers in my riding requesting that we enhance the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board by adding other commodities to the board.

My question for the hon. member is this. Does he believe that the theory behind the motion of the third party in the House of Commons is to destroy, undermine and undercut the credibility of the Canadian Wheat Board as well as undercut the grassroots movement of this country which is Canadian farmers?

• (2055)

[Translation]

**Mr. Landry:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond, because this is a very important question. It raises two points. The first, I feel that there must be solidarity among western producers.

As I was saying just now in my speech, not everything is perfect, but there is a difference between wanting to make improvements and throwing the baby out with the bath water. I feel the Canadian Wheat Board has a place among the producers in western Canada.

I would have been pleased to see the Reform members come up with a motion indicating that they had something better to propose. Having worked in the labour movement, I must admit that I see this as a kind of western association. They want to pull out, but they want to be able to come back. Let us ask this: after they have been out for two years, how will they get back into the Canadian Wheat Board?

I feel that, with the Canadian Wheat Board, things can be added, we can try to modify and to improve, and if that is done, all of the western producers—it is not Quebec that is the big wheat producer, but the west—if we sit down around the same table to try and find solutions, let me tell you, everyone will be happy and peace will have been restored.

[English]

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask our colleague why does the American government so strongly argue against the Canadian Wheat Board? Does the hon. member think the Americans are trying to protect Canadian grain producers or would it be possible they are trying to protect their own?

Does the hon. member also think that it is possible that if the Canadian Wheat Board was dismantled they would throw their borders open and allow grain to flow across that border without a problem or a challenge?

[Translation]

**Mr. Landry:** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond. I went to Washington when the Farm Bill was being studied, and let me tell you, I had some interesting experiences. We are not the most protectionist, the Americans are.

They protect their markets, and when they can improve things, they do. Let me tell you, the Americans will gain the upper hand if we do not get our act together. What we in Canada have to do in connection with the Canadian Wheat Board is not to destroy everything, but to build it up where necessary.

*Supply*

[English]

**Mrs. Georgette Sheridan (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the comments made by the members of the third party this evening.

It is somewhat ironic that it takes a member of the Bloc Quebecois to explain to the third or fourth party the destructiveness of what it is Reform members are advocating this evening.

The member from the Bloc mentioned, and I quote from some of his comments, that the Reform Party was out of touch. That is abundantly clear when we have many western producers who favour not the dismantling of the wheat board but having a close examination of it to see how it could be improved in a sensible, logical, carefully thought out way. It is anathema to the Reform Party. Carefully thought out is not in the Reform Party handbook.

My hon. friend also mentioned that what the Reform Party is up to is political mileage. The other side of that is short term thinking. I guess if one is the fourth party, short term thinking is about all one can afford to do because one will not be around that long anyway.

The other term that was used by my colleague was Reform mania. I know we are here speaking about wheat and not mad cows, but it occurred to me as I listened that their solution to this is because there some problems with the wheat board and they cannot think their way out of this, so just dump it. That is the Reform Party's simplistic, short term, Homer Simpson-like solution.

Of course the wheat board is not perfect—

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

**Mrs. Sheridan:** I know, it is the other side of the story. It is not perfect and that is why the minister has put together a panel chaired by a very competent individual and people representing all the stakeholders involved on all sides of the issue. We can put a thoughtful view on this, as opposed to whatever it is that comes out of the Reform Party.

• (2100)

I wonder if my colleague could explain to Reformers one more time why there is strength in numbers, why 130,000 farmers acting together with an improved board to sell their grain would be more useful than every man for himself. I do mean every man for himself when I talk about the Reform Party.

[Translation]

**Mr. Landry:** Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Reformers are a new party. They have just arrived in this House, and they too are learning. We know that we learn from our mistakes.

I remember the Reformers when I arrived here, in the House of Commons. They did not talk about wheat and barley, but I will not mention that. The first thing I heard them talking about was the

price of club sandwiches and the shoe shine service. They wanted to see these benefits disappear.

I will tell you that there are more serious matters than club sandwiches and shoe shine services that need to be discussed in this House. I would like to warn western producers. The Reformers had better watch out because they are going to see a fast one pulled, let me tell you.

[English]

**Mr. Morris Bodnar (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is quite a lively crowd at nine o'clock. It sounds like the French party is having a French festival on the other side.

It is a pleasure for me to join the debate today on an issue which is of vital importance to tens of thousands of Canadian men and women, the Canadian grain marketing system. This is not a debate to be entered lightly or frivolously. This country's grain industry is a vital, prosperous and growing sector, a sector where farm receipts alone totalled more than \$8.5 billion last year. It is the economic backbone of Canada's prairie region.

Though based in the prairies, the influence of the grain sector is felt across the country, from the flour mills of Montreal to the ports of Vancouver, to the fertilizer and farm equipment dealers in my native Saskatchewan.

I believe it would be fair to say literally hundreds of thousands of Canadian men and women depend on the grain sector, either indirectly or directly, for their livelihood and well-being.

Today's debate is not just about party politics or about an opposition party's attempting to score political points at the expense of the government. It is about institutions that helped to build the prairies. It is about the thousands of western Canadian grain producers and their families who have a very real and basic stake in what we are discussing today.

The motion we are debating in the House today calls on the government to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act to include a special two year opting out provision permitting those prairie producers who believe they are missing market opportunities the flexibility and choice to market their wheat and barley outside the jurisdiction of the board.

I find it quite interesting that members of the party opposite have waited so long to introduce a motion on an issue about which they claim to care so deeply. Anyone who has followed the ongoing debate on western Canadian grain marketing would know that within a matter of weeks there will be a report from the prairie-wide consultation process the minister initiated.

The nine members of the Western Grain Marketing Panel consulted with producers, industry, the provinces and other concerned stakeholders about the future of the western grain

*Supply*

marketing system. Their findings and conclusions will be on the minister's desk within a matter of weeks. Yet members opposite would have the federal government disregard this process, discount the hard work of the panel and the contributions made by thousands of individuals and companies, and unilaterally introduce a major change in the manner in which wheat and barley are exported in Canada. I find this reasoning quite dumbfounding.

What I find even more surprising is that not only did the Reform Party make a submission to the panel, a submission which if the government were to adopt this motion would simply be tossed aside, but the submission was made by the sponsor of this motion. As Alice noted in *Through the Looking Glass*, it is curiuser and curiuser.

• (2105)

I cannot and would not want to speak for the Reform Party but I am prepared and committed to wait and see what western Canadian grain producers have to say about contemplating any changes.

This motion speaks of giving farmers a choice. It promotes the so-called dual marketing system, a system which in theory gives farmers the option of marketing grain on their own or continuing to have the Canadian Wheat Board market their produce on their behalf. Dual market proponents say they want the alternative to use the current system or not to use it as their choice. Fundamental in their line of argument is that the wheat board should remain. That is the fundamental issue and one that bears largely on this motion. Can you have your cake and eat it too?

Can the Canadian Wheat Board continue to operate successfully side by side with a free and open market? I do not know the answer to that question. I am not inclined to jump to any conclusions but my instinct would be that it is pretty tough to have both systems equally successful. Let us reserve judgment until we see what the panel has to say on the issue.

The issue of grain marketing in western Canada is one that has stirred emotion and debate for quite some time. There are farmers on both sides of the issue, some of whom are very strongly supportive of the Canadian Wheat Board system and others who hold different points of view.

In order to bring some logic, focus and coherence to the debate rather than having people shout at each other through bull horns from the back of pickup trucks, last year the minister established the Western Grain Marketing Panel to investigate on behalf of all grain producers in western Canada the issue related to the broad subject of grain marketing, one of which is obviously the marketing system of the Canadian Wheat Board.

The panel has been hard at work for many months. It held 15 public town hall meetings across the prairies to provide information and to receive input and feedback from farmers and farm organizations. It conducted three sets of formal hearings in Winnipeg, Edmonton and Regina to provide a formal opportunity for all of those with differing views to come forward with their best arguments, their best evidence for one system or another, to be subject to examination and cross-examination, and to weigh the benefits and the consequences.

The panel is now in the final stages of preparing its report. The minister expects to have that document the first week of July and he will make it public soon after. Once we have the report we will be in a much better position to make whatever future decisions are necessary with respect to grain marketing.

The Western Grain Marketing Panel review has been a process of the utmost integrity and it is a process we are committed to seeing through until the end. We wanted input from grain producers. We will not dishonour that commitment by agreeing to such a monumental change before considering their views.

I know that some individuals within the sector, possibly some within this Chamber, have criticized the panel process as being too long and too time consuming. They applaud the efforts of a small fringe group which calls itself Farmers for Justice. I prefer the name which was bestowed on that group by a letter written by one of western Canada's larger farm newspapers, Farmers for Just Us.

This group has for many months staged protests in which convoys of Canadian wheat and barley cross the border into the United States without having the required Canadian Wheat Board export licenses. These individuals may see themselves as freedom fighters or some kind of latter day Robin Hoods, stealing from the big Canadian Wheat Board, but in reality the situation is far different.

By illegally exporting grain on their own, by circumventing the Canadian Wheat Board and its pooling system, these individuals are not pooling or sharing their profits from these sales with other producers from across the prairies. What is wrong with that, some might ask.

Through the use of pooling the board ensures all western Canadian producers, whether they farm in the Red Deer Valley of Manitoba or the Peace River region of British Columbia, share and share alike in the revenues generated by their sweat and toil. This is the co-operative spirit that helped to build the prairies and it is a tradition of which all prairie residents should be justifiably proud.

• (2110)

A recent ruling in Manitoba has created a certain degree of confusion within the industry and has given rise to false claims and charges by some, including those on the opposite benches, that the court ruled against the Canadian Wheat Board. If I may be

permitted to quote from the judge's formal written decision it will become quite clear that nothing could be further from the truth:

This is not a case about the Canadian Wheat Board's monopoly over interprovincial and international trade in grain. This is not a case about the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board to control the export and sale of grain and to grant licences therefore. This is not a case about free enterprise in a democratic society nor is it about the benefits of marketing boards versus the benefits of free enterprise. This is not a case to resolve the apparent debate between farmer and farmer or between farmers and the government as to which is the best method to market grain. This is not a case about David versus Goliath. This is a case about a man who is alleged to have exported grain to the United States of America and, at the time he crossed the border with the grain, did not show a licence to export the grain to the appropriate customs official.

Some have criticized the government for the action it took to respond to this court ruling, action taken to restore certainty in the wake of the decision. The situation the federal government and the entire western grains industry found itself in following the judgment was intolerable and could not be left alone.

There were two apparently conflicting rulings from courts in Manitoba with respect to export procedures on wheat and barley. Producers, exporters and industry needed a degree of certainty. In order to restore that certainty, in order to make crystal clear the requirements to export wheat and barley, the federal government clarified the relevant Canadian Wheat Board regulations. Industry needed to know clearly what the rules were and that is what the federal government achieved by clarifying the regulations.

In responding to the calls from the opposite side of the House for drastic and immediate change to the wheat board, I simply ask them to urge caution. We do not change an entire grain marketing system on a whim. That is not what good government is all about. Good government is about listening to the people, listening to all sides of a debate, weighing the pros and cons, then taking action based on the best long term interests of the vast majority.

Given the current international trade agreements Canada has signed and the new rules under which we now operate, once we change the board we are stuck with the new version. We cannot change our minds if we decide after a couple of years that we do not like the new system and revert to the old way of doing things.

Any decision the government makes will be a profound and serious one requiring a thorough and serious approach and evaluation. This is a multi-billion dollar industry and its future is not to be taken lightly in the way the third party is doing. Farmers and their families who depend on the marketing of grain are depending on us.

None of what I have said should be taken to mean that the status quo is good enough. Everyone agrees there is need for some type of change and there may be change. First I simply appeal to everyone with an interest in western grain marketing to hold their arguments and their fire until the grain marketing panel is released. Unilateral action by one group or province at this stage could have far

### *Supply*

reaching consequences and a final magnitude which nobody could now possibly estimate.

Change may be coming. Make no mistake, it may be coming. But it will be considered and thoughtful change by a government that has consulted with the people who will be most affected by that change. It will not be the sort of change driven by editorial headlines and dictated by a small vocal fringe group concerned only with its own self-interest.

• (2115 )

**Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as usual I listened with great interest to the member from Saskatoon—Dundurn. Why? I am not too sure. Perhaps it is the lateness of the hour and I do not have anything better to do this evening so I listened.

I noticed he said the Reform wants to change this on a whim. Nothing could be further from the truth. This motion is well thought out. I do not know whether he has taken the time to read the motion.

The member wants to cling to the past. This is quite unusual because normally that is what the Liberals accuse the Reform Party of doing, but in this case they want to cling to the past. He said he did not know whether the two systems, free marketing and the Canadian Wheat Board, can operate jointly. Well neither do we. That is the whole point of the motion.

We heard tonight about the unfairness that Ontario corn producers can market their product wherever and whenever they want yet western wheat growers cannot. We heard that Quebec wheat growers can market their product into Ontario yet western wheat growers cannot.

I would like to take a couple of minutes to recount my personal experience with this. My brother and I were farming up until the time I got elected to the House of Commons. We were farming 3,000 acres, producing wheat, barley, canola and grass seed in the Peace River country of British Columbia, not Alberta as a colleague said earlier.

We got into an effort to market some of our barley directly into the Caribou, to truck it ourselves through the Rocky Mountains and market it in the Caribou region. It was feed barley. When we did that we learned of a situation in the remainder of the province of British Columbia involving the wheat growers in the Creston valley and other areas of B.C. Bear in mind that the vast majority of the arable land in British Columbia is in the Peace River country on the east side of the Rocky mountains. Although that was small acreage, they could market their wheat directly to Rogers Flour Mill in Armstrong in the Okanagan interior but I could not. The same province, the same country. We were in tough times then.

*Supply*

Most farmers were just barely getting by. Grain prices were in the basement. Is that fair? That is what I want the member to answer.

Is it fair that some farmers in this country depending upon where they live can take advantage of opportunities and market their wheat directly to a flour mill? It is still going on today. Farmers in another area, because it is under the umbrella of the Canadian Wheat Board, are prevented from taking advantage of that opportunity. That is what we are talking about tonight. We are talking about freedom, choice and fairness.

**Mr. Bodnar:** Mr. Speaker, when we speak of fairness I simply ask the member to look at a few facts. One of them is just plain ordinary common sense.

If Reformers only looked at the Americans who want to destroy the Canadian Wheat Board, they are not doing it for the benefit of Canadians. Then there is the leader of the third party who in March 1995 talked to the Americans about this being an irritant to the Americans. He talked of getting rid of our Canadian Wheat Board. Their own leader talks against the Canadian farmer. Their own leader does not care about the western Canadian farmer. He is more concerned about removing an irritant for the Americans. He is running on the wrong side of the border. That is what they want to do.

That is the party that has thought everything out so well including this particular motion, as he is indicating. He wonders whether I read the motion. I read it in my speech. It is obvious he was not listening as closely as he indicated. He indicated that it was so well thought out. If it was so well thought out, why was it not in the brief presented by the member opposite who sponsored the motion? It was not in the brief. This was really well thought out.

• (2120)

Why is this motion brought at the eleventh hour just before the panel is to release its report? They would not wait until the panel report came down because they are not looking for fairness. They are simply looking for air time so they can present further arguments in trying to show how unfair the system is, a multibillion dollar system.

They talk of a dual marketing system and they have not presented any numbers or any evaluation of their proposal by any professionals to show that their system is beneficial to the farmers. They have done nothing of the sort in a multibillion dollar system. Perhaps they could get a few numbers from H&R Block. They should not be that busy, tax time is over. They have not even done that. They are simply acting on a whim.

**Mr. Garry Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, one of the questions the member raises is why we are discussing

it at this time. He knows very well that the report from the grain marketing panel has not yet been tabled and Parliament will not be sitting all summer. When else do we debate it? We debate it whenever we have the opportunity. That is quite obvious. We pressed for this debate and we finally got it.

Why do we raise this issue? Because farmers do not trust a government which says it is going to support farmers and then as soon as it is elected it removes the Crow subsidy with no inkling at all that this is going to happen. That was one of the problems.

**An hon. member:** Shut up.

**Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville):** The member also said he was listening to the people. I want to tell the member the results of a survey which was done in my riding.

Of the people in the riding of Yorkton—Melville, 80.5 per cent think the government should hold a plebiscite of all Saskatchewan farmers and producers regarding the future of the Canadian Wheat Board; 66.1 per cent do not think the Canadian Wheat Board should continue to have a monopoly on wheat and barley sales in western Canada; 73.9 per cent think producers have the right to sell their grain, including wheat and barley, anywhere they want; 96.3 per cent think the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board should be open and accountable to the farmers it serves. That is the people speaking and this government refuses to listen.

Last of all, 51.9 per cent of the people think the government should exempt the wheat and barley shipped through the port of Churchill from the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board because they do not trust the wheat board to handle it properly. They feel it is controlled by eastern interests.

**Mr. Bodnar:** Mr. Speaker, I find it rather disgusting in a debate such as this when there are comments being made and the hon. member for Calgary West utters comments to the minister of agriculture to shut up. That is completely unparliamentary. That is the new way that the Reform Party does business in the House.

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

**Mr. Bodnar:** There they go again. They refuse to allow anyone to speak because they believe the new way of being in Parliament is to be the loudest, to monopolize time and to call people down all the time.

The hon. member made comments that the reason this matter was raised now is that the report will be filed in the summer. They have had 16 opportunities since last year to have this matter brought up. They never did it until the eleventh hour. This is nothing but gamesmanship on the part of the third party and this will be remembered by the people in the west.

*Supply*

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member talks about etiquette and decorum in this House. He did not even attempt to answer my question.

**An hon. member:** The minister of agriculture is heckling.

**Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River):** Yes, exactly, the minister of agriculture is heckling our speaker and someone tries to tell him to please be quiet. No, we are not supposed to do that. However, the member did not even try to address my question.

• (2125 )

I will ask the member again: Does he think that this system is fair after hearing me recount my personal experience? Would he please address that question and tell Canadian farmers that this system is fair? That is what happened to me personally and my family farm and it has happened to countless others in this country.

**Mr. Bodnar:** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the argument made by the hon. member is one on which he should be sitting on this side arguing in favour of pooling. It would have been beneficial to him. In effect he has destroyed his party's whole argument on its motion but that is not unusual. I am sure if Reformers read the blues for today they will determine that they have these contradictions in their own arguments.

It is interesting to hear the derogatory comments. As soon as Reformers are caught with something, they try to degrade an individual. Now they are referring to my legal background. Unfortunately they have not done their research to determine that I come from a farming background. I grew up on a farm and farmed with my father for a while before proceeding to law school. Maybe it would not hurt them either to get a post-secondary education.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** This is the place of vigorous debate. We might be able to pursue our business until 9.42 p.m.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I see I am going to have to cut this a little short because of the time limitation. I am glad for the opportunity to speak on the Reform motion dealing with the Canadian Wheat Board.

My family, my son and I, actively farm 1,400 acres in the Peace River country. There are 12 or 13 members in the Reform caucus who have farms or who are operating farms in some capacity. I think we have a little bit more credibility in this matter than these do-gooder Liberals across the way who have to have the minister of agriculture prompting them with bits of information here and there.

As a matter of fact, the only Liberal member that has spoken today who has any credibility on this issue is the member for Dauphin—Swan River who has a farm herself. She raised the question as to why should we get rid of the Canadian Wheat Board,

that she wanted to use the Canadian Wheat Board. She entirely missed the whole essence of the motion.

We are not getting rid of the Canadian Wheat Board. We are calling for a trial period to see which agency farmers will choose: a free marketing system or the state controlled monopoly of the Canadian Wheat Board. If they choose to vote state controlled for their produce that is what we will continue with. If they choose to vote for a free market, that is what they should have.

Who was the member for Saskatoon—Humboldt asking to make expert testimony on this issue? A member from the Bloc Quebecois. What possible relevance could that member have to this debate? If the Canadian Wheat Board is so good, why do we not extend it to Ontario and Quebec?

Maybe the member for Saskatoon—Humboldt knows something about appointments of commissioners to the Canadian Wheat Board because it is my understanding that she did not have to face any election for her nomination, it was an appointment. I guess she is probably an expert on that.

I have spoken to a number of farmers in my riding. Without a doubt the majority want freedom of choice to market their grain. While some think the Canadian Wheat Board makes sense, different farmers have different needs and that is not being recognized here today.

Some are happy to take the initial price offered them by the board. They can afford to wait for a year for the final payment but others are paying high interest rates and they need the immediate cashflow. They have big payments to make in the fall and they cannot afford to wait. Then there are still others who grow specialty crops while the board is simply not able to handle those specialty crops.

A plebiscite was promised by both the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food and the Prime Minister very conveniently in the 1993 election. Where is that plebiscite? It is not to be had. It is another broken promise by this Liberal government.

• (2130 )

Alberta went ahead with that plebiscite and what happened? An overwhelming number of farmers voted for that choice. Freedom of choice is what farmers want. I have farmed for 28 years. We want freedom of choice, as any other industry enjoys. The real issue here is freedom of choice.

We can have a dual system if we want. The Canadian Wheat Board can offer that side by side. In fact that took place from 1935 to 1943. It has happened before. It worked effectively. The war came along and there were special circumstances. Canada put in a

*Supply*

system whereby supply could be guaranteed to Europe. I can understand that. This is a different time entirely.

Democracy, what is this about? The government is willing to allow for an elected advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board. That makes some sense. If it makes sense, would it not also follow that the commissioner should be elected? Is that not democracy? Or does the government want political control of commissioners so that it can dominate their decisions?

Is it common sense to have grain running through the Canadian seaway at a time when it is costing a lot more money than through the west coast or across the border into the United States? I do not think it is. With control of commissioners that is the type of thing that can happen.

I would like to go back to the farmers that find the Canadian Wheat Board a hindrance to their operations. These are examples of farmers who are trying to diversify but have been frustrated by the rigid structure of the Canadian Wheat Board.

First there is the story of Bob Numweiller. Mr. Numweiller is a Saskatchewan miller who lives close to the U.S. border. He farms there. He wants to mill his own wheat into flour and sell it on his farm. Of course he cannot do that under this rigid structure. The board says he cannot do it. First he has to sell his wheat to the Canadian Wheat Board, and although it does not do any of the marketing, then he can buy it back. This is really good stuff. He also must pay the board's price and administration fee, although it does not do anything for him. Then he waits for a year and maybe he will find out he might get a final payment and maybe not.

There is an absurd twist to the story. Now that the Canadian Wheat Board, as a result of the World Trade Organization, can no longer control imports, Mr. Numweiller has discovered that he can cross the U.S. border, buy the wheat, bring the wheat back and mill it on his farm. However, he cannot mill his own wheat. Does that make any sense?

**An hon. member:** That's Liberal policy.

**Mr. Penson:** Then there is the story of Dexter Schmidt, a constituent of my riding of Peace River. This government has been telling farmers they should diversify. He has taken their advice. He has diversified into organic grain, but the wheat board does not sell organic grain because as soon as it is pooled with all the other wheat it loses its distinctiveness. He wanted the ability to sell it himself.

Of course the board cannot get these niche markets. They sell in boat loads and there is not enough production at this time in the organic grain market to make 20,000 tonnes. What has to happen to Mr. Schmidt? It is too much hassle for the board to administer the

container loads. Is Mr. Schmidt allowed to do his own marketing? Only if he goes to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Here are the steps he must go through. First, he has to go to the elevator to sell his grain on contract. The elevator writes out the sales ticket. Mr. Schmidt writes out a buy back cheque for \$36.94 a tonne. He also pays the elevator \$5 a tonne administration fee. Now he owns his own grain. That is a major step. Now he can sell it as he pleases but he still has to wait a year to get back his original \$36.94 a tonne and he may not see any of it at all, depending on how the board does on its marketing.

If he tries to bypass the board he commits a criminal offence and has to pay a penalty of \$12,000 plus spend two years in jail. Does this make any sense?

Canada and Russia passed in the night about three years ago. Russia is going to a market system and where are we going? We are continuing with a very regressive system. This is an example of the type of thing we would hear from communist Russia 20 years ago.

• (2135 )

These are just two examples of why I think the Canadian Wheat Board needs to be overhauled. I would start by ensuring that the commissioners are democratically elected by producers. After that, I think the board would change in the ways it needs to meet the 21st century.

Today's generation of commercial farmers want to substitute their management skills for the collective approaches that have dominated the past few decades. They see new opportunities in hot new markets like organic grains. Using their own skills and their own comparative advantages, they want to be free to grow crops and market them as they please, just the same as any other industry.

I want to take a moment to talk about the reports that were done for the Canadian Wheat Board and for the grain marketing panel. The Kraft report was referred to earlier. The Kraft report was done with selective information from the Canadian Wheat Board. It fed the panel certain information. That is a strange thing. Nobody else can get any information out of the Canadian Wheat Board.

This group was paid a certain amount of money to do a very selective report for the Canadian Wheat Board and was spoon fed the information. What did the report say? It was very complimentary to the board. It said that the board gets about \$13 a tonne more for the grain when it sells all around the world than any other country or any other market would get. Does that make sense? If a company in Brazil was buying grain from us, why would it pay \$13 a tonne more to the board than it would pay to anybody else? Maybe there is a quality issue here. That could be. But that same quality would exist whether the board marketed the grain or not. I think this Kraft report has to be discounted completely.



There was another report done by Colin Carter and Al Loyns. Their report states that they found just exactly the opposite. They said that the grain marketed by the board is costing farmers about \$20 a tonne. The report was compiled without any benefit of Canadian Wheat Board information. In fact, they were stymied every step of the way trying to get information from the board.

This Canadian Wheat Board is acting very much like the department of defence these days. It has a bunker mentality and is hunkered down behind the barricades.

Then we have the famous Deloitte & Touche report. These are the people who are the Canadian Wheat Board's auditors. This firm was asked in 1992 to look at the board's management operations. What did it find? First, I have to say that the report was kept secret from 1992 until it was finally leaked and saw the light of day this winter. The report said that the Canadian Wheat Board has no corporate strategic plan, no formal marketing strategic plan, no clear plan for budgeting and managing information. Furthermore, the report reveals that the board is currently not conducting any value for money type reviews.

The minister of agriculture has told us all those things are being corrected. Who would know? The board does not report to anybody but the minister of agriculture and sometimes I wonder if it even reports to him.

My colleague has moved a motion that the auditor general should be able to review the Canadian Wheat Board books. This is a crown corporation. However, the Liberal Party voted against the motion on accountability to government. The Canadian Wheat Board is a crown corporation of government that cannot be audited by the auditor general. Shame.

This leaked information is especially disturbing because Deloitte & Touche is the Canadian Wheat Boards' own auditor. If it found that kind of incompetence, it would have to be fairly guarded in what it said. Imagine what it must have really looked like.

I do not have much time but I want to talk for a moment about the grain marketing panel that has been referred to here today. This is a whitewash. Mr. Molloy is heading up the grain marketing panel. He is a buddy of the minister of agriculture. What did this grain marketing panel do? The panel came to my riding. It had a facilitator go around and say: "Give us the information and we will tabulate it". Then there was a consensus at the end.

When a group of farmers in my area said they wanted to make a direct presentation to the panel, the facilitator said: "Okay, you can do that, but you have to come to Winnipeg". Imagine, they would have to travel all the way to Winnipeg from Grande Prairie, Alberta.

Then we called for the panel to hold hearings in the capitals of the three provinces, to at least make it easier for those people to

### *Supply*

present information. We had a major fight to get that to happen. This is supposed to be an open process. It was a major fight.

What did we find when we got to the grain marketing panel? A bunch of political hacks, in most cases. One member is a former member of the Manitoba pool. His sole contribution to the debate was: "Things cannot be too bad under the Canadian Wheat Board. I was out in the country the other day and I saw some farmers driving new pick-ups".

The Liberal government in this very House, less than a month ago, talked about a monopoly. It talked about a monopoly in the gas and oil industry. It said that gas prices are being controlled by a monopoly. It pales by comparison with the monopoly that the Canadian Wheat Board holds over farmers. It is a monopoly on the buy side only. There is only one buyer for wheat and barley that goes to export and that is the Canadian Wheat Board. Any other industry could not be controlled this way. Nobody would want it to be so.

I ask the question again: If the Canadian Wheat Board is so good why do we not have it in Ontario, Quebec and the maritimes so that the potato farmers can experience the joys of having the Canadian Wheat Board?

To whom does the Canadian Wheat Board answer? I had a discussion with a Canadian Wheat Board field representative in my riding recently. I held a series of meetings in my riding and people were concerned that they were not getting very good shipping of wheat out of the Peace River area. I phoned the Canadian Wheat Board and asked what the shipping schedule was for the next two or three weeks.

The next time I met this man he was quite offended that I had not talked to him. He asked me what was my interest in this. I answered that as the member of Parliament, the government representative, I represented these constituents who are concerned that they are not able to move their product. He then asked me what it had to do with me as it was not a government matter. When I mentioned that the Canadian Wheat Board is a crown corporation, he said: "Technically that might be so, but we do not answer to the politicians". I said: "Who do you answer to? Do you answer to the farmers?" He said: "No, we do not answer to them either". There is the answer. They are completely unaccountable.

Let us try this system and let the farmers choose what they want. If they want the Canadian Wheat Board working alongside with a dual marketing agency, that is fine. If they choose the Canadian Wheat Board alone for their product, that is fine. If they choose the private sector completely, that is fine too. The choice should be made by the farmers, not by the Liberal lawyers on the other side who have no experience whatsoever in this area.

*Adjournment Debate*

**Mr. Hermanson:** Mr. Speaker, in light of the vigorous debate we have had over this issue I wonder if there might be unanimous consent to make this a votable motion.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** There being no unanimous consent and it being 9.42 p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that the proceedings on the motion have expired.

That is the kind of leadership we need in the B.C. fishery which Premier Clark is giving.

• (2145)

The recently announced fleet reduction policy is a disaster for the B.C. fishery. It ignores key recommendations of the federal round table and especially the recommendations of the 1991 Cruikshank commission which held extensive hearings in coastal communities.

The plan purports to strengthen conservation but there is nothing at all for habitat protection, for enhancement or for restoration. There is nothing for enforcement whatsoever and the plan has been condemned by all key environmental and conservation groups.

The stackable area licensing will have a devastating impact on small owner/operators in coastal communities like Sointula, Alert Bay, Ucluelet and Port Hardy. We have already seen the disastrous effect on the black cod and herring fishery. Dennis Brown of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union has said that while small operators, especially gill netters, will be particularly hard hit, it will be the fish packing companies and well financed entrepreneurs who will scoop up the licences and take over the industry.

It will also hurt the suppliers, suppliers of small shipyards, marine suppliers, machine and repair shops, tackle and gear manufacturers and others. With as many as 5,000 jobs being lost there is absolutely no compensation whatsoever, no retraining, no adjustment program whatsoever. When we compare that with what has happened on the east coast it is a disgrace.

The buyback is totally inadequate. Fishers have already paid in some \$65 million to the \$80 million that was on the table. It should be well in excess of \$200 million and the buybacks are a failure. Only half the target has been met and there are absolutely no criteria for bidding in this process. Approximately 90 per cent of coastal fishers voted for a fair voluntary buyback.

An unprecedented coalition has come together to oppose the government's plan, the DFO plan. That coalition has offered a very clear alternative. It wants a transparent inclusive process that would be implemented to devise a new plan to ensure a healthy fishery, a healthy industry and healthy communities.

I urge the government to adopt this plan, this coalition plan which has been supported by the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union, the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council, the Canadian Labour Congress, Coastal Communities Network, Greenpeace, the David Suzuki Foundation, the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia, the Georgia Strait Alliance, the Pacific Trollers Association, IWA-Canada, the T. Buck Suzuki Environmental Foundation, the West Coast Sustainability Association and many others.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

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

### FISHERIES

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of months I have raised two issues of particular concern to all British Columbians, namely, the failure of the Canada-U.S. salmon treaty and the disastrous DFO fleet reduction policy of the minister. In both of these areas federal Liberal policies are having a devastating impact on B.C. fisheries, particularly on coastal communities and on small owner operators.

Of course, the six B.C. Liberal MPs and 24 Reform MPs have been totally ineffective in standing up for B.C. interests.

It is appalling that while Liberals are taking drastic action on fleet reduction they are pathetically weak in standing up to the United States, especially Alaska, which has shown such contempt for the Canada-U.S. salmon treaty.

I would note that over the course of the last decade Canada's interception of salmon bound for U.S. spawning beds has fallen by 25 per cent, while U.S. interception of Canadian salmon has jumped by 50 per cent. The Government of Canada has totally failed to stand up to the United States and, in particular, to Alaska overfishing.

B.C. Premier Glen Clark has made it very clear that this will be at the top of his agenda for the first ministers' conference which will start tomorrow. I urge the Liberal government to accept the recommendations of the B.C. government for a fisheries renewal plan. Its primary goals would be the conservation of fish and the maximization of jobs in British Columbia from each fish caught.

*Adjournment Debate*

Yesterday Premier Clark was in the village of Sointula with a population of 900. That village will be absolutely devastated by the impact of the government's plan according to the Glen Robertson, the New Democrat MLA for that area. He said it is an arbitrary and capricious plan.

Other speakers said the same thing. The Mifflin plan will not save the salmon. It will simply take the catch away from coastal communities and give it to companies that can afford to stay in the industry.

I appeal to the government to finally listen to the people of British Columbia, listen to coastal communities, listen to owner/operators, stand up for the B.C. fishery, stand up for the proposal that has been made by Premier Glen Clark. Shelve the disastrous Mifflin plan and get tough in negotiating the Canada-U.S. salmon treaty.

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, although he will pardon me as a student of oratory in suggesting it was less of a question than a philippic. Nevertheless we can bring some light into the darkness.

The Pacific salmon revitalization strategy was announced on March 29. It is clear that some fundamental structural problems in the B.C. salmon fishery must be resolved if we are to meet two objectives, ensuring conservation of the resource and promoting the viability of the commercial fishery in the future.

Problems of excess capacity and declining returns in the commercial fishery are not new. Over the past 15 years there has been a commission of inquiry on the state of the B.C. fishery and several task forces which recommended fundamental change. But the will to take the necessary steps simply was not there.

The Pacific revitalization strategy is a six point plan including conservation as a priority intersectoral allocation device, new licensing measures, a licence buyback program, transition measures and new institutional mechanisms.

• (2150)

There has been criticism of the strategy, particularly from coastal community representatives. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans listened to these representatives, travelled to B.C. and met with fishing industry groups and announced modifications to the strategy on May 9, 1996. These minor adjustments were based on consultations and included the announcement of a salmon licence fee holiday for those who choose not to fish in 1996.

The minister announced on June 14, 1996 the preliminary results of the implementation of the strategy. New licensing measures,

including single gear and area licensing, have been successfully applied to 97 per cent of the salmon fleet. Indications are that more than 250 licence holders intend to take advantage of the new licence stacking provision that permits one vessel to fish in two areas.

The licence buyback program has achieved half of its targets in the first round with the retirement of 411 salmon licences, 10 per cent of the fleet, at a cost of \$42 million. On the recommendation of the independent fleet reduction committee, the minister has announced a second round of the buyback program in an effort to realize the fleet reduction target of 20 per cent set out initially.

This program is about choice, and the results indicate the fleet has been prepared to make the difficult decisions required to contribute to the long term protection of the salmon resource. These changes are also necessary to make the industry more viable.

This strategy addresses immediate concerns before the 1996 season, and the minister has invited the input of the round table steering committee on longer term issues as implementation proceeds.

## HAZARDOUS WASTE

**Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1996, I questioned the Minister of the Environment regarding the Taro dump in Hamilton.

The proposed dump is slated to be located within 800 meters of the Niagara escarpment, a fractured rock bed which is a United Nations declared biosphere.

Constituents in this area are concerned that the leachate has the possibility of going into Lake Ontario, water protected under the Great Lakes eco-basin agreement signed in 1974.

Surface runoff from the site is now piped into the lake. People are seriously concerned the local water table and land will be negatively affected.

My question to the minister was direct and succinct: "Can the minister tell us whether a federal environmental assessment panel review will be conducted?" His answer had everything to do with the election in Hamilton East and little to do with environmental assessments.

In my supplementary question I asked: "Will the minister use his power and commit to launching a full environmental assessment of the Taro dump so all sides will be allowed real influence?" Again the minister answered with the same political bluster.

I remind that this is the jurisdiction of the federal environment minister to initiate full panel reviews. The former minister never

*Adjournment Debate*

conducted these, even when the problem was very close to her own constituency office. Taro dump is an example of a larger problem of environmental assessments.

Section 28 of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act gives the minister the power to launch a full panel review of a project:

Where at any time the minister is of the opinion that

(a) a project for which an environmental assessment may be required under section 5, taking into account the implementation of any appropriate mitigation measures, may cause significant adverse environmental effects, or

(b) public concerns warrant a reference to a mediator or review panel. The minister may—refer the project to a mediator or a review panel in accordance with section 29.

Will the project cause adverse environmental effects? If leachate from the dump goes into Lake Ontario, which is under federal jurisdiction, then yes, the project will cause serious environmental effects.

Is there public concern? The minister could easily review the Hamilton *Spectator* newspaper and he will discover the anger of the locals, especially those who have been threatened with lawsuits to keep them quiet about this project.

The issue at stake is whether the Minister of the Environment is willing to do his duty. If a minister does not make use of his powers then Canadians must ask what special interest has a hold on him.

Last month I was Sydney, Nova Scotia to see the extremely hazardous tar ponds site. The people of Sydney for years have desperately looked for help. The provincial government wants the most economical solution, while the federal government seems to be hiding. I challenge the minister to spend a day of inspection at Sydney like I did.

This was the scope of my question from May 17: when will the minister do what is needed to put Canada on the right track of environmental sustainability?

• (2155)

The minister knows full well that my two previous questions were not answered properly. I ask now three pointed questions on which I expect a clear answer.

First, does the Minister of the Environment envision ever using the power to conduct environmental assessments? Second, if leachate seeps into Lake Ontario, does the province of Ontario suddenly become responsible for the Great Lakes or does it remain the responsibility of the federal government? Third, the parliamentary secretary stated that before the end of the term the government will do something with the Sydney tar ponds. Can she explain exactly what the government plans to do with this poisoned black tidal inlet?

Sadly the answers so far appear to be process rather than action, paper making instead of field operations. My questions relate to needed action by the minister. The time for excuses is over.

**Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. May I compliment him on his patience and durability in sitting through an exhausting and some would say interestingly combative debate. If it was not the eleventh hour as some of our predecessors in the debate eloquently suggested, it is at least the witching hour and it is quite clear that all honest people and all MPs should be home in bed at this hour. It is a tribute to our staying power in the service of the state.

The proposal by Taro Aggregates Limited for the east quarry landfill in Stoney Creek is presently being reviewed by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Energy under that province's environmental assessment process. The proposed site would be used for non-hazardous waste.

We understand that under Ontario's process a decision on the project or a decision to submit the project to a full Ontario public hearing will be made by the Ontario Minister of the Environment and Energy, the Hon. Brenda Elliott.

With respect to a federal environmental assessment panel, the project is not subject to the federal environmental assessment process as described under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. A federal review process will therefore not be established.

The federal process is only triggered when a federal agency is a proponent, provides funds or loan guarantees, administers the project lands, or issues permits or licences which enable the project to take place. None of these conditions are in effect for the Taro landfill proposal.

We gather that a number of groups, including the Hamilton Regional Conservation Authority, have reviewed the project's plans and have asked the Ontario Minister of the Environment and Energy to hold a provincial public hearing for the proposal under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act.

We have been advised by Ontario region that in past years a private company owned the landfill site known as the west quarry adjacent to Stoney Creek. The site received residential and industrial garbage but was not an "engineered" site with a liner. It reportedly was the source of some local groundwater contamination by chlorides.

This west quarry site was taken over by Taro-Philip Environmental and remedial measures were taken at the site to stop further groundwater discharges. The west quarry site is not presently in use, but the site has not been formally closed.

The Hamilton-Stoney Creek area needs a disposal site for industrial non-hazardous waste to replace the Glanbrook landfill which is nearing capacity. Taro-Philip Environmental has proposed

*Adjournment Debate*

the use of an engineered landfill with a proper liner at the east quarry, next to the inactive west quarry facility.

It is this proposal which is currently under review by the Ontario government. If the hon. member has any further concerns about the project, we would advise him to make submissions to the Ontario Minister of the Environment and Energy.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger):** A motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24 (1).

(The House adjourned at 9.59 p.m.)

---

(Version Page\ Numbering 2)

(Version Auto\ Numbering 1)

(Page\ Numbering

(Named\ Stream page

(Starting 28))

(Pages 1))

## **APPENDIX**

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

**CHAIR OCCUPANTS**

**The Speaker**

HON. GILBERT PARENT

**The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

**The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BOB KILGER

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE–MALTAIS

---

**BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY**

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

MR. DON BOUDRIA

MRS. MADELEINE DALPHOND–GUIRAL

MR. GILLES DUCEPPE

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

MR. JIM SILYE



**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS**

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caron, André	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	Quebec	PC
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	Quebec	BQ
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup	Quebec	BQ
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	New Brunswick	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphonde-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE**

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

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



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

#### MANITOBA (14)

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

#### NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

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

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

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

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

#### PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

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

#### QUEBEC (75)

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

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

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	BQ
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	BQ
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ

#### SASKATCHEWAN (14)

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

#### YUKON (1)

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







**SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF THE SPECIAL  
IMPORT MEASURES ACT (SIMA)**

**Chairman: Ronald J. Duhamel**

Herb Grubel                                      Yvan Loubier                                      Brent St. Denis                                      Susan Whelan                                      (5)

---

**FISHERIES AND OCEANS**

**Chairman: Joe McGuire**

**Vice-Chairmen: Yvan Bernier  
Derek Wells**

Gerry Byrne                                      Harold Culbert                                      Ted McWhinney                                      Mike Scott  
René Canuel                                      John Cummins                                      Lawrence D. O'Brien                                      Harry Verran                                      (11)

**Associate Members**

Diane Ablonczy                                      Ron Fewchuk                                      Jean Payne                                      Paul Steckle  
Vic Althouse                                      Fred Mifflin                                      Roger Simmons                                      Elsie Wayne

---

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

**Chairman: Bill Graham**

**Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron  
John English**

Sarkis Assadourian                                      Jesse Flis                                      Bob Mills                                      Charlie Penson  
Colleen Beaumier                                      David Iftody                                      Lee Morrison                                      Benoît Sauvageau  
Michel Dupuy                                      Francis G. LeBlanc                                      Philippe Paré                                      Bob Speller                                      (15)

**Associate Members**

Diane Ablonczy                                      Maud Debien                                      Jean H. Leroux                                      Ted McWhinney  
Leon E. Benoit                                      Jack Frazer                                      John Loney                                      Val Meredith  
Jag Bhaduria                                      Beryl Gaffney                                      Ron MacDonald                                      Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Bill Blaikie                                      John Godfrey                                      Gurbax Singh Malhi                                      Janko Perić  
David Chatters                                      Herb Grubel                                      Keith Martin                                      Paddy Torsney

---

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL  
FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS**

**Chairman: Bill Graham**

David Iftody                                      Bob Mills                                      Philippe Paré                                      Paddy Torsney                                      (5)

---

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

**Chairman: John English**

Colleen Beaumier                                      Maud Debien                                      John Godfrey                                      Keith Martin                                      (5)

---

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES**

**Chairman: Michel Dupuy**

Sarkis Assadourian                                      Ron MacDonald                                      Charlie Penson                                      Benoît Sauvageau                                      (5)

---

## GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

**Chair:** **Albina Guarnieri**

**Vice-Chairmen:** **Eugène Bellemare**  
**Gilbert Fillion**

John Bryden Paul Crête	Bill Gilmour Dick Harris	John Harvard Ovid L. Jackson	Gurbax Singh Malhi Dan McTeague	(11)
---------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------------	------

### Associate Members

Mauril Bélanger Ghislain Lebel Ian McClelland	Carolyn Parrish Janko Perić George Proud	John Solomon Randy White	Ted White John Williams
---	--	-----------------------------	----------------------------

## HEALTH

**Chairman:** **Roger Simmons**

**Vice-Chairs:** **Beryl Gaffney**  
**Pauline Picard**

Antoine Dubé Sharon Hayes	Grant Hill John Murphy	Andy Scott Georgette Sheridan	Paul Szabo Joseph Volpe	(11)
------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	------

### Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman Jan Brown Maurice Dumas Laurent Lavigne	Keith Martin Audrey McLaughlin Réal Ménard	Pat O'Brien John O'Reilly Bernard Patry	Svend J. Robinson Roseanne Skoke Rose-Marie Ur
--	--	---	--

## SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS

**Chairman:** **John O'Reilly**

Sharon Hayes Réal Ménard	Pat O'Brien Bernard Patry	Svend J. Robinson Paul Szabo	Rose-Marie Ur Joseph Volpe	(9)
-----------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----

## HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

**Chairman:** **Maurizio Bevilacqua**

**Vice-Chairs:** **Jean Augustine**  
**Francine Lalonde**

Warren Allmand Christiane Gagnon Daphne Jennings	Dale Johnston Ian McClelland Larry McCormick	Robert D. Nault Pat O'Brien George Proud	Geoff Regan Anna Terrana Stéphan Tremblay	(15)
--	--	--	---	------

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Chris Axworthy Leon E. Benoit Bonnie Brown	Jan Brown Gerry Byrne John Cannis Marlene Cowling	Paul DeVillers Wayne Easter Jim Gouk Herb Grubel	Réal Ménard Maria Minna Svend J. Robinson Andy Scott
--	--	---	---

## HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

**Chair:** **Sheila Finestone**

**Vice-Chairmen:** **Maurice Bernier**  
**Andy Scott**

Sarkis Assadourian Jean Augustine	Sue Barnes Daphne Jennings	Russell MacLellan John Maloney	Ian McClelland Réal Ménard	(11)
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	------

### Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Robert Bertrand	Sharon Hayes Audrey McLaughlin	Philippe Paré Svend J. Robinson	Roseanne Skoke Myron Thompson
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------

**INDUSTRY****Chairman: David Walker****Vice-Chairmen: Nic Leblanc  
Tony Valeri**Morris Bodnar  
Pierre Brien  
Bonnie BrownEd Harper  
Tony Ianno  
Walt LastewkaPhilip Mayfield  
Réal Ménard  
Ian MurrayWerner Schmidt  
Alex Shepherd  
Roseanne Skoke

(15)

**Associate Members**Peter Adams  
Pierre de Savoye  
Nick Discepola  
Jay HillKaren Kraft Sloan  
Ghislain Lebel  
Peter Milliken  
Andy MitchellJohn Nunziata  
Denis Paradis  
Yves Rocheleau  
John SolomonDarrel Stinson  
Paul Szabo  
Len Taylor**JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS****Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen****Vice-Chairs: Paddy Torsney  
Pierrette Venne**Diane Ablonczy  
Judy Bethel  
Pierre de SavoyePaul DeVillers  
Nick Discepola  
Roger GallawayArt Hanger  
Gordon Kirkby  
François LangloisJohn Maloney  
Jack Ramsay  
Derek Wells

(15)

**Associate Members**Chris Axworthy  
Jag Bhaduria  
Garry Breitkreuz  
Paul Forseth  
Patrick GagnonJim Gouk  
Stephen Harper  
Sharon Hayes  
Jay Hill  
Gar KnutsonDerek Lee  
Val Meredith  
Bob Mills  
George S. RideoutSvend J. Robinson  
Bernard St-Laurent  
Myron Thompson  
Randy White**SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY****Chairman: Derek Lee****Vice-Chairman: George S. Rideout**

Nick Discepola

Gar Knutson

François Langlois

Val Meredith

(6)

**LIAISON****Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair: Albina Guarnieri**Reg Alcock  
Eleni Bakopanos  
Maurizio Bevilacqua  
Raymond Bonin  
Charles CacciaMary Clancy  
Shaughnessy Cohen  
Sheila Finestone  
Patrick Gagnon  
Michel GuimondGhislain Lebel  
Clifford Lincoln  
Joe McGuire  
Andy Mitchell  
Jim PetersonRoger Simmons  
Lyle Vanclief  
David Walker  
Paul Zed

(21)

**Associate Member**

Jack Frazer

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET****Chairman: Jim Peterson****Vice-Chairman: Paul Zed**Sheila Finestone  
Jack Frazer

Bill Graham

Michel Guimond

Andy Mitchell

(7)



## PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Chairman:** Michel Guimond

**Vice-Chairmen:** Denis Paradis  
Andrew Telegdi

Sue Barnes  
Pierre Brien  
Rex Crawford

Ivan Grose  
Leonard Hopkins

Charles Hubbard  
Yves Rocheleau

Jim Silye  
John Williams

(12)

### Associate Members

Jim Abbott  
Jag Bhaduria

John Bryden  
Mac Harb

Ed Harper  
René Laurin

Ian McClelland  
Alex Shepherd

## TRANSPORT

**Chairman:** Reg Alcock

**Vice-Chairmen:** André Caron  
Joe Comuzzi

Gerry Byrne  
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk  
Ed Harper

Charles Hubbard  
Jim Jordan

Stan Keyes  
Paul Mercier

(11)

### Associate Members

Vic Althouse  
Leon E. Benoit  
Ivan Grose

Dick Harris  
Jake E. Hoepfner  
Ovid L. Jackson

John Maloney  
Philippe Paré

Bernard Patry  
Elsie Wayne

## STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

**Joint Chairman:**

**Vice-Chairman:**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc  
Philippe D. Gigantès  
Maurice Riel

Peter Adams  
Roger Gallaway  
Jim Karygiannis  
Philip Mayfield

Paul Mercier  
Pat O'Brien  
Roseanne Skoke

(10)

### Associate Member

Ted White

## OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

**Joint Chairmen:** Sen. Jean-Louis Roux  
Patrick Gagnon

**Vice-Chairmen:** Jean-Paul Marchand  
Benoît Serré

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin  
Marie-P. Poulin

Jean-Claude Rivest  
Louis J. Robichaud

Warren Allmand  
Eugène Bellemare

Cliff Breitzkreuz  
John Godfrey

(12)

### Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Bob Ringma

Jim Silye

## SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

**Joint Chairmen:** **Sen. P. Derek Lewis**  
**Ghislain Label**

**Vice-Chairman:** **Derek Lee**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Doris M. Anderson  
Michel Cogger  
Normand Grimard  
William M. Kelly

Shirley Maheu  
Pietro Rizzuto  
Nicholas W. Taylor

Gilbert Fillion  
Mac Harb  
Gar Knutson

Dan McTeague  
Tom Wappel  
Ted White

(16)

---

## SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

### A CODE OF CONDUCT

**Joint Chairmen:** **Sen. Donald H. Oliver**  
**Peter Milliken**

**Vice-Chairs:** **Sen. Jean-Robert Gauthier**  
**Suzanne Tremblay**

Representing the Senate:  
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

W. David Angus  
Peter Bosa  
Consiglio Di Nino  
Mira Spivak  
Peter Stollery

Don Boudria  
Marlene Catterall  
Ken Epp  
Mac Harb  
François Langlois  
René Laurin

John Loney  
Rey D. Pagtakhan  
Carolyn Parrish  
Bob Ringma  
Ray Speaker  
Paul Zed

(21)

---

**The Speaker**

HON. GILBERT PARENT

**Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees**

**The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

**The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MR. BOB KILGER

**The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole**

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

**THE MINISTRY**

According to precedence

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



**PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

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



# CONTENTS

Wednesday, June 19, 1996

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

<b>Replica Guns</b>	
Mr. McWhinney .....	4067
<b>World Folklore Festival in Drummondville</b>	
Mrs. Picard .....	4067
<b>Canadian Healthy Environment Awards</b>	
Mrs. Jennings .....	4067
<b>Railway Safety</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	4067
<b>Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day</b>	
Mrs. Finestone .....	4068
<b>Armenian Genocide of 1915</b>	
Mr. Assadourian .....	4068
<b>Ray Karlson</b>	
Mrs. Cowling .....	4068
<b>Parc de l'aventure basque</b>	
Mr. Crête .....	4068
<b>Lumber Export Quota</b>	
Mr. Penson .....	4069
<b>Violence against Women</b>	
Mr. Harper (Churchill) .....	4069
<b>Sir Wilfrid Laurier</b>	
Mr. Paradis .....	4069
<b>Bombardier</b>	
Mr. Discepola .....	4069
<b>City of Rimouski</b>	
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	4069
<b>Early Parole</b>	
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	4070
<b>First Ministers' Conference</b>	
Mr. Bertrand .....	4070
<b>Newfoundland</b>	
Mrs. Hickey .....	4070

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

<b>First Ministers' Conference</b>	
Mr. Gauthier .....	4070
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4070
Mr. Gauthier .....	4071
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4071
Mr. Gauthier .....	4071
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4071
<b>Social Programs</b>	
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	4071
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4071
Mr. Bellehumeur .....	4072
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4072

## Job Creation

Mr. Manning .....	4072
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4072
Mr. Manning .....	4072
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4072
Mr. Manning .....	4072
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4073

## Social Programs

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	4073
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4073
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) .....	4073
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) .....	4073

## Canada Pension Plan

Mr. McClelland .....	4073
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4073
Mr. McClelland .....	4073
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4073

## Goods and Services Tax

Mr. Duceppe .....	4074
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4074
Mr. Duceppe .....	4074
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4074

## Canada Pension Plan

Mr. Williams .....	4074
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4074
Mr. Williams .....	4074
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4074

## Securities

Mr. Loubier .....	4075
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4075
Mr. Loubier .....	4075
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4075

## Communications Security Establishment

Mr. Lee .....	4075
Mr. Collenette .....	4075

## Taxation

Mr. Solberg .....	4075
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4076
Mr. Solberg .....	4076
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) .....	4076

## Blood Supply

Mrs. Picard .....	4076
Mr. Dingwall .....	4076
Mrs. Picard .....	4076
Mr. Dingwall .....	4076

## Canada Customs

Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4076
Mrs. Stewart (Brant) .....	4076
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4077
Mr. Goodale .....	4077

## The Environment

Mr. Caccia .....	4077
Ms. McLellan .....	4077

## National Defence

Mr. Jacob .....	4077
-----------------	------

Mr. Collenette .....	4077
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	4077
Mr. Rock .....	4078
<b>Health</b>	
Mr. Robinson .....	4078
Mr. Dingwall .....	4078
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	4078
<b>Privilege</b>	
<b>Notice of Question of Privilege</b>	
Mr. Nunziata .....	4078
<b>Point of Order</b>	
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Williams .....	4079
Ms. Catterall .....	4079
The Speaker .....	4079

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Richardson .....	4080
<b>Review of Financial Sector Legislation</b>	
Mr. Peters .....	4080
Mr. Loubier .....	4080
<b>Financial Institutions</b>	
Mr. Peters .....	4080
Mr. Loubier .....	4081
Mr. Mayfield .....	4081
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Environment and Sustainable Development</b>	
Mr. Caccia .....	4082
<b>Official languages</b>	
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) .....	4082
<b>Justice and Legal Affairs</b>	
Ms. Cohen .....	4082
<b>Procedure and House Affairs</b>	
Ms. Catterall .....	4083
<b>Privilege</b>	
<b>Security Intelligence Review Committee</b>	
Ms. Meredith .....	4083

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Foreign Affairs and International Trade</b>	
Mr. Graham .....	4085
<b>Privilege</b>	
<b>Security Intelligence Review Committee</b>	
Mr. Silye .....	4085
Mr. Boudria .....	4085
Mr. Baker .....	4085
<b>Whistle Blowers Protection Act</b>	
Bill C-318. Motions for introduction and first reading agreed to. ....	4086
Mr. de Savoye .....	4086

<b>Consumer Packaging and Labelling Act</b>	
Bill C-319. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted .....	4086
Mrs. Jennings .....	4086
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Special Joint Committee on a Code of Conduct</b>	
Mr. Milliken .....	4087
Motion .....	4087
(Motion agreed to.) .....	4087
<b>Petitions</b>	
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Ms. Catterall .....	4087
<b>Wartime Merchant Navy</b>	
Ms. Catterall .....	4087
<b>Taxation</b>	
Ms. Catterall .....	4087
<b>Proceeds from Crime</b>	
Mr. Iftody .....	4087
<b>Port of Churchill</b>	
Mr. Iftody .....	4087
<b>Mining</b>	
Mr. Iftody .....	4087
<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Iftody .....	4087
<b>Guaranteed Income Supplement</b>	
Mr. Nunez .....	4087
<b>Proceeds from Crime</b>	
Mr. Ringma .....	4087
<b>Dangerous Offenders</b>	
Mr. Robinson .....	4088
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	4088
<b>Proceeds from Crime</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	4088
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	4088
<b>AIDS</b>	
Mr. O'Reilly .....	4088
<b>Cod Fishery</b>	
Mr. Baker .....	4088
<b>Unpasteurized Cheese</b>	
Mr. Johnston .....	4088
<b>Proceeds from Crime</b>	
Mr. Johnston .....	4088
<b>Health and Dental Benefits</b>	
Mrs. Jennings .....	4088
<b>The Judiciary</b>	
Mrs. Jennings .....	4089
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. Collins .....	4089
<b>Bovine Growth Hormone</b>	
Mr. Easter .....	4089
<b>Pedophile Registry</b>	
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	4089
<b>The Senate</b>	
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	4089
<b>Proceeds from Crime</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	4089
<b>Unsolicited Mail</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	4089
<b>Proceeds from Crime</b>	
Mr. Jackson .....	4089
<b>Abortion</b>	
Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4089

<b>Human Rights</b>	
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4089
<b>Bovine Growth Hormone</b>	
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4089
<b>The Constitution</b>	
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4090
<b>Wartime Merchant Navy</b>	
Mr. Forseth .....	4090
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Richardson .....	4090
<b>Motions for Papers</b>	
Mr. Richardson .....	4092

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Supply

#### Allotted Day—Canadian Wheat Board Act

Mr. Hermanson .....	4092
Motion .....	4092
Mr. Easter .....	4095
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	4096
Mr. Goodale .....	4097
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	4099
Mr. Hermanson .....	4100
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	4101

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Queen's University

Bill S-8. Motion for second reading .....	4103
Mr. Milliken .....	4103
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to committee of the whole; bill reported; bill concurred in at report stage. Ringuette—Maltais in the chair.) .....	4103
Motion for third reading .....	4103
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) ...	4103

### Financial Administration Act

Bill C-270. Motion for second reading .....	4103
Mr. Milliken .....	4103
Mr. Langlois .....	4104
Mr. Williams .....	4106
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee.) .....	4107

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Supply

#### Allotted day—Canadian Wheat Board Act

Consideration resumed of the motion .....	4107
Mr. Hoepfner .....	4108
Mr. Pickard .....	4110
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac) .....	4111
Mr. Easter .....	4113
Mr. Hermanson .....	4114
Mr. Pickard .....	4114
Mr. Hanger .....	4116
Mr. Hermanson .....	4116
Mr. Collins .....	4117
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	4118
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4118
Mr. Benoit .....	4119
Mr. McKinnon .....	4122
Mr. Shepherd .....	4122
Mr. McKinnon .....	4123
Mr. Hoepfner .....	4124
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4124
Mrs. Cowling .....	4125
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	4126
Mr. Hermanson .....	4126
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4127
Mr. Landry .....	4127
Mrs. Cowling .....	4130
Mr. Pickard .....	4130
Mrs. Sheridan .....	4131
Mr. Bodnar .....	4131
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) .....	4133
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville) .....	4134
Mr. Penson .....	4135

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

### Fisheries

Mr. Robinson .....	4138
Mr. McWhinney .....	4139

### Hazardous Waste

Mr. Forseth .....	4139
Mr. McWhinney .....	4140

### Appendix

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**8801320  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canada Communication Group — Publishing

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Groupe Communication Canada — Édition

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

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

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

**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.**