



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 020 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, October 24, 1997

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

OFFICIAL REPORT

At page 1007 of *Hansard*, October 23, the following motion moved by Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC) should have appeared:

That this House recognize the urgent need for action to address the serious problems in Canadian fisheries on both the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, and calls upon the government to establish a comprehensive national fisheries policy that demonstrates real commitment to resource conservation, leadership on the issue of resource sharing with foreign interests, and sensitivity to the individuals, families and communities whose futures are linked to the health and sustainability of the Canadian fishing industry.

All parliamentary publications are available on the
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 24, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

CUSTOMS TARIFF

Hon. Jim Peterson (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that Bill C-11, an act respecting the imposition of duties of customs and other charges, to give effect to the International Convention on the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System, to provide relief against the imposition of certain duties of customs or other charges, to provide for other related matters and to amend or repeal certain acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, this is one of those occasions which rarely arises in this Chamber when all party consent, quickly given, is in the interests of all Canadians.

By simplifying the customs tariff, the bill will result in duty savings next year for Canadian businesses and consumers of \$90 million and will eliminate red tape. It will lower the production costs for Canadian firms, increase competitiveness in domestic and global markets and create more jobs.

All of us know that Canada's prosperity depends on trade. Exports account for 33% of the gross domestic product and 29% of GDP consists of imports. If the costs of tariffs can be lowered for Canadian businesses and administrative burden can be lessened, we will have a more competitive job creating economy. This is why the government has worked closely with Canadian businesses to design a more simple, cost effective customs tariff.

• (1010)

Consultations were extensive. Letters were sent to the leaders of the parties opposite from the heads of Canadian businesses and business organizations throughout Canada asking for their unanimous support for these measures. They have asked that priority be given by Parliament to passage of this legislation.

I would remind my colleagues that on January 1 next year, just a couple of months off, under the North American free trade agreement, tariffs with the United States will be eliminated. On this side we share the concerns of business that a simplified customs tariff be ready for implementation on that date. Of course, this implies that business too must be ready. We have to preclude economic disruption, allow for automated systems to be adapted and employees to be educated to the new tariff structure. This is why government has been working very closely with business to ensure that they are ready.

Since April Revenue Canada and StatsCan have undertaken ongoing, extensive outreach programs with those affected. Officials of the finance department have met with businesses and trade organizations and participated in conferences to inform interested parties. Obviously, early passage would enable the government to provide the information necessary regarding what is needed in terms of certainty, clarity and timeliness to the business community.

Quick passage will also demonstrate to Canadian industry that Parliament is not only aware of market realities, but is also able to respond quickly and effectively to industry calls for legislation. Put simply, it is timely that Bill C-11 be enacted.

Why? Because the current customs tariff represents a highly unnecessary hurdle to doing business. It is complex and outdated. It is time consuming and its redundant compliance requirements represent both a financial and opportunity cost to industry, not to mention government and bureaucracy. We have to streamline it, simplify it and update it to make Canadians competitive at home and abroad.

With rates of duty on all trade with our largest partner ending on January 1, 1998, coupled with other real rate reductions and eliminations flowing from the Uruguay round of the World Trade Organization, it is important to simplify our regime by eliminating complex and redundant mechanisms and ensuring that the tariff is responsive to competitive pressures facing Canadian industry.

Our regime has become truly complex. In all there are now 13 tariff treatments, 7 schedules, about 8,500 tariff items and 2,500 concessionary provisions or regulations and over 200 different rates of duty. The system is complicated, lacks transparency and leads, because of its complexity, to great uncertainty. This has been noted in many reports by the World Trade Organization. It is imperative to minimize these costs to industry. Let us recognize

Government Orders

that it is not only in Canada but all around the world that tariff rates are going down.

The Uruguay round, the FTA and the NAFTA have resulted in an almost 60% trade weighted reduction in average Canadian tariffs. The tariff system must be better adapted to the competitive Canadian industrial economy. In the context of an increasingly open economy, we have to have dynamic linkages between exports and imports, meaning declining rates of duty.

[*Translation*]

For all these reasons, the February 1994 budget announced a thorough review of the Canadian tariff system over a three-year period.

• (1015)

The main objectives were to ensure that the Customs Tariff and its regulations better reflect the pressures of international competition and also to reduce the regulatory burden and all the related costs.

Accordingly, a working group was set up within the Department of Finance and was mandated to achieve the objectives within three years. One of the key points of this review was its consultation of all the parties concerned to ensure that the results of the review were in line with the objectives set.

Meetings were held in order to inform those involved of the measures planned and to seek their views. Following public consultations, a draft version of the simplified Customs Tariff reflecting public comments was issued in March 1996 to give everyone an opportunity to prepare their final comments.

Thus, in order to reach the greatest number of interested parties, ads were published in a number of major Canadian papers, and the provisional version was displayed on the Internet site.

The proposed legislation and letters of support from industry leaders received by the leaders of the opposition parties indicate that the consultation process was a success, since business supports the bill and is getting ready for its application.

It is obvious the bill is based on the measures the current government has taken up until now to restructure and modernize the Customs Tariff. We hope in this way to help our businesses become more competitive and prosperous.

In June 1995, Bill C-102 lowered tariffs on a broad range of manufacturing inputs, so as to reduce the pressure exerted by the competition on Canadian industry as a result of the amendments to the drawback program affecting exports to the United States. These amendments were necessitated by NAFTA.

This initiative was the first legislative measure taken to simplify tariff provisions. I am very happy to say that it enabled business and consumers in Canada to save some \$60 million a year.

The planned tariff reductions will benefit Canadian producers. What's more, the administrative burden will be lighter—and related costs lower—for both government and business. Finally, the Customs Tariff will become easier to implement.

This bill will replace the seven existing schedules with a single one, simplify the tariff structure and greatly reduce the number of provisions in the Customs Tariff. The number of provisions will be reduced from 11,000 to 8,000. Moreover, obsolete or unnecessary tariff regulations and administrative procedures will be eliminated.

• (1020)

The new Customs Tariff will also have a broader application and permit unilateral tariff reductions for manufacturing inputs and the application of similar measures to the service sector.

I would like, in this regard, to remind my colleagues of the importance of ensuring that the Canadian service sector is as competitive as possible, especially in light of the international lifting of trade barriers in the service sector. We all know that the service sector is one of the most important ones in our country.

[*English*]

Until now I have spoken only in general terms concerning the overall economic benefits of simplifying our tariff structure. To illustrate these benefits allow me to turn briefly to several measures in the legislation.

I have already talked about the duty saving on a wide range of manufacturing products. The legislation will make further reductions in this direction, including the acceleration of most final Uruguay round reductions currently scheduled for the next two years.

As well, we are going to get rid of nuisance rates. Rates under 2% will be eliminated. We are going to round other rates to the nearest half per cent. These will be permanent features of our tariff system.

Rate reductions which affect goods coming into Canada that are used as inputs for manufacturing are very important. These will reduce the cost to Canadian manufacturers. It will make them more competitive and better able to take advantage of the growing regime of free trade. In short, our industries will be better able to compete for jobs.

Government red tape also stands in the way of our competitiveness. A case in point is the remaining not made in Canada provisions in the tariff to which I referred earlier. Under these provisions duty free entry is provided for specific goods, mostly manufacturing inputs.

Government Orders

While these provisions once provided flexibility to take into account the needs of Canadian manufacturers and producers, they have now been rendered redundant by the openness of our Canadian economy resulting from freer trade.

As well, they give rise to inconsistencies in the tariff treatment of goods, impose administrative costs to industry and the government and create uncertainty over what is dutiable.

Therefore we are now converting the remaining not made in Canada provisions to duty free items in the tariff schedule without the not made condition. This, again, will improve our competitiveness, particularly in our manufacturing sector.

Concerning concessionary codes in the current tariff, these provide for reduced rates or free entry for a wide range of goods that are not really part of the main tariff. With freer trade generally and with the United States in particular, changes in trade patterns and technology and other factors, many of these provisions are no longer justified. This is why we have proposed to eliminate about 1,000 of these codes. Another 1,000 or so codes remain relevant, since the amount of imports under them from non-U.S. sources is significant. These codes have been converted to tariff provisions at concessionary rates in a single tariff schedule.

To further reduce costs to industry we are terminating the machinery program and replacing it with duty free or dutiable tariff provisions for unavailable equipment or available equipment, respectively.

Currently duties on a broad range of machinery from all sources are remitted to applicants if reasonable equivalents are not available from Canadian production. Again, however, this program has been rendered largely irrelevant, or less relevant, by tariff reductions.

• (1025)

Implementing tariff items will not eliminate inconsistencies and uncertainty, it will alleviate the administrative requirements of the former remission process. Under the proposed legislation virtually all machinery production parts and most other parts under the program will come in duty free.

Regarding the remaining dutiable production machinery under the existing program, industry will continue to be able to seek and obtain relief under the proposed broadened order in council authority to reduce tariffs on inputs. Any relief granted will be implemented by means of amendments to the schedule.

I wish to note that following consultations with industry and a transitional period of three years, the sole criterion to be assessed in considering these applications for relief from the tariff will be

whether the equipment is available from domestic production. This program will lower costs to machinery users, provide greater transparency and predictability and help make us more competitive.

As well, the regulatory burden will also be reduced by revoking an additional 300 duty remission orders that are no longer needed. Yet another 70 regulations will be replaced with simpler provisions in the schedule. For example, for customs duty purposes, 12 regulations and 13 provisions that provide fuller partial tariff relief on certain temporarily imported goods will be replaced by one single tariff item, an item that allows conditional duty free entry for virtually all goods that are imported on a temporary basis, again to help make us more competitive in Canada.

Turning to the legislative provisions of the customs tariff there are a number of proposed changes in the bill. Many current provisions are not continued in the new tariff because they are no longer justified because of free trade. Others such as the machinery program are not continued due to the simplification that we have brought about. Perhaps the most striking change is the way the new single consolidated tariff schedule will look. It has a revised format with two columns pertaining to tariff treatments, reduced from the current five.

The government also proposes to eliminate the British preferential tariff. The reductions in most favoured nations rates of duty over the years have significantly eroded or, in most instances, completely eliminated the preferences under the BPT on most imports from developing commonwealth countries. Over the years this treatment has been overtaken in many instances by other preferential tariff treatments for developing countries and has become largely redundant. The British preferential tariff is therefore not in the proposed legislation.

Another important change to the legislation, which I briefly mention, is the broadened order in council authority to reduce duties on all imports including production machinery used by manufactures and service providers. It will ensure that the government has sufficient flexibility to respond efficiently to competitive pressures facing our industries. It also provides a new three year authority for the Minister of Finance in light of the experience over that time to rectify errors that we find in consultation with our private sector partners. This provision is considered particularly important by the business community in view of the wide ranging changes that this bill envisages.

Given these and other changes to the customs tariff, which my colleagues will address during this debate, we proposed to repeal the current customs tariff and replace it with an entirely new act. Substantive amendments are also being made to the Customs Act including provisions to harmonize the time limits for claiming duty refunds and providing for adjustments to tariff classifications, origin or value for duty determinations without the requirement for a formal appeal.

Government Orders

It will also provide for a single level of administrative appeal in Revenue Canada. These will simplify the appeal process and facilitate a focus on those issues where Revenue Canada and the importer may have disagreements. Overall we will have a much more simplified, transparent and predictable administration and regime.

• (1030)

In conclusion this bill and the measures I have detailed here today have three overriding results. First, they will help make Canadian industry far more competitive within a much freer global trading environment. Second, they will make our tariff system more transparent, more predictable and simpler. Third, they will reduce greatly the regulatory burden and the associated costs of that for both business and government.

Industry, as it has contacted members on all sides of this House, has indicated that it is anxious to see this legislation in place for the January 1, 1998 debut. I am confident that members of this House will accede to the needs of industry and allow us to pass without undue delay these measures in order that uncertainties will not apply throughout our business community.

I reiterate our view that this bill merits all party support and accelerated approval in order that businesses, workers and consumers can reap its benefits.

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking of course to Bill C-11 this morning, the simplified customs tariff.

Sometimes a low profile bill like this does not get a lot of attention. It is not front and centre in the media. It does not get all the excitement around it that some of the other bills do. But I want to say this morning how important this bill is because of its very significance around what it represents. Bureaucracies in general have a tendency to grow and if left unchecked, they just grow and grow and grow.

This particular piece of legislation that is being proposed is counter to that bureaucratic current of continual growth. I am going to come back to that concept later but I would like first of all to go through some of the highlights of this particular piece of legislation. I may touch on some of the notes of the previous speaker but as I go through these highlights I would ask members of the House to focus on the efficiencies and the countercurrent to bureaucratic growth that is inherent in this piece of legislation and consider applying this same kind of approach to other pieces of legislation and other parts of the bureaucracy.

First, this particular piece of legislation focused on reducing the custom duties on the goods that are used in the manufacturing

process in Canada, allowing Canadian businesses to better compete in the international marketplace.

Second, this piece of legislation totally eliminated some of the tariffs and duties for products in a not made in Canada category. This allowed Canadian businesses to improve their competitiveness on a broader range of duty free imports, but maybe even more important is the sea of red tape that that one change allowed. No longer do we have to go through an onerous process of determining what is a not made in Canada product and trying to track that as the situation changes in Canada both by government and industry.

I would like to also mention the clean-up that was done on the concessionary tariff codes. Many of these concessionary codes, as the previous member mentioned, had become obsolete. Two thousand of them in total were either eliminated or restructured and put in place as regular tariff schedule items. There are great gains in efficiency there.

In addition we had the elimination of the machinery remission program, duties remitted on machinery that was not available in Canada. This program had a huge administrative cost both for the private sector and for government in the determination of what is the machinery that is not available in Canada and how do we track it as the situation changes, applying for the remission and then tracking to make sure one actually got the remission cheque. Then there was all the discussion around whether or not it applied to the legislation that was in place. This was a great simplification of the tariff that is inherent in this new legislation which we fully endorse.

• (1035)

There was also the clean-up and elimination of those duties that were expressed in dollars and cents numbers rather than a percentage. The majority of tariffs are in a percentage but there were some that were still expressed in dollars and cents. It was much more appropriate to move them all into the one common format of percentage. It allows for much greater ease of use. It is also more appropriate as the price of the tariff item changes.

In addition some of the trade developments that have occurred in Canada made some of the regulations obsolete. Three hundred different remission orders and regulations were revoked. Seventy others were replaced with simple tariff items. Again all of this reduced the regulatory burden.

In addition there was a rationalization of the tariff schedule which was terrifically unwieldy the way it was before. There was the elimination of nuisance rates. Anything that was less than 2% tariff was eliminated. There was a rounding off of numbers to make it easier to apply the tariff. There was a harmonization of rates on like products. There was an amalgamation and a fixing of anomalies.

Government Orders

None of this is particular earth shaking. None of it is particularly difficult to do. It just took work. But the benefits to Canadian business and the Canadian government are substantial. The cumulative effect is a more predictable, simplified tariff legislation with less regulatory burden and increased competitive strength. Some aspects of Canadian business I would suggest are even ready for a lot more of this.

After touching on the highlights of this particular piece of legislation, let us go back to the significance of this kind of work and take the success of this particular initiative and apply it to the broader range of government legislation and bureaucracy that is out there.

As I said, bureaucracies have a tendency to grow. Why is that? It is largely due to their reward structure. In a bureaucracy the way one gets ahead personally is to build the bureaucracy underneath oneself. Always spend all your budget plus a little bit more. Launch new ideas and try to win support for your ideas. Get more people motivated around your good idea with very little accountability to what is actually being provided in the way of service and the value of that service evaluated through an impartial third party.

This particular piece of legislation goes counter to that kind of bureaucratic tendency in that it serves to shrink the bureaucracy and add efficiency. Those who are involved in this type of work are usually within bureaucracies and their efforts go unrewarded.

I would like to suggest that the Reform Party from the very inception recognized this tendency within bureaucracies to grow and grow. Within our policy and platform books it is clear that we have called for a simplification of the regulation, a rationalization of the redundancies of the processes within government, adding to the efficiency and quality of the service provided by government but doing it in a way that downsizes the extent of the bureaucracy.

Reform has recognized the need for this type of initiative from the very inception. In fact within our policy documents it is clear that we have also recognized the need for a change in the reward structure around bureaucracies.

• (1040)

What we are calling for within our government is a recognition for those people and those individuals who can demonstrably deliver a higher quality of service at lower cost. These kinds of efficiency gains are usually brought about by individuals within the government at the front line or at the first level of management who are aware of the waste and aware of where the problems are.

The problem today is if those people do take the initiative to increase efficiency, they are not rewarded. In fact they can even encounter some very significant resistance. Our policy calls on that type of initiative to be rewarded. If we are to really see the

bureaucracies in our government begin to shrink and become more effective, we need to recognize individuals and groups of people who are focused on providing a higher quality of service at a lower cost to Canadians.

I would like to commend the individuals who were involved in this project. They consulted with industry. I am sure there were many hours spent poring over this piece of legislation to come up with something that is refreshing and is counter to the usual growth we see in the bureaucracy.

With those comments, I would like to say that this is the kind of legislation that is a step in the right direction. It is consistent with what Reform has been calling for. Would it not be refreshing to apply this kind of approach to other pieces of government legislation, perhaps the Income Tax Act.

Many people do not realize that the Income Tax Act was implemented as a temporary measure to fund the war effort. It was actually 36 pages at that time. Now it is over 600 pages of legalese and another 700 pages of special interpretations and guidelines. It is almost twice as thick as the yellow pages in my own home city of Calgary. And Canadians are supposed to somehow figure all of it out.

I believe we need to apply the same kind of rationalization and simplification that we are seeing in this bill to a number of areas within our government. That is why this bill is so significant for what it represents here today.

The Reform caucus and I believe all my colleagues are in support of this bill. Therefore it can be anticipated that there is support from this side of the House on this bill this morning.

• (1045)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to state the Bloc Quebecois position on Bill C-11 on the customs tariff.

The Bloc Quebecois is in favour of expansion of the free trade zone to all of the Americas, essentially to enhance our trade exchanges with other countries, Brazil and Argentina in particular.

We have already taken one step in this direction with the Canada-Chile free trade agreement. We believe Canada must continue along this path, which is a continuation of a long history of market liberalization, one which is accelerating as we approach the second millennium.

Free trade agreements in our time bring numerous questions to the fore. To provide a clear picture of the Bloc Quebecois position on this, I will begin with a reference to the steps leading to the recent liberalization of markets. I shall then move on to the sad

Government Orders

record of Liberal promises on this subject. Lastly, I will set out the Bloc Québécois position on Bill C-11.

On numerous occasions we have referred to the essential nature of the free trade agreement. We have often said that a major shift in direction is needed, and I believe we must continue to say so.

A review of numerous events in our history shows us that markets need to be opened up, as we have always believed. As far back as 1950, American capital was flooding into Canada. Since the War of 1914, the United States had replaced Great Britain as our principal source of foreign capital, funds which Canada could not do without. But the British contributed to the bonds issued by Canada and even to subsidiaries wholly owned by the Americans. So many Canadian companies were bought up by American interests in 10 years that the 1950s will be remembered as the decade of the big takeover. Entire industries, created by English Canadians to be sheltered from the tariff, fell into the hands of the Americans.

The Canadian government was facing two problems at the same time. Unable to rely on customs duties to direct industrial development, it had to abandon any initiative in that area or find new means of achieving the same ends. Also, with the Americans apparently set on buying everything out, should they be allowed to carry out their initiatives or should measures be contemplated to hold them back?

The answers came from the 1960s up until 1988. The policies that were set reflected a consistent effort to direct industrial development and to erect barriers against foreign control. Starting with the 1960 federal budget, the purpose of fiscal policies and subsidies was twofold: to direct investments toward preferential activity areas and to encourage investment in regions where both unemployment and the rate of growth was particularly high.

• (1050)

In this context, Canada was built and the early experiences were never forgotten. Without the government, the railways could never have been built in a country with such a small population. When people saw where commercial aviation was headed and set up Trans-Canada Airlines, the development of Hertzian waves for transmission purposes resulted in the creation of the CBC. The telegraph, and telecommunications could have developed along north-south lines, while railways were looking after the east-west link. Building a country by means of customs tariffs is inevitably a form of schizophrenia.

Naturally, without the burden of customs duties, factories sprang up, jobs were created, foreign companies that otherwise would have been content to sell to Canada, set up business here so as to avoid paying duties. From these perspectives, a protectionist policy

helped increase provincial production and at the same time contributed to trade.

It is also true, however, that the consumer paid more than would otherwise have been the case if he had bought goods directly outside the country duty free. In addition, the establishment of many factories in a small Canadian market, with consumers demanding the same diversification of products as American consumers, meant that factories' production costs were much higher than in American factories, with correspondingly higher unit production costs.

As it developed, the Canadian manufacturing industry cut itself off from most export markets. It existed for the domestic market, but in most cases, it was not able to compete on international markets, and it should come as no surprise that attempts were sometimes made to point out the advantages of free trade over those of national production.

The attempts made by the Laurier government, before World War I, and those of the Mackenzie King government immediately after World War II, make no sense otherwise. But the imperatives of building a country and a national economy won the day.

The fifteen years following the end of World War II, however, were to profoundly, decisively, and in some ways irreversibly, alter the policies of organizing and developing the Canadian economy. The great depression of the 1930s led most national industrial economies to resort to extremely restrictive protectionist measures. With 20%, 25% or even 30% of the labour force unemployed, governments did not hesitate to reserve what was left of the domestic market for national businesses, by drastically increasing custom duties. Such a measure encouraged trading partners to do the same, with the result that, in the decade which preceded the world conflict, tariff wars proliferated.

From 1930 to 1935, protectionist hysteria between Canada and the United States knew no limits. Some traditional trade activities between the two countries completely disappeared. The same was happening all over the world. This period will be remembered as a crazy time when every country was trying to ruin its neighbour and ended up going bankrupt too. Nations came out of the war with a firm resolution to never let this happen again.

In 1947, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, or GATT, was established. The setting-up of that remarkable organization resulted in a gradual lowering of custom duties, first among major industrial countries, and then between them and an increasing number of developing countries. Suffice it to say that, by the end of the second world war, average U.S. customs duties on American taxable imports stood at 30%, compared to barely 5% today. This gives you an idea of the progress that was made.

In Canada, changes may have been less spectacular but they were nevertheless significant. Eventually, it was realized that the very nature of the GATT agreements made it impossible to use customs duties to structure the Canadian economy. In fact, if the government still needs an industrial policy, it has to rely on instruments other than those that have been used so rigorously for close to 100 years. Customs duties are bound to be reduced or to remain at their current level.

To be sure, GATT regulations contain any number of derogatory clauses. We gradually learned how to use them, which was no small feat.

• (1055)

I have just described a significant part of the development of trade in Canada and in Quebec with other countries and between provinces. I feel it is important to specify as well that the federal government has not shown great efficiency in this connection, has not demonstrated any desire to move further with it, despite its lukewarm support of free trade in the past—we need only recall the battle over the free trade agreement.

Where improvement of dispute resolution mechanisms is concerned, for example, the three partners announced in March of this year that no progress had been made. In addition, the United States indicated that there would be no further discussions on this matter. By so doing, they drew attention to the false statements the party across the way was still making on the matter of free trade.

The same goes for energy. Canada has never obtained similar protection to what Mexico has under NAFTA. Instead, it has released a declaration setting out its interpretation of the NAFTA clauses relating to energy. This declaration, of course, is not an integral part of NAFTA, unlike the special Mexican reservations and clauses.

In response to Bloc Quebecois questions on the matter last winter, the Minister of International Trade at the time could do no more than take refuge once again behind the work of the task force, which was still incomplete. He told us in his response that he had not yet been able to meet with his U.S. and Mexican counterparts to examine the NAFTA committee report.

In his testimony before the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade, the minister recognized that he needed more time to come to an agreement with the U.S. over antidumping and countervailing measures. I need not remind you that such measures were often taken against Canada and that the so-called efforts of this government, which was looking for reforms in that area, never produced any concrete results.

The government's strategy, as stated by the minister responsible, was to sign a similar agreement with Chile, and later with Mexico, to put a little more pressure on our other trade partner, the United States. He added that progress was made and that a report will be tabled, which he will release as soon as he is given the green light.

S. O. 31

I urge the government to table this document in the House of Commons now, if eight months was long enough to seek the necessary permissions to share this information with the elected representatives of the people of Quebec and Canada who are sitting in this House. However, it seems rather—

The Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but it being 11 o'clock, the House will now proceed to statements by members pursuant to Standing Order 31. The hon. member will have 5 minutes left to complete his speech after Oral Question Period.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, according to the Sierra Club of Canada we are the second largest emitter of greenhouse gases per capita in the industrialized world.

To the government's credit, the Minister of the Environment has indicated that Canadians and the international community must take immediate action to reduce these emissions and stop the harmful effects of global climate change.

It is up to each and every Canadian to do their part to reduce emissions. It means being more responsible in how we use energy. It means conserving our national resources. It means using renewable fuels that are more friendly to the environment. We cannot rely on any other sector of the population to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions for us. All Canadians must work together to reduce these emissions.

I fully support the Minister of the Environment and the international community in their efforts to reduce the threat of global warming.

* * *

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Blackstrap, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the House my colleague from Wild Rose stated how Roy Tremblay, a prison guard in the process of relocating a prisoner with full-blown AIDS, was stuck by a hidden tattoo needle.

• (1100)

The following letter from Mr. Tremblay expresses his frustration with our present day penal system. The letter reads:

S. O. 31

Isn't it ironic that Corrections Canada provides convicts with condoms, lubricant and bleach to clean their needles, and we've been told that Joyceville is thinking about opening a tattoo room for its inmates?

Well what about providing some protective equipment for the staff? I ask you, isn't a guard's life worth the cost of a pair of puncture resistant gloves?

He goes on to write:

It may be said that I am bitter and should just get on with my life. Well guess what? I am very bitter and I would gladly trade places with these people and let them have the worries and uncertainty that I have to endure every day.

Corrections Canada gives staff lip service to our concerns. Well if they want to talk the talk then they better start walking the walk.

By the way, it should be noted that it is a policy not to inform prison guards and staff about—

* * *

[Translation]

UNITED NATIONS DAY

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on this United Nations Day, I would like to draw attention to the work of the UN, particularly in the areas of health, education, human rights, the environment, peace and security.

[English]

The United Nations is the cornerstone of Canadian foreign policy and we have historically been one of its strongest supporters.

Lester Pearson's contribution to our modern peacekeeping efforts is legendary and Canadians are proud of our peacekeeping missions.

We are working with the United Nations to increase worldwide support for the treaty to ban landmines, a landmark agreement which the Minister of Foreign Affairs should be commended for initiating.

Canada is currently a candidate for the non-permanent seat on the Security Council. If successful, we hope to play an even greater role at the United Nations over the next few years toward increased peace and security internationally.

Our credentials and reputation in this regard are respected world wide.

[Translation]

On this United Nations Day, we must support Secretary General Kofi Anna in his efforts to make the UN more efficient so it can face the challenges of the 21st century.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as this is Small Business Week, I am pleased to recognize this sector's active contribution to our economy.

In the riding of Laval Centre, over 880 small businesses help provide work for 18,875 people. Their energy and their creativity are the keys to their vitality and success.

In this context, I am proud to pay tribute to the exceptional work of PBI experts-conseils Inc. Yesterday, this business from my riding received an award at the 30th gala of the Association of Consulting Engineers of Canada.

Under the leadership of its president, Paul Boyer, this small business employing five people developed state-of-the-art software which received high praise from Hydro-Québec and Quebec's Ministry of Environment and Wildlife.

This success story clearly shows that Quebec's know-how and knowledge are worth their weight in gold.

* * *

[English]

CANADA COUNCIL

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in keeping with our red book commitment, the Minister of Canadian Heritage announced an annual increase of \$25 million to the Canada Council for the arts.

Much has been accomplished by the Canada Council in the past 40 years. From the grassroots up, the council has contributed to building a vast, lively and diverse arts sector of creators and organizations in communities across Canada.

The Canada Council for the arts has focused its efforts on the creation, production and dissemination of artistic work which has fostered the emergence of generations of great Canadian artists and a body of work in which we can all take pride.

Increasing resources by \$25 million will enrich the entire cultural sector, which relies on the arts for content, inspiration and talent. Most important of all, it contributes to enhancing Canadians' understanding of each other and forging a strong national identity.

* * *

SPENCERVILLE LEGION

Mr. Joe Jordan (Leeds—Grenville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as Remembrance Day draws near I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House an important project. The

Spencerville Legion, Branch 604, with Bill Woodhead spearheading the initiative, has taken up the challenge of having the soon to be completed highway 416 named in honour of Canadian veterans.

This initiative, along with the anticipated successful acquisition of the McCrae medals, would clearly indicate that we are not only prepared but proud to hold the torch high.

I feel it will also serve to compliment and support the activities of the Royal Canadian Legion as it deals with the challenge of ensuring that the next generation of Canadians do not break faith.

I encourage all members of the House, especially the members for Ontario, to endorse this cause of the Spencerville Legion.

• (1105)

As Remembrance Day approaches, take this opportunity to write the Ontario minister of transport to strongly support our very own veterans' memorial highway.

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Jim Pankiw (Saskatoon—Humboldt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in March the Minister of Industry compared direct to home satellite retailers to drug pushers.

Mike Heck is a constituent of mine and is in the direct to home satellite business. He provides jobs in the community, pays taxes in the community and he is understandably upset over the comments of the minister.

Mr. Heck does not consider it a crime to offer Canadians freedom of choice. But the Liberals believe that if programming does not come from Canada's monopolies, officially sanctioned by the CRTC, then it will corrupt us.

Three hundred thousand Canadians have said enough is enough and have tuned the Liberal government out. They are watching what they want, paying for they want, enjoying what they want on their direct to home satellite systems. They are standing together in opposition to the Liberal government, telling it to "get its dirty little fingers off our remote controls".

* * *

PORNOGRAPHY

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House to draw attention to the white ribbon against pornography campaign.

[Translation]

The purpose of this national campaign is to eliminate the destructive influences of obscene, pornographic and indecent material.

S. O. 31

[English]

Concern with the destructive nature of pornography is nation wide and the campaign for its elimination has been spearheaded by many groups in our ridings. The main goals of the white ribbon campaign include ensuring that possession of child pornography is a chargeable offence, that no pornography is sold to minors and that all videos are classified before they can be displayed or rented.

From my perspective, pornography is essentially degrading to women and I am at a loss to comprehend how any feminist writer could perceive it otherwise.

As a member of Parliament, I will be receiving this week a box of white ribbons from the Catholic Women's League in Barrie. These ribbons have been worn by residents as a sign of their desire to eliminate pornography.

* * *

[Translation]

UNITED NATIONS DAY

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is United Nations Day.

As the UN launches into a major reform, the Bloc Quebecois hopes that the organization will remain true to its primary mission, the promotion of peace and international security, the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and the promotion of economic, cultural and social development.

Since it was founded on October 24, 1945, the UN has attracted almost 200 member countries, 20 of them since 1989. Whether through its international peacekeeping activities or its actions to promote the respect of human rights, the UN has held fast to the objectives of justice, collective security, human development and equal rights for all.

The Bloc Quebecois thanks all Quebecers who are working to defend and encourage the principles and objectives of this organization so as to make our world a better place.

* * *

[English]

PEACEKEEPING

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege for me to pay tribute to Canada's peacekeepers.

They provide an invaluable and a necessary service to communities throughout the world. However, this commitment does not come without personal cost. These men and women leave behind wives, husbands and families in discharging their duties.

S. O. 31

It is with this in mind that Randy Chester and group of committed volunteers have started the Home Fires Burning project. It was a personal experience for me to be at the ground breaking ceremony for the first Home Fires Burning project in all Canada at CFB Petawawa in my riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke.

The project's objective is to provide visible recognition for those who provide a supportive role in our military community. All they ask in return is a safe journey home of their loved ones.

I believe it is fitting and proper that we pay honour to not only the peacekeepers but to their families.

* * *

THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this weekend we celebrate the anniversaries of two milestones for democracy in Canada.

Five years ago this Sunday, on October 26, 1992, millions of Canadians had a rare taste of grassroots democracy when they cast their votes in a national referendum on constitutional change. Ordinary Canadians resoundingly rejected the special status, distinct society laden Charlottetown accord. By doing so, they also rejected the top down process by which that accord was drafted. Canadians set an important precedent that day. Never again will they allow political elites to dictate our constitutional future.

• (1110)

Four years ago tomorrow, millions of Canadians defied conventional wisdom and set another democratic landmark. They voted Reform by the millions. On that day 51 new Reform MPs joined the Reform member who is now the member for Edmonton North.

These are two great dates, two dates that mark the coming of age for democracy in this country. Reformers everywhere should be proud.

* * *

VOLUNTEERS

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I urge the government to recognize the value of volunteers by including a volunteer tax credit in the forthcoming federal budget.

The purpose of this proposal is to offer a tangible thank you in the form of a tax credit for those unsung heroes who volunteer their time and services for community and non-profit organizations.

The government allows tax deductions for charitable donations, real estate and securities. Does a volunteer hour not have a similar quantifiable value?

The economic realities of funding cuts increase the demand for and importance of these Canadian champions. As the non-profit sector does more with less, volunteers fill the gaps.

Members of Parliament constantly extol the value of volunteers and volunteerism. For the greater good it is time to put money where our mouth is.

* * *

MULTILATERAL AGREEMENT ON INVESTMENT

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, for two years the Canadian government has been engaged in secret negotiations on the multilateral agreement on investment, an agreement which goes well beyond the provisions of NAFTA in ceding power to multinationals and threatens to diminish even further the rights of nations to direct their own economies, provide safe and decent working conditions and protect the environment for future generations.

This Liberal government promised not to sign NAFTA unless it could get adequate protection for labour and environmental standards in 1993 and then it signed on to an inadequate and toothless side agreement designed to convince Canadians that they were standing up for Canadian interests.

This government should not proceed in any further trade negotiations without first constructing an international legal framework to protect human rights, the rights of labour and the rights of communities to regulate in the interest of sustainable development.

* * *

CANADIAN WAR MUSEUM

Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the many Canadians, including those from my riding of Nepean—Carleton, who generously donated to a special fund established toward the purchase of the military service medals of Lieutenant-Colonel John McCrae, author of *In Flanders Fields*.

Many Canadians are pleased that the federal government will be financially supportive of the efforts being co-ordinated by the McCrae House Museum in Guelph and the war museum to hopefully purchase these medals.

As we approach Remembrance Day it is very important for us to keep in mind that a nation has a duty to honour those who have died in defence of freedom. The Canadian War Museum has a special

role to play in promoting our collective remembrance of the sacrifices of previous generations. In future we must ensure that they have the resources to do a job that should be important to all Canadians.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, a huge injustice is being committed as we sit here today. The Liberal government is killing off the early stage software development industry by axing tax incentives. The government crushed industrial creativity when it abruptly decided on August 6 this year to remove investment incentives to high risk “angel” investors of small to mid-size development companies. The Minister of Finance is going through with this removal of important forms of finance for early stage software developers without any consultation with the industry: no orange light, no warning, no review, even after he has been asked for a review and even offered co-operative help from the industry.

The killing off of a valuable fast paced growing industry is absolutely despicable and unacceptable. On October 31 an entire part of the technology industry will die. If the government is going to brag about helping the innovative technology industry, then it should either treat the industry as partners or stop using the partnership rhetoric.

* * *

[Translation]

POVERTY

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that last Friday was International Day for the Eradication of Poverty.

In the riding of Québec, poverty has a face and a name. I pay tribute to the work of our social and community workers. Distributing glasses of milk, providing assistance to single parent families, visiting the elderly, listening to the young without judging them, helping the unemployed look for work, providing housing assistance, and encouraging those on welfare to stand up for themselves are just some of the things they do that make life a little easier. We must continue to support those who make a contribution to the community and to follow their example.

• (1115)

That is why we are demanding that the federal government reimburse the provinces, who are facing an annual shortfall of \$4.5 billion in transfer payments for social assistance, education and health, instead of using the savings made on the backs of the poor to promote the maple leaf.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Justice told the House the Liberals would not bring in a carbon tax, but she specifically failed to rule out other taxes on the energy industry, taxes that would devastate Canada’s resource industries and the thousands of families that relied on it for their livelihood.

As the minister for Alberta, it is up to her to clear the air, which she can do right now by telling the House the following words: “Never again will the Liberal government cripple our economy with a massive energy tax grab”. Will the Minister of Justice tell us that today?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to read something into the record: “Actually for several years people have been talking about climate change, global warming and greenhouse gases. We think it is better to be safe than sorry. The world should act now and control carbon dioxide emissions”.

Who said that? The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers.

If even the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers wants Canada to recognize the problem and be part of the solution, why is the Reform Party the only group in this country that is not willing to act in the interests of all Canadians?

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are looking for assurances that they are not going to be stuck with a multi-billion dollar tax grab and all we get are evasions from this government.

The Kyoto deal could double home heating costs and raise gasoline costs to almost a litre. I want the minister to commit right now to no more taxes on energy, not a cent more on gas, not a cent more on the wellhead, not a cent more on heating fuel.

Will he or she give us their word today?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the Reform Party program on the environment.

It says: “The Reform Party supports ensuring that all Canadians dwell in a clean and healthy environment. The Reform Party believes environmental considerations must carry equal weight with economic, social and technical considerations in the development of a project”.

Why has the Reform Party abandoned its own program? Why has it abandoned its principles? Why has it ceased to care about the best interests of all Canadians as part of a world community? What

Oral Questions

has gone wrong with the Reform Party? More Reform rubbish today. Why can't it get back to its principles?

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the question is why has the government not ruled out a tax grab. That is the question. The average family already pays more in taxes than it does on food, shelter and clothing combined.

This government has taken \$8 billion more out of their pockets. Canadian families are working harder but coming home with less because of the tax burden.

Why has the Liberal government committed to support the Kyoto tax attack which could suck thousands of dollars out of the pockets of every Canadian family?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, even the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers wants us to come up with a fair solution through the Kyoto negotiations.

This government is consulting with all the stakeholders including the provinces. We are going to be negotiating actively in Kyoto in the interests of all Canadians, bearing in mind western Canada, central Canada, eastern Canada. Any deal this government signs will be in the best interests of all Canadians, not like the Reform Party which has a monomania about taxes and does not care about the health and safety of Canadians for the future.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the environment minister admitted to reporters yesterday that Canada made a mistake at the earth summit in Rio. This is quite a revelation.

The minister said: "Canada should not have agreed to cut its emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000". We did not realize what was implied by that commitment.

If Rio was a mistake, why is Canada prepared to repeat it in Kyoto with a legally binding treaty?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, who is not here today, I want to clarify the remarks she is quoted as stating.

• (1120)

She said that the targets at Rio were very noble ones. Unfortunately there was not enough follow-up on implementation.

What she is really saying is that this time we anticipate having a legally binding, realistic and achievable implementation system. That is the answer.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it sounds like we are getting a little flip-flop over here.

The minister was speaking from the heart, speaking the position that Canadians want to hear and what she feels. Yet she is not allowed by the frontbench to have her say.

The environment minister admits that the Kyoto treaty will lower the standard of living of all Canadians across this nation. This is not just an Alberta issue. Industry will be devastated in Ontario and Atlantic Canada as well.

Will the minister commit to conduct an economic impact analysis that considers the devastating that will descend on industry and the thousands of jobs lost in her home province of—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Transport.

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are all manners of consultations going on dealing with this very crucial file.

This is an issue that affects all Canadians no matter where they live. It is wrong for one party, one particular group in the country to play off one part of the country or one interest group against the other. That is what the Reform Party does and it has to end.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Everyone except the federal government knows that poverty is on the rise in Canada and that drastic cuts to employment insurance only make it worse. Yesterday, the premier of Quebec suggested that the question of how to use the billions of dollars from the surplus in the employment insurance fund be put on the agenda of the next federal-provincial conference.

Does the government intend to act on the Quebec premier's suggestion to finally put an end to the scandal of the \$12 billion surplus accumulated at the expense of the unemployed?

[English]

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand here and pretend to speak for the prime minister and the premiers as to how they will discuss their issues.

I will say, though, that I find it somewhat humorous that a minister of the Mulroney government who jacked premiums to over \$3 is now giving us lectures on why we have not reduced them lower than \$2.80.

Oral Questions

I can assure the House that with the EI fund we will do what is best for the workers, best in the long run for Canadians. That is the balanced approach this government has taken all along.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the voters saw right through it and taught the Liberals a good lesson in the last federal election. It will happen again in the next election if the Liberal government does not reconsider its position in this matter.

In St. Andrews, last summer, all provincial premiers agreed to ask the federal government to lower the EI premium rates and to improve protection for the unemployed.

Will this government, which boasts about working in partnership with the provinces, act on this request and put an end to the drastic cuts to employment insurance?

[*English*]

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we first announced that we were going to change directions dramatically from where the Tories were in their previous terms in government, we said that we were going to make sure that there was a surplus in the EI account. We knew, as all other Canadians know, it is not a time to increase premiums when the economy is in a downturn.

If people do not accept that we should plan for a day when we might have a little more difficulty with the economy than we have today, they obviously should not be on this side of the House. I suspect they may want to stay where they are.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN AMBASSADOR TO FRANCE

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Canadian ambassador to France, Jacques Roy, continued his tour of Quebec under the aegis of the Council for Canadian unity. The ambassador delivered the message of national unity to Quebecers from Trois-Rivières to Quebec City and will do so through the lower St. Lawrence as well.

My question is to the Deputy Prime Minister. How does the Deputy Prime Minister justify having a diplomat, who is supposed to be representing us abroad, on a clearly partisan tour of Quebec with and under the aegis of an organization that is no less partisan, the Council for Canadian unity?

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roy is currently in Quebec as part of public awareness tour. He already was on such a tour last year in Manitoba and Ontario. This a routine visit and one of his duties as Canadian ambassador is to promote the idea of a strong and united Canada.

• (1125)

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, these are very odd routine visits when an ambassador speaks of

flags, of French Canadians in the public service and essentially of Canadian unity. If Jacques Roy wants to go into politics, he should get himself elected in the next elections.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister not acknowledge that he should immediately send his ambassador back to work in France?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is usual for the ambassador of Canada to speak for Canada. Would the hon. member prefer he speak for Guadeloupe?

* * *

[*English*]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the aboriginal population grows the crisis deepens and costs rise. By the year 2016 the cost to Canadians could be as high as \$11 billion a year. For thousands of young aboriginal people poor health, lost economic opportunity and lost hope for the future can never be measured in dollars. When will this government honour its commitment to aboriginal people and provide a full and complete response to the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Patry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as mentioned yesterday in response to another question in the House, the Government of Canada will respond to the royal commission of inquiry, the commission of Justices Dussault and Erasmus. The response will be given as soon as possible.

In the meantime, we have established priorities. We are meeting with all interested parties and we will report to the House as soon as possible.

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Royal Bank said that the deplorable state of Canada's aboriginal people is a national shame. If investments are not made to infrastructure in the northern communities, if investments are not made in jobs and economic development, if investments are not made in the social realities of aboriginal people, will the deputy prime minister commit today to look at the deplorable means of aboriginal people and work with them to look at the betterment of our future and our country?

Mr. Bernard Patry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is why we have supplementary estimates. In the supplementary estimates we have some money for infrastructure. There was \$8 million for infrastructure. For the youth employment strategy we have \$24 million in the estimates. This is what we are doing and doing well.

* * *

SEARCH AND RESCUE

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday people died in the north Atlantic. Today the eyes of the world are

on Canada's search and rescue operations. We have excellent people who cannot do their jobs without excellent equipment.

In response to a serious question the Minister of National Defence gave partisan lines that were inappropriate. Every single Canadian knows that it was this government that cancelled the helicopter deal that could have made a difference yesterday. When will this government stop playing partisan politics and act responsibly by properly equipping our coast guard?

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the incident off the coast of St. John's this morning and the ongoing search and rescue activities are things I am proud of. Our Canadian forces personnel are doing an outstanding job.

To put the record straight, the helicopter the member is referring to would only have a range of 500 miles offshore—

An hon. member: It's 700.

Mr. John Richardson: I am sorry, it is 700. But this is beyond that range, and he knows it. Until we get the ship within that range, we could not have used those helicopters. What we are doing now—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Fundy—Royal.

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague asked twice yesterday and I am asking for a second time today. Soon is not good enough. Yesterday's events made it clear that Canadians need an answer. Please take this question seriously.

Today we have a platform out there, the Hibernia platform. Any helicopter could have actually flown to the platform, refuelled and continued on. We did not have the flexibility to actually make that step because we did not have the helicopters in the first place.

• (1130)

I ask the parliamentary secretary—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence.

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to make one correction. That was 550 miles the EH-101 would have gone. That was not within the range from the platform to get to those ships and you know that.

The Deputy Speaker: The parliamentary secretary will please address the Chair.

Mr. John Richardson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The member knows that. In fact we have picked up 10 survivors. One is critical and the other is not so critical. We are flying them into hospitals. We are moving as quickly as we can to close the gap and continue searching for bodies in the Atlantic. It is a heroic effort—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Dewdney—Alouette.

* * *

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister is here in Canada he does not like to talk too much about the GST. It is no wonder, after all he did promise to scrap it, kill it and abolish it. However yesterday in England the Prime Minister was actually bragging about how much he likes the GST.

Which is it? Is it a tax he grudgingly collects, or one that he brags about to tax collectors around the world?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a tax as all members know that we inherited from our predecessors. I must admit that I was very proud as the chair of the finance committee to have had the opportunity to review 20 alternatives to it.

We have made numerous changes to that tax. We have taken a lemon and made lemonade.

Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister seems to have forgotten that because he wants to adopt the tax as his own. In fact the Prime Minister tells the world he loves the GST and yesterday he actually said "We introduced it". He wants to take credit for it.

Which Prime Minister should hardworking Canadians and hardworking taxpayers believe: the 1993 version who hated the GST, or the 1997 version who tells the world how much he loves it?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): And this, Mr. Speaker, is coming from the party that is on record for praising our efforts at harmonizing the GST. This is the party that worked with us constructively to ensure that we had a more competitive tax system. This is the tax that, harmonized in the Atlantic provinces, is being bragged about by

Oral Questions

the premiers as offering a competitive advantage to those who have not harmonized.

If they want to get rid of the \$18 billion without blowing our deficit to pieces, let them tell us how.

* * *

[Translation]

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE OF CANADA

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General of Canada.

In his letter of October 2, the Solicitor General of Canada said that he did not believe it necessary to hold a public inquiry within the Correctional Service of Canada. Labour Canada did an evaluation and concluded that there was no risk for employees.

My question—

The Deputy Speaker: The Solicitor General of Canada.

[English]

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned a number of times in this House, the protection of our employees is of paramount concern and is an ongoing concern. Management and the Union of Solicitor General Employees are working together constantly in the interests of their protection.

[Translation]

Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, why is the minister refusing to hold a public inquiry, when the life and safety of correctional services officers and the public are involved?

[English]

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have a number of instruments available for monitoring situations and investigating situations, and the safety of our employees is of paramount concern.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister has promised, and I quote from him this week in the House, “a guarantee to the provinces for cash as it relates to medicare”. Now from finance documents we find that is not quite true. There is a \$171 million shortfall in those cash transfers.

• (1135)

Where is the missing money for medicare?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. We intend

to bring legislation before the House which will reflect our commitment to have a CHST cash floor of \$12.5 billion. Until that legislation has been passed, that cannot be included in the estimates.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the promise is there, a promise made by the minister across the way. This is not a promise to me nor to my party. It is a promise to people like Bill Prentice who has been waiting for a hip replacement for two years because the OR is closed. That money would go toward opening the OR for Bill Prentice. There is probably somebody in the gallery with hepatitis C who is waiting for a compensation package.

My question again, where is the missing money for medicare?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said to the hon. member, as soon as the legislation is passed it will show up in the accounts on that basis.

I take it that the representation of the hon. member is a commitment by his party to grant unanimous consent when we bring that legislation before the House.

* * *

[Translation]

RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION

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

The moratorium on railways along the St. Lawrence river to Lévis ends December 1. We learned yesterday that the minister has not yet made a decision in this regard.

Would the minister agree, in light of the importance of this issue to meet with the agencies concerned and to hold public hearings on the subject?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a number of options for rail service across the country. On the matter of the Lévis station, no decision has yet been made. I will gladly consider any idea or opinion my colleague or anyone else might have on the subject before I make my decision.

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I note the minister has not made a decision, but how is it that his colleague, the Secretary of State for Agriculture and Agro-food, and Fisheries and Oceans announced this week with great fanfare in *Le Soleil* that the Lévis station would close on December 1?

Is the Minister of Transport still in charge of the department or is it his colleague?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am the Minister of Transport.

Oral Questions

[English]

SEARCH AND RESCUE

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the dedication of Canada's search and rescue personnel is undisputed. It is the best. The dedication of this government's commitment toward search and rescue is also undisputed. It is the worst.

In 1993 the Liberals exploited the purchase of new helicopters and this exploitation has cost lives.

Will the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence stand in this House today and defend the inaction of this government on the helicopter fiasco?

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that supercilious sort of sham reasoning is belied directly by the facts. This helicopter would not have had the range to reach from Hibernia to the existing site.

An hon. member: Wrong.

Mr. John Richardson: That is right. The other fact is to wait for the announcement on the helicopters.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the parliamentary secretary surely knows that the capability of refuelling was available with the C-130 and that capability is available today if we had the right helicopter.

For cheap political points the Liberal government has placed people's lives in jeopardy. The decision is four years overdue. Our pilots will only fly this government's helicopters as high as they want to fall.

When will the government support our search and rescue personnel and buy the equipment they need?

Mr. John Richardson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, they can huff and puff but they won't blow the house down. The fact is the helicopters are on line. The announcement will be made imminently. The hon. member knows that.

* * *

• (1140)

[Translation]

VCN MARINE RADIO

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for the Coast Guard.

There are all sorts of rumours rampant at present concerning the Magdalen Islands marine radio service. Yesterday, while regional authorities of his department were notifying employees on the

islands of their relocation, the minister was telling me that his department had not reached a decision.

Can the parliamentary secretary assure us in this House, in order to dispel the rumours and reassure both the pilots and the people of the Magdalen Islands, that Fisheries and Oceans has not made a decision to move or close the Islands radio station?

[English]

Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the member that we are not closing the station but rather it will be operated from Rivière-au-Renard. There will be no change in the level of service to the fishermen in the area. In fact we have established that safety will remain a priority for those fishermen involved.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services.

[English]

Architectural and engineering services are a significant component of Canada's small and medium size business community. Could the minister tell us what is the government doing to give greater access to this important sector of our economy?

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the week I announced an initiative called Contracts Canada which will allow one-stop shopping for all Government of Canada procurement. This afternoon I will be announcing that our small professional architectural and engineering firms will have a new system which will make accessibility to government procurement easier.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Finance made a very surprising announcement. He went ahead and set up a committee to nominate candidates to his proposed CPP investment board.

Members of the House know that the legislation has barely entered into debate in the House, yet the minister is moving full speed ahead. Is this minister telling members of the House that our work is irrelevant, that he is going to do whatever it takes to see that this is a done deal?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite knows perfectly well that in order for the government to be ready

Oral Questions

for the legislation once it is complete it must prepare now. To have done the opposite would have been totally irresponsible.

This in no way infringes upon the privileges of the House. It is normal to prepare ahead of time for the day when the legislation is passed so we do not waste valuable time and taxpayers' money.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it does not matter what we say or do in the House. This legislation is going ahead according to the government.

The minister just cannot wait to get his hands on all this tax money. We have a taxaholic finance minister waiting for his new hit of 10 billion new tax dollars.

Is this just another example of the government's contempt for the people the citizens of Canada elected to look after their affairs?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. member is wrong in suggesting that the premium revenue goes into the general revenues of the government. The funds go into the special Canada pension plan fund dedicated to maintaining and securing the Canada pension plan for all Canadians.

Therefore with this legislation we are acting in the interests of all Canadians to help them have a secure, safe retirement, unlike the Reform Party which wants to submit them to the marketplace and the Bre-X investment policy.

* * *

[Translation]

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the parliamentary secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development.

While Canadians are still waiting for the jobs promised by the Liberals, the government is cutting funding for non-profit organizations helping the unemployed re-enter the labour market.

• (1145)

What the government is saying to women, aboriginal people, the disabled and others who have a particularly hard time finding a job is "sorry, but we do not want to help you".

Is the government prepared to reaffirm its commitment to all those who are trying to find a job by maintaining funding for these organizations?

[English]

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can say to

the member and to everyone in the House the number one priority of the government is obviously employment of Canadians.

We will not be satisfied as long the unemployment rate is as high as it is. We continue to work every day to find solutions to problems that are very complex. For the NDP to stand and suggest that there is some sort of magic solution, some band aid program that we could put in place to deal with an issue that has been ongoing for the last 30 years to 40 years of high unemployment, is crass and unacceptable.

We will continue to put programs in place, help the unemployed, put training in place—

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this government is resorting to patronage at the expense of the poor in our society.

In Ottawa alone, the minister wants to close six non-profit organizations to award a lucrative contract to former employees of the Department of Human Resources Development. The Liberal scheme will cost an additional \$520,000, and those who used to have access to the services provided by these organizations will no longer have that possibility. Such is the Liberal logic. It explains why the minister refused to meet with representatives from one of these organizations.

Is the minister prepared to meet with the Ottawa's Women's Career Counselling group?

[English]

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the particulars of the case the member is asking about I can give him this commitment. If he gives us the information he is talking about, we will certainly meet with any individual, any organization, to help the unemployed, the disabled or anyone out there who needs our help to get employment. We are there on their behalf.

Give us the information. Give us the specifics. We will take a good serious look at it.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday Mothers Against Drunk Driving held a press conference and released very important results of a national survey which indicated that more than 80% of Canadians support toughening the Criminal Code with respect to drunk driving.

Twelve months ago MADD came to Ottawa looking for action and attempted to meet with the former justice minister. Apparently he was too busy dealing with politically motivated matters to meet

Oral Questions

with them and was oblivious to the 1,700 Canadians who were killed by drunk drivers.

My question is for the current Minister of Justice. Will the minister commit today to stopping the carnage on Canadian highways by tabling amendments to the Criminal Code dealing with drunk driving?

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

I had the opportunity to meet with representatives from MADD the day before yesterday. We spent over an hour together. On behalf of all members of the House I congratulate and thank those who act as volunteers in MADD for the fine work they have done over the past number of years to sensitize Canadians to the problems of drunk driving.

I have undertaken to raise the issue when I meet with my provincial counterparts in December. I would like to have a federal-provincial working group that presents an integrated strategy to deal with this important issue.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, by doing nothing on the issue of drunk driving the Liberal government bears responsibility for the deaths and injuries caused by drunk drivers.

Yesterday the minister said that she was waiting for the transport department to do something. The minister knows well that neither the Department of Transport nor provincial ministers can do anything to amend the Criminal Code.

Is the justice minister hiding behind another public servant's report to cover the lack of action by her government on this issue? I urge her to take the responsibility to prevent another 1,700 deaths in the coming year and commit to concrete steps to review the Criminal Code roadside procedures and enact a victims bill of rights.

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the hon. member's comment in terms of his references to the Department of Transport.

What I said yesterday was that the Department of Transport is undertaking an important study in relation to blood alcohol concentration. The Department of Transport is doing this study in co-operation with the chiefs of police of the country. Of course we are waiting for the outcome of that study before we mindlessly make changes to the Criminal Code.

I want to go back to my original point. What is important here is an integrated strategy to deal with the terrible problem of drunk driving. Part of that strategy—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Milliken): The hon. member for Kitchener Centre.

• (1150)

HUMAN RESOURCES

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Following the release of the report of the task force on persons with disabilities the government has repeated on a number of occasions that helping persons with disabilities is a priority.

What concrete measures is the government taking to ensure that persons with disabilities can be full participants in Canadian society?

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important subject.

We have been accused on many occasions that the task forces and groups we have put together have no impact.

The task force on disabilities recommended certain things. We have now enacted \$30 million annually in the opportunities fund announced in the 1997 budget. Tax assistance increased to a total of \$70 million annually.

At the recent ministers meeting of the Council on Social Policy Renewal, a new initiative called employability assistance to people with disabilities was put in place. Those are the kinds of initiatives that we think the government and this—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkton—Melville.

* * *

SOLICITOR GENERAL

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the solicitor general kept repeating the same mantra, no matter what question he was asked.

He claimed that the gradual release program improved public safety. A survey by his own department found that 37% of prisoners in the early release program reoffended within two years, but only 16% reoffended in the same time period if they served their full sentence.

My question. Does the solicitor general think we should keep the bad guys in jail for their full sentence if it cuts their probability of reoffending—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. solicitor general.

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again they are wrong. In good faith I had a meeting last night with the commissioner to discuss some of the issue raised yesterday. I found out that seven facts presented yesterday by the Reform were absolutely wrong.

Oral Questions

That has prompted the following statement by the Union of Solicitor General Employees:

The Union of Solicitor General Employees feels that it is counterproductive to have outside critics attack the professionalism of the service, its staff—

An hon. member: Talk to the real people.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general seems intent on disputing the findings of his own department. Now we find that he has hired a private public relations firm to put a positive spin on negative numbers.

Will the solicitor general please tell the House what is more important, public relations or public safety?

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again I want to go back to the statement made by the Union of the Solicitor General Employees which got together with CSC and said very specifically that it does not help and in fact it is counterproductive to have outside critics attacking the professionalism of the staff they pretend to protect by intentionally raising fears and making inflammatory statements.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

The Canadian Human Rights Commission in its report recommended that the concerns of the Micmac Indians of Newfoundland be addressed. When Newfoundland joined Confederation the Canadian government decided the Indian Act would not apply, and these people have never been treated fairly. There are 11 members of the Federation of Newfoundland Indians.

Will the minister commit to negotiating and settling agreements with all Indians of Newfoundland?

Mr. Bernard Patry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question.

Yesterday I had a conversation with Mr. Watso of the Micmac Indian Band. We addressed the problem. It is a very serious problem coming from the report of the Canadian Human Rights Commission released on October 6. We are looking at it. When the minister returns we will have more consultations with the Micmacs of Newfoundland.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question today is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Yesterday the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development said that they hoped to imple-

ment some aspects of the aboriginal commission. Today in questioning he led the same line, that he hopes. Would the Deputy Prime Minister please make a release to the House?

• (1155)

You have been sitting on the commission for almost an entire year. When will you be speaking—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member is not in his seat, but if the minister wishes to make a reply he may do so.

* * *

SEARCH AND RESCUE

Mr. Bill Matthews (Burin—St. George's, PC): Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue a line of questioning started this morning by the member for Fundy Royal and answered by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence.

The parliamentary secretary very clearly stated to the House that the EH-101 helicopter would not have the range capability to search for the people fighting for their lives right now in the North Atlantic and those who have already died.

Will the Minister of National Defence admit and confirm for the House that if we did indeed have EH-101 helicopters they could have at least gone to the Hibernia platform to refuel and those people who have already died may still be alive—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of National Defence.

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): That is absolutely wrong, Mr. Speaker. Our search and rescue people are out there. They are using other kinds of aircraft.

The range is far beyond the capability of our helicopters or the helicopters of any of the companies that are bidders on the current contract, including the one the member has talked about, the one the Conservative government fouled up.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of International Trade.

Since 1995, imports of oil, butter and sugar mixtures have doubled annually. All dairy producers are concerned about this situation, for makers of ice cream are turning increasingly to milk substitutes. The dairy industry estimates its quota losses at 3%, or \$50 million in lost revenue, for 1997-98.

Routine Proceedings

Will the minister admit that these oil, butter and sugar mixtures have been created to get around the tariff measures put in place by Canada, and will he act quickly to resolve the situation?

[English]

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is very much aware of and giving serious consideration to this very new thing called butter oil which has been put on the market.

I assure the hon. member the government is committed to maintaining an effective supply management system for the dairy industry, one which is consistent and continues to be consistent with our international trade obligations.

* * *

[Translation]

COMPUTER SYSTEMS

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

With respect to the year 2000 computer problem, the auditor general said in his latest report, and I quote: "Systems that are most critical in supporting major programs may fail and could affect public health and safety and other essential services to the public".

While the government's priority seems to be lavish spending to celebrate the year 2000, can the President of the Treasury Board give an immediate assurance to citizens who depend on pension, unemployment and disability payments for their survival that they will not be affected—

The Deputy Speaker: The President of the Treasury Board.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question.

He is quite right. Programming computers for the year 2000 is a major problem. We have talked with the auditor general. Numerous working groups have been set up in various departments to examine the very matter to which he is referring. No government can give a complete guarantee, but I can tell him that we are now working very seriously to find solutions to the problem and to avoid negative consequences to the greatest extent possible.

* * *

[English]

SOLICITOR GENERAL

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I wish the solicitor general would talk to real people once. He talks to the elite all the time.

We have guards with us again today who would love to have a conversation with him but he will not talk to them. They are just lowly guards. That is the problem with his department.

• (1200)

It was reported to me today that when the guards were demonstrating and had a little picket line in Kingston, the warden promised the inmates a rumpus room if they would behave themselves. I understand there has been a rumpus room installed with a pool table, shuffle board and a big screen television. Please would the—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. solicitor general.

Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said and I think it is very important to repeat, we cannot count on the facts that are presented by Reform.

The union of the employees issued a statement this morning saying that the union and CSC both feel it is counterproductive to have outside critics questioning the professionalism of the service by intentionally raising fears and fearmongering and making inflammatory statements.

The Deputy Speaker: That will conclude question period for today.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

NUNAVUT IMPLEMENTATION COMMISSION

Mr. Bernard Patry (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 32(1), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, copies of the 1996-1997 annual report of the Nunavut Implementation Commission.

[Translation]

Pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, copies of two reports by the Nunavut Implementation Commission, a compilation of the supplementary reports published by the Nunavut Implementation Commission in 1996, and *Footprints in New Snow*, volume 2.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding membership

of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans and the associate membership of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

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

* * *

PARLIAMENT OF CANADA ACT

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-265, an act to amend the Parliament of Canada Act and the Canada Elections Act (change of political affiliation).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce this bill today. Its effect, when enacted, would ensure that the seat of a member of the House of Commons becomes vacant when that member gives up membership in the political party for which that member was elected or where a member of the House sitting as an independent informs the House that he or she is joining the membership of a political party.

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

* * *

● (1205)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

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

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

PETITIONS

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to table two petitions today on behalf of constituents. The first one reads: "We the undersigned citizens of Canada draw the attention of the House to the following"—

The Deputy Speaker: Order. I caution the hon. member. He is not to read the petition but he is to give a brief summary of the petition and presentation. I sense that he is reading it from what I am hearing. I would invite him to comply with the rule and give the House a summary.

Mr. Mike Scott: Mr. Speaker, the petition concerns the massive increase in CPP premiums that are proposed by the government.

Routine Proceedings

The petitioners ask Parliament to enact legislation to wind down the CPP, protecting the pensions of current seniors and that Canadians contribute to mandatory RRSPs of their own choosing.

JUSTICE

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition I have to present on behalf of constituents is with respect to the criminal justice system. It is a lengthy petition requesting a number of amendments to the criminal justice system.

On behalf of constituents, I would like to table these now.

THE FAMILY

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have three brief petitions today. The first states that managing the family home and caring for pre-school children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to pursue initiatives to assist families who decide to provide care in the home for pre-school children, the chronically ill, the aged or the disabled.

LABELLING OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition has to do with the Food and Drugs Act. The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that fetal alcohol syndrome and alcohol related birth defects are 100% preventable by avoiding alcohol consumption during pregnancy.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to require health warning labels to be placed on the containers of alcoholic beverages to warn expectant mothers and others of the risks associated with alcohol consumption.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS COMPENSATION FUND

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the final petition has to do with our police officers and firefighters who place their lives at risk on a daily basis and that we all mourn that loss when one of them loses their lives in the line of duty.

The petitioners therefore pray and call on Parliament to establish a public safety officers compensation fund for the benefit of families who lose their spouses in the line of duty.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour of presenting two petitions on the same subject.

The petitioners are extremely concerned that the moral structure of society is being threatened and community standards eroded by the increasing incidents of topless women in public places.

Government Orders

They request Parliament to amend the Criminal Code of Canada to prohibit the exposure of female breasts in public.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CUSTOMS TARIFF

The House resumed consideration of the motion: That Bill C-11, an Act respecting the imposition of duties of customs and other charges, to give effect to the International Convention on the Harmonized Commodity Description and Coding System, to provide relief against the imposition of certain duties of customs or other charges, to provide for other related matters and to amend or repeal certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Deputy Speaker: When the debate was interrupted, the hon. member for Rosemont had five minutes left to complete his speech. The hon. member for Rosemont therefore has the floor.

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to continue with my speech on Bill C-11.

The Liberals would only be too happy today to forget about the 1993 election campaign, in which they stated time and time again that they were prepared to tear up the free trade agreement between Canada and the United States if this agreement was not renegotiated. In this context, it is surprising to see the Liberals going at it again in red book II, where, on page 34, they try to pass themselves off as the great champions of trade liberalization.

• (1210)

Unlike the Liberal Party, which fiercely opposed free trade in the 1980s and changed its tune once in office, the Bloc Québécois has always supported free trade.

We believe that trade liberalization has always been essential to the economic prosperity of Quebec and the rest of Canada in its

present form. Just think that more than 3.5% of Canada's GDP depends on exports. In Quebec alone, exports account for 40% of all the goods and services produced.

I feel it is important to spend some time looking at how trade has evolved in Quebec. Some federalists seem to think that, by constantly putting down Quebec's economic performance, they are furthering their cause. I personally think they are shortsighted individuals who put their parties' interests before the greater good of Quebecers.

There are currently 16,000 exporters operating out of Quebec. These are mainly businesses, commercial concerns, boards of trade and individuals doing business in foreign countries. The top 260 exporting firms alone sell for more than \$10 million abroad. This performance is the result of a gradual and steady rise.

Indeed, between 1984 and 1996, the value of Quebec's exports abroad more than doubled, growing from \$17.3 billion to nearly \$49 billion. During the same period, Quebec's imports rose from \$19 billion to \$40.9 billion. Because of this strong and sustained growth of exports, in 1996, Quebec showed a large trade surplus, amounting to \$8.1 billion. In 1995, the trade surplus was \$8.7 billion.

When we take a close look at Quebec's economic structure, we notice that international exports of goods and services account for more than 25% of the GDP in Quebec, which is twice as much as in Japan and 2.5 times higher than in the US.

On the international markets, Quebec ranks among the top 30 exporters and importers in the world. This ranking sets us far apart from a mere province without any economic vitality at the international level. Quebec is actually a leader in the export of certain products. It does particularly well in the export of aluminium, being number one in the world, and the export of asbestos. In the area of newsprint export, Quebec ranks second in the world. In fact, in 1994, Quebec was among the 10 leading exporters in the world for some 20 products.

Add to that interprovincial trade within Canada and Quebec ranks 17th in the world in the export of goods and services, before countries like Norway, Korea and Australia. It would rank 23th in the world, just before China, for imports. Overall, approximately 50% of what is produced in Quebec is sold abroad.

To better understand these figures in the context of free trade, we must clearly identify where this economic activity is taking place. While Quebec's trading activities span the whole world, they are primarily concentrated in North America. In 1996, over 86% of its exports went to the North American market. The second most important destination, western Europe, received 10% of Quebec's exports.

For these reasons, the Bloc Québécois feels that expanding the free trade zone to include all the Americas is essential to increase

our trade, including Brazil and Argentina, for instance. A step has already been taken with the signing of a free trade agreement with Chile. Canada must keep going in this direction.

In this context, it is not surprising that Quebec's movers and shakers are in favour of gaining access to new markets. Quebec has established successful economic ties with its main trading partner, the United States, but also with other partners overseas, such as Germany, France, Japan and Italy.

• (1215)

Therefore, we reiterate our general support of free trade. Bill C-11, which we are debating today, is a step in the right direction. Needless to say it will not arouse passions. It is a very small step, as the Prime Minister likes them. We do not expect any better from a government that has always lacked vision as regards the future of this country, preferring once again to go "one step at a time".

To be sure, it is not easy to find a balance between the importance that must be given to human rights and the opportunity for Quebec and Canadian companies to do business in those countries that violate human rights the most. Still, the Bloc Québécois is convinced that international trade is not incompatible with promoting human rights. Unfortunately, it is clear to me that this government did not do enough to promote human rights in the context of its international and trade relations.

As for the trade agreements themselves, I stress once again the lack of concrete measures to provide protection that goes beyond merely protecting the rich in our society. It is essential that all trade agreements include adequate clauses to protect labour and the environment. Canada will continue to negotiate international agreements until Quebec becomes sovereign and should protect the effective provisions of labour and environmental standards with our trading partners.

Certain bilateral agreements already contain parallel accords that provide for such provisions. However there is no such accord in multilateral agreements Canada has signed. Environmental protection and social protection clauses provide more benefits to a greater number of people and are to be viewed in the context of sustainable development.

The government must stop hiding behind confidential reports in order to justify its lack of action in this area. We want the government to raise the issue of human rights in its meetings, during its discussions and on its trips abroad. It is high time this government publicly condemned, not only in camera, human right violations committed in foreign countries and, more specifically, in countries that trade with Canada. This government continues to drag its feet in establishing a code of behaviour for Canadian businesses active abroad.

In closing, I would like to reiterate that the Bloc Québécois supports Bill C-11. However, this government cannot use this initiative as a substitute for developing an overall international trade policy.

Government Orders

[English]

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is my first time to conduct my order as a responsible member of Parliament in a most crucial debate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on our esteemed appointment as Deputy Speaker of the House.

I would like to state at the outset that I am against Bill C-11. The intent of the bill is to provide relief against the imposition of certain customs duties and other charges.

This morning the government asked for quick passage of this legislation. It said that there would be a quick elimination of the nuisance rates.

In recent years in some of the shopping centres in my riding we have seen the introduction of Wal-Mart stores. Are these nuisance rates for Wal-Mart trucks coming across the border? It looks like \$1 billion will be gained by outside multinationals trading in our country. The estimate is that \$90 million will be saved by our companies in trading elsewhere. Where is the balance? Foreign corporations will be saving \$1 billion while Canadian companies will only be saving \$90 million.

• (1220)

This is a test of our sovereignty, a test of who Canadians are. Canadians live here. When we look at the intent of all our resources, our markets, our economy and our needs, and we look at tariffs, when people want to trade with our country and we look at the history of our country, the colonization of the world was the reason that brought many of our investors here. We should not continue on the rampant path of pillaging and plundering resources and taking markets to the lowest common denominator of simply making a profit and not looking at the social aspects of our people, the need for higher education, the need for medicare, the need for people to find meaningful employment in all aspects of our economy, not just in manufacturing or the providing of products but also in the protection of our environment. It is a role where the citizens of our country can create a meaningful future for our children.

On the record on the previous agreements that have been made, Bill C-11 seems to be a process of completing the North American Free Trade Agreement. When we sing our national anthem we are the ones singing it as Canadians when we say "our true north strong and free". It is not an American singing it. It is a Canadian singing it and being proud of who we are. We are strong and we are free to work for the future of our country and the future of our people.

It is not an American person saying it is a free country in northern Canada. It is not. They cannot come across here and get benefits from our lands, our measurable jurisdiction which we call our home. This is our future and our children.

Government Orders

To cause a political awareness I call on Liberals who have formed the government and in their time have served their purpose on this side of the House that in 1988 the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement was an issue. The 1993 election came about with NAFTA as a major issue in the red book of the Liberals. The NDP was very clear in its opposition to the free trade agreements and the direction that was being taken, as did the Liberals, but the difference is that the NDP has stuck to its guns. We are still against the free trade and the implementations of the regulations of free trade. That is what Bill C-11 is all about. It is implementing free trade provisions.

The Liberals have turned full circle. Now they want to be champions of the free trade agreement. They ran two elections against the whole free trade aspect in this country. The Liberals were certainly right when they told Canadians that in 1993 their election campaign was if you are opposed to NAFTA you should vote NDP.

In future elections I call on Canadians to remember the New Democrats of this country. We seem to be the only ones protecting Canadians, not multinational interests, not profit making interests, but the future of all Canadians, the future of our land, the environment and also the generations to come.

Despite these claims, these ironclad assurances that we have been crying for regarding labour and environmental standards have not been signed. They have not been protected in the NAFTA and we are afraid that the government of the day will not be protecting them in the multilateral agreement on investment.

The extent to which the Liberals have joined the ranks of globalizing elites is this whole issue of NAFTA and MAI. These are major issues. Globalizing in the Miami summit of the Americas in 1994 where the negotiations began toward free trade of the Americas and where Canada began negotiating with Chile to join NAFTA, the government claimed that the trade deal with Chile would lead to cheaper bananas for Canadians. This government evidently believed that a Latin American country like Chile was a major banana producer.

• (1225)

Someone in the Department of International Trade forgot to tell this government that Chile is not a tropical country. It does not produce or export bananas. The vision and the explanation of this agreement is simply to protect multinational interests and to break down our borders with other countries which have huge amounts of assets and capital to come in and invest, take our resources and our markets and break the economic cycle that we need in this country.

We need to produce, to finish our products and use our products. We need to create a cycle where our Canadian dollars are changing hands within Canada, not externally. If we can attract outside

interest from European countries, Asian countries, the America countries and other American states, let them come in but let them invest in our future. Let them pay the tariffs and duties that come with the existence of creating these provisions by our country.

With these tariffs we can invest in better education. We may have a future where children can have tuition free education. Let the corporations pay not only tax dollars through income tax, GST, BST, HST and provincial sales tax to improve our standard of living, but through investment into Canadians' means of providing a better future. Let them pay for medicare and the building of hospitals. Let them pay for the betterment of our medical personnel.

There are doctors in rural and northern Canada who are being imported from outside Canada to come and work and provide health services to our communities. Why can we not teach our children from our local communities to be doctors? The one simple fact is they cannot afford it. If we cannot afford to buy a career or a profession in our own country what is this country's role? What is this government's role? We have to protect our children's future.

If we do not stand up against multinational interests of pure and simple capitalism, of taking profits for their own corporations, we are going in the wrong direction. The vision of this country has been to provide a means for continued investment and globalization. Globalization is a nice, cute, sexy word but it does not mean anything to Canadians. Our purpose in this country is to look within our boundaries for the betterment of our future.

I have looked at the Liberal's trade policies. They have enjoyed the support of the Bloc Quebecois, as was obvious this afternoon when we heard Bloc members speak in favour of this, the Reform Party and the Conservative Party because it introduced the whole NAFTA project. The NDP members are the only ones to take the choice to speak in favour of Canadians, in protecting Canadian companies, in protecting the Canadian labour force, in protecting the future of Canadians and in protecting our land.

Globalization of Canadian sovereignty is for international communities. It is not for Canadians.

I would like to speak on the irony of this. As Canada has sought allies against Canadian trade harassment, it has built alliances with countries that do not contain American trade harassment. Americans are strong and powerful and they will harass you however they can. Canada has been looking for alliances to keep human rights, labour rights and environmental practices on all trade agreements, to a greater extent, in all of North America.

On the question of the social clause of the World Trade Organization, common labour practices in the free trade agreement and supporting UN resolutions condemned Chinese human rights. However, Canada has been on the side of trying to keep the social dimension of trade off the agenda against countries like the United

States which have been supportive of broadening trade agendas globally. We must protect the consciousness of all people.

Canadians and Americans, like others around the world, have been asked by multinationals and their allies in government to sacrifice considerable national sovereignty; our investment policy in social, labour and environmental standards in exchange for rule based regimes and profit making schemes by multinationals.

• (1230)

The NDP wants to work toward international trade rules that are not so one sided in favour of multinationals. We are part of a system of international governance that balances economic opportunities for a new economy.

We must build a responsible international economy that is accountable to our communities and the public interest of our country. That is why Canadians have put us to the challenge of being here in the House of Commons to create the consciousness of this government and all governments of the world.

The social clauses are a major source of awareness for our party. We have fought to protect labour, farmers and other people of our communities. A co-operative movement has striven in many corners of the country to protect the community interest, to keep the investment, profits and the dividends at a community level. These are part of a Canadian vision for Canadians.

The biggest challenge is to build a more democratic international community. Multinational and international agreements have been trying to create international trade agreements. They must deal effectively with the social dimensions of trade. A growing international movement seeks to build social clauses such as NAFTA and the World Trade Organization. We are calling on the government to keep that consciousness in mind when it is negotiating the multilateral agreement on investment.

Such clauses should respect human rights, basic labour rights, economic decision making within the new economy and the ability of workers to negotiate the terms under which they will participate in the global economy. Social clauses allow states to establish environmental regulations that have challenged non-tariff barriers to trade.

The new trade rules are remarkably one sided in defence of the rights of investors. I guess their lobbying strategy is working. They seem to have multi-parties talking in favour of multinational rights to intellectual property.

Intellectual property rights are a major cause for sovereignty and national interests. If we have resources within our country we must work to create, negotiate and fight for the rights of our people and

Government Orders

our interests. We cannot simply give them wholesale access to multinationals. For the pharmaceutical companies to have access to resources for medicinal purposes, the interests might be in our backyards in Canada.

We must protect our environment and our livelihoods. If we trade them off and give them to the profitable right of somebody else we will never create an economic cycle with our own resources. We will have lost it.

To reverse this process seems to be a battle in itself. How can we get away from NAFTA once we have signed on? It seems to be a big ship that goes down. We just cannot to keep it buoyant.

There is nothing about workers rights and trade unions and the right to a safe workplace. They speak loudly of level playing fields but globalization, according to many observers, has certainly been a race to the bottom, to the lowest common labour standards, to the lowest possible wage levels with the highest level of profit.

There is no limit to profit taking. The banks of the country brag that they are making 25% to 30% more profit than they did last year. This means they made profits the years before. They are measuring percentages over their profits, just leapfrogging their profit-making margins.

Then international banks are coming into our markets. They are trying to break down the rules to allow them to compete against our banks. We must speak on behalf of our own banking institutions as well. We must protect our own market, our own industries.

We see products like old growth forests being cut down on the west coast. Whole logs are shipped to Japan for the people there to provide products and possibly sell back to Canadians. Let us finish our products here. Let us market and be aggressive.

In order to be aggressive and competitive we have to train and teach our children. If we do not acquire further taxes from our corporations and the multinationals operating within our market, we will lose a big source of revenue generation. We must create revenue and wealth by taxing the people doing business with us.

• (1235)

The Liberal government accepts one of the cliches of globalization, that the best way to address the problem of human and environmental rights is by developing open trade in society.

Where does Canadian sovereignty fall into place? Support for the social cause is a start. We are seeing the government going hell-bent to negotiate these agreements. We must call on the government to have a social conscience and link trade benefits to the human rights of the people of the world.

Government Orders

Without such causes the World Trade Organization is like a turkey shoot where multinationals and their allies in some developing countries can exploit the most vulnerable. Chile is an example. Why is it not negotiating free trade agreements with the other countries of South America? It chose Chile because it was the most vulnerable.

I call on the government to be fair and equitable to all developing countries of the world and not to pick on the weak. Speaking of the weak, Canadians cannot be seen as a weak entity. We must stand up for ourselves. I call on the government to stand up on behalf of all Canadians, to be strong and to be free to speak for the will of all Canadians.

I call on the government and the House of Commons to challenge each other to provide a way of negotiating our needs with the rest of the world. If they are willing to invest in our country, let us stop the colonization move.

There are remnants of colonization remaining in our northern communities. I draw attention to the reality that in northern Canada the Hudson's Bay Company has changed its name to Northern Stores. The Hudson's Bay Company and Northern Stores do not invest in our communities.

We talk about our aboriginal communities needing to create an economic cycle for the betterment of their lives and those of their children. The Hudson's Bay Company does not invest in our communities. It deals in profits as it did in the days of the fur trade and takes them elsewhere. We have to put up trade barriers to stop profit making and keep some of those revenues in the country.

I speak on behalf of our party against Bill C-11 because it is a remnant of the NAFTA. I challenge the House of Commons and the leadership of the country to protect the interest of Canadians wholeheartedly. Let us keep our companies, workers, banks and our railroads in this country for future generations. Let us stay Canadian, strong and free.

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the hon. member for Richmond—Arthabaska.

The PC Party of Canada supports making legislation that simplifies our lives and the lives of business owners. However there are matters that need to be addressed in the legislation.

I thank the hon. member from Manitoba for acknowledging it was the Progressive Conservative Party that introduced and brought forward the free trade legislation.

We are happy to see the Liberal government has realized our initiatives on free trade in the late 1980s are so important, a lead that it continues to follow. Our initiated agreement made trade between countries competitive, boosted economic success and

began to tear down the walls that hindered successful open trade transactions between countries.

At that time the Liberals did everything in their power to oppose the initiative. Today we witnessed something else. What was so profusely objected to almost 10 years ago is today the largest bill on our shelves and the biggest factor in the contributing of tax revenues to the recovery of our economy.

While we are flattered the government of the day continues to carry out our initiatives and our tariff agreements that we put in place when we were in government, there are several important factors to be considered.

• (1240)

Just a few weeks ago the government was reprimanded for the untimeliness of the year 2000 project. How can we expect modern innovation from the Liberals when the bill is distributed in paper form instead of CD-ROM? The documents are composed of about a foot and a half of paper. In the last couple of days we have heard about the importance of the environment. This is truly an unfriendly environmental document.

Let us look at the size of the bill. Instead of setting an example and proving that we are moving into the 21st century, our offices are cluttered with these volumes.

Perhaps my most important message today is that this is the beginning, not the end. We cannot stop now with the progress that we have made because the bill has been simplified. Work still needs to be done.

I ask the government to commit to continuing with the work in progress, to continue developing trade agreements with our partners, to look ahead to the global marketplace and to achieve a standard of excellence with our trading partners. This means the government must continue to promote trade and encourage business development in Canada. It is imperative that taxes in all areas be competitive.

While we know that industry generally supports the bill, we also know it has qualms about it. First and foremost is the sense of urgency being placed on the bill. The Canadian Importers Association is concerned with its speedy passage as it says importers will not have enough time for what will be a very time consuming and costly exercise. The Alliance of Manufacturers & Exporters also shares this concern. It states that it is a scary exercise and there is very little time to do the programming it needs.

Unlike the government that has known about the year 2000 problem for the last five years, perhaps we should give businesses a month or two leeway to implement the bill.

These are the affected parties. We demand that the government listen to their concerns and continue with the theme of simplification. If we are to simplify the process we need to continue with their agreement and simplify the lives of business owners. We will

Government Orders

hold the government accountable and demand that it listen to the suggestions that have been received.

The recurring message we are hearing from the business community with respect to the uneasiness it faces is related to the delivery and the implementation of the tariff simplification initiative. While it supports the elimination of regulation and business procedures, it is deeply affected by the timing of the bill. It feels quite rushed and that it has not been granted enough time to prepare for the upcoming changes and enormous challenges it must face.

This is the most complex tariff system in the world. We know it and our trading partners know it. I urge the government to consider the huge tasks that lie ahead for importers in Canada and demand they be given time to adopt to the enormous changes ahead.

Since the Liberal government obviously agrees with us on the importance of free trade, why do its members not agree with us on simplifying the lives of businessmen, simplifying the lives of Canadians, decreasing red tape, lessening government interference, simplifying Bill C-11 and agreeing with changes to the complexity and short term allowances given to these important businesses?

The PC Party stands for less red tape, less government interference, less government involvement in people's lives, more power to businesses and more power to the people.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bachand (Richmond—Arthabasca, PC): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Markham for allowing me to share his time.

The Conservative Party in fact is very proud to support Bill C-11. We are delighted that Liberals are today behaving like the Conservatives of yesterday. Nevertheless, we are surprised that the New Democrats of today are behaving like the Liberals of 1993. We hope that the miracle will continue and the people will understand that isolation is passé.

• (1245)

We do agree with this bill. For over ten years now the Conservative Party has been working on a process, and we must not forget that NAFTA was only part of it, to globalize Canada's trade. Quebec and, in large measure, Ontario most strongly supported the debate and the treaty in the 1980s, so that today, all provinces may enjoy increased trade through the free trade agreement.

However, as my colleague pointed out, the problem we have with people opposite is that there is no planning. Businesses are told to get ready because, in January, things will be made simpler. However, in fact, as my hon. colleague pointed out, the thickness of the document would indicate that people will not be ready by January 1.

As my colleague also pointed out, we are asking the government to be patient. This is a bit surprising for the Conservative Party, but we are asking the government to perhaps pay attention to the bill's wording. Even though we support the bill, we honestly believe that it should have been introduced much earlier in the previous legislature so that people could prepare for it. People in private industry in Canada, big and small business, are not aware of the government's position and are still waiting, with a bit of surprise, for the bill to fall on their heads.

So, as I was saying, NAFTA was good for the country and for Quebec. Now there are more treaties with other countries. That is why the Conservative Party will always support any bill that means that Canada and Quebec will not be isolated in the international marketplace, but will assume their rightful place.

I would also like to point out that it would be a good thing in this House if the government were to start being much more conservative, in the good sense of the word. I think that the gods must be smiling on us, because yesterday the Prime Minister said that the GST was a good thing. A tax is always heavily criticized, but in the end it was a good thing. It is now recognized that NAFTA was a good thing. However, there can be no doubt that the election of the Liberals in 1993 was a bad thing. But this will surely get sorted out with time.

As for Bill C-11, it is extremely complex. It is, however, a step in the right direction. We hope that it will benefit all import businesses in Canada.

We must not be afraid of isolating ourselves. Our New Democratic friends worry about this. The hon. member of the NDP gave the example of western forests. Western forests were being cut down and the logs sent outside the country, only to come back in as finished products. I would like to explain to my hon. colleague that Quebec imports wood from the United States, processes it and sells it back to the Americans. International treaties must therefore be examined as a whole and international trade looked at much more globally.

Nor should it be said that only large corporations have benefited from NAFTA. Ten years ago, there were fears that textile companies, in Quebec for example, would take a terrible beating. They had to adapt quickly, and today Quebec's textile companies are among the province's largest exporters.

What we are saying, therefore, is that the tens of millions of dollars that will be saved will result in our being much more competitive. Here again, the government has a problem. They are helping companies save money, using the argument that the economy has to make a better recovery, that we must help our businesses. However, this is just one point of view, the issue of imports. What we are saying is that there are also other ways of helping businesses. We are prepared to support Bill C-11, but we

Government Orders

are also prepared to support, and have always supported, a reduction in employment insurance contributions, among other things.

So, if all these objectives could be combined, Canadians and Quebecers as a whole could benefit. Slowly but surely, this government is learning, and we hope that will continue to be the case.

We are proud to support Bill C-11 and any bill, as I was saying earlier, that means that Quebec and Canadian businesses can benefit from the globalization of markets.

• (1250)

[*English*]

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill because of the ramifications it will have, along with the NAFTA deal, the free trade deal, the MAI, APEX and all those other deals that governments past and present have made.

We would assume by listening to government members that the sun rises and sets on their current policies. They have repeated on several occasions that Bill C-11 was created in consultation with industry. Industry, industry, industry. If I am not mistaken, the government member who previously spoke said that five times. However, not once have I heard them say they have consulted the working people, labour groups, citizens groups or action groups. Any group having a leaning toward the social left was not consulted with respect to Bill C-11. That is typical of the government when it comes to modifying or altering current legislation.

If I may digress for a moment, a few years back this government did not like the regulations which governed the foreign sale of nuclear CANDU reactors. Literally overnight, with an order in council, it changed the trade regulations and the environmental regulations in order to sell two CANDU reactors to China.

I remind the House that China has one of the worst human rights records in the world today and yet this government, without consulting the House of Commons, without allowing proper debate, changed the environmental and trade regulations and sold the CANDU reactors to China. Organizations such as the Sierra Club have taken the government to court to fight those arrangements.

I could go on and list more spectacles of that nature. That is the despicable nature of the government.

Slowly, bit by bit, this government and previous Conservative governments have relinquished control to the corporate elite. I have said time and time again that I would much rather have an elected Bob Rae or an elected government official than I would an unelected Conrad Black. The reason I say that is that if people do

not like an elected official, he or she will come up for election again in so many years, and the people can kick them out.

Elected officials have to listen to the concerns of the people whether they like them or not. An unelected corporate official does not have to listen to the people. They never have to attend meetings. They can totally ignore the wishes of the Canadian people.

I have held talks with members of the professional bankers association in my riding. They have indicated, as we have suspected for quite some time, that the big six banks will soon merge to become the big three. The bankers are saying that will happen because we cannot compete globally. That they can make \$1 billion in six months is not good enough for them. Now they are saying we have to compete globally. Globally, globally, globally. That is all we ever hear.

What will happen to the thousands of people working in the banking institutions? What will happen to them years down the road? What kind of jobs will we be able to offer our children? Are there going to be any jobs?

The hon. member from Saskatchewan indicated that we should be working toward the benefit and health of our children. Our children are our most valuable resource.

During the wars and after the wars this country produced all kinds of equipment, machinery and products. For example, the world's largest gypsum mine borders on my riding. Ninety per cent of the gypsum is shipped out of Canada, into the United States, turned into gyproc, and we turn around and buy it back. That is insanity. There could be hundreds of jobs created in my riding if there were a gypsum board factory. That would be tremendous.

We do the same thing with whole logs. We ship them to countries like Japan when we could be manufacturing those logs in Canada today. We could be creating thousands and thousands of jobs.

The Minister for International Trade, through the Economic Development Corporation, is giving \$285 million to a firm to set up a pulp mill in Indonesia. That is another country with a terrible human rights record.

• (1255)

We give it \$285 million to build a pulp mill so it can compete with our pulp mills in Canada. We have pulp mill workers in Skeena, which is represented by the Reform, and I have yet to hear a Reform member stand up on behalf of those working people out there.

They have to give labour concessions and more wage cuts and more benefit cuts in order to compete through the government's turning around and giving millions of dollars to another country to compete with ours, and not just a country with a good record, a country that has some of the worst human rights records in history.

The APEC deal is coming around, and who do we invite with open arms and the red carpet? Soeharto, one of the vilest people on the planet, and Canada is going to sit there and welcome him with open arms.

I wish I had brought the picture with me that I had taken a few years ago of the defeated minister of health, Mr. David Dingwall, who was soundly defeated in the riding of Cape Breton. He could not wait when the premier of China, Li Peng, the butcher of Beijing, came to Canada in his big 747 to the Halifax airport.

Members should have seen Mr. Dingwall tripping over everybody, pushing away security guards in order to get in that limousine and have his picture taken with the butcher of Beijing. Those kinds of attitudes in this Liberal government are still there.

Liberals are willing to sell their souls to anybody in this country or anybody in the world willing to pay, without proper debate and without consultation of the House of Commons.

I recently referred members to the CPP bill, one of the most damaging pieces of legislation ever in Canadian history. Whether someone is for or against it is really not the question. The question is that we should be having proper debate on something that affects every single Canadian.

What does the hon. House leader do after only seven hours of debate? He shuts it off. He invokes closure. He uses the majority, by the way only a slim majority, of the government officials to defeat the debate. To us that is simply scandalous.

What is this government afraid of? Why is it not willing to talk to Canadians, all Canadians, not just industry but labour groups, other opposition parties, to form political solutions to the political problems that we have today?

It is unbelievable to those Canadians outside Parliament that this government and former governments would continue on this path of hide and seek policies every time.

We kept hearing when free trade was talked about that it would be good for Canadians. It was not good enough. We have to have NAFTA. That is going to be good for Canadians. No, no, that's not good enough either. We have to go one step further.

APEC really is not anything, just some sort of agreement among economies and businesses, not countries; no human rights legislation, no protection for working people, none, just sort of business deals.

But that is not good enough. Now we have the mother of all trade deals coming down, the MAI. I remind members that if not for the leader of the New Democrats, this deal may already have been

Government Orders

passed, as this deal was silently being passed through without any consultation with the House of Commons.

During the campaign she mentioned this deal and all of a sudden the government said "Hold off, the cat is out of the bag now. We are going to have to reluctantly discuss this with the House of Commons". I cannot wait for the day when that debate comes around. It goes on and on.

I think back to a movie I saw in the early 1970s, "Rollerball", in which there were no governments and the world was being dominated by five corporations. The corporations were fighting among each other for total control of the planet. I cannot understand why elected officials would relinquish their control through legislation and allow corporations to take over and take over.

I remind members in the War of 1812 we won. We won the sovereignty of our country. We won the solidarity of working people throughout this country from coast to coast to coast, the French and English together.

Jonathan Winters said in a stand-up comic routine "We Americans, gee, we hope we can take you peacefully". They are doing a very good job of it right now. They are taking us over economically, and what is happening?

There are literally millions of workers in this country who do not even know if they are going to have a job next week. Probably every labour aspect and every trade union have had to go before their employers. Their employers have had to go to them. It is becoming not just protection or improvements to collective agreements but givebacks and takeaways and further wage cuts, downsizing, restructuring, this and that and this. We have had over 80 months with unemployment rates of over 9%. We had heard that free trade was going to cure that problem. We had heard that NAFTA was going to cure that problem. We hear now that the MAI is going to cure that problem. We now hear that Bill C-11 is going to cure that problem. Government had to get rid of the manufacturers sales tax. The former Tory government said we absolutely had to get rid of that and place the burden of taxation away from corporations and on individuals.

● (1300)

What happened in Atlantic Canada? Lo and behold, the Liberals get elected. Eleven Liberals from the province of Nova Scotia are elected. Off they go to the House of Commons. I can see all 11 of them sitting there and agreeing like this: "You know Mr. Prime Minister and Mr. Finance Minister, the GST really isn't hitting those people hard enough. I think we should impose another tax on them called the HST", or as we prefer it, the BST. "It is no longer acceptable to pay 8% or 9% or combined percentages of rates. We now have to hit them with 15%".

Government Orders

I remind the House that in three provinces of Atlantic Canada we pay more for postage stamps than anywhere else in this country. That is just one slight example of the scandalous treatment of Atlantic Canadians. It goes on and on. The HST is the most regressive tax ever to hit pensioners on lower incomes and people with low wages.

It is just incredible that government would shift the burden of taxation away from corporations that make record profits year after year and place the burden of taxation on to individuals. It blows me absolutely away.

I could stand here all day and mention example after example but I will cut my speech short and say once and for all that I wish the government, instead of listening to its friends on the corporate world, would start to listen to ordinary working Canadians, those from labour and social action groups, to come up with the solutions we need for today.

Mr. Tony Valeri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to summarize the interventions heard on Bill C-11.

For the record, the bill is intended to improve the competitiveness of Canadian companies and industry and to lessen the regulatory burden on industry and government. It is a bill that has received broad support from Canadian industry. It has been developed in close consultation with Canadian stakeholders over a three-year period.

No new commitments are being implemented in this bill. It is really the elimination of nuisance rates, rates that would benefit Canadian manufacturers, as it mostly affects goods that are used in inputs for Canadian manufacturers. This should help Canadian industry to be more competitive. Certainly in the end it should benefit Canadian consumers.

Comments were made earlier today with respect to the timing of this initiative. For the record I want to state that since April when the initial notice of ways and means was tabled in the House, Revenue Canada and Statistics Canada have been undergoing extensive outreach campaigns to alert those who could potentially be affected by the legislation with respect to the proposed changes. Officials from the finance department have also met with industry and trade associations and participated in customs conferences to inform interested parties of the developments in preparing the legislation.

It is also important to note that we have received letters from various associations in support of this legislation that call for its swift passage through Parliament to ensure the business community has a wider window of opportunity to prepare businesses for the competition they face in the global marketplace. Letters have been received from the Canadian Importers Association Inc., the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and other types of associations calling for passage of this bill in order to deal with some areas that lack efficiency within this climate.

The current tariff provisions are being consolidated into a single tariff schedule that will be simpler to read and will provide greater flexibility.

• (1305)

The measures, as I said earlier, will enhance industry competitiveness. When industry competitiveness is enhanced, it allows greater opportunity of employment for Canadians.

We are just as sympathetic as all other members toward unemployment. The NDP made reference to that in their speeches today and I congratulate them and thank them for their intervention. It is important to make the point and they made it very eloquently. We must ensure that what we do in enhancing the competitiveness for industry translates into greater opportunities for Canadians in allowing them those employment opportunities.

We hope the simplified customs tariff meets its objectives of improving the competitive position of Canadian industry while going forward and providing a very transparent and predictable regime that lessens the regulatory burden and reduces the business costs that companies face.

We set out to improve the competitiveness and efficiency of our industries. The review was launched over three years ago. We believe, with the help and support of the House, companies will benefit, which will translate to greater competitiveness and employment opportunities. I thank all members for the time that they have taken to participate in today's debate.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the parliamentary secretary for his comments toward the New Democratic Party concerning our trying to get the message across that we should be working with and assisting Canadians.

There is one thing I mentioned. He again said that the government had consulted with various industries and groups. I did not hear him once that he had consulted with the CLC. I did not hear him once say that he had consulted with the Quebec Federation of Labour.

An hon. member: What is CLC?

Mr. Peter Stoffer: Sorry. The Canadian Labour Congress, for those on the other side who do not understand the labour groups.

I did not hear him once say that he had spoken with the CAW, the Canadian Auto Workers. Not once did I hear him say that they referred this bill to working people.

There is one point I forgot in my submission. A few years ago the Mexican government allowed the peso to drop and devalue on the market. This caused shock waves through the financial community. What was Canada's response? Canada had to pump tens of millions of dollars through the auspices of the World Bank

and friends in the American government to prop up the Mexican peso.

We were told in the House of Commons—although I was not here at that time—but read the *Hansard* comments that that was to assist, enable and help out the people of Mexico and the Mexican workers. In reality, it was to help out those Canadian businesses that left provinces like Ontario and the rest of Canada to go down to Mexico because of their cheap labour force.

We were told that the whole aspect of NAFTA and free trade was to prop up the living standards of those workers in Mexico.

Madam Speaker, I invite you and everyone in the House of Commons to go down to Mexico and see how propped up they are. They are not very propped up at all. What has it done? It has not increased the working conditions of Mexican workers. It has decreased the condition of Canadian workers.

Mr. Tony Valeri: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the intervention and the question.

The intention of the government with this legislation, as it is with other legislation, is to work closely with all Canadians. We do not want, as a government, to start pitting worker against worker, Mexico against Canada.

We want the entire global economy to become consumers of Canadian products. We want the entire global economy to benefit and grow in its capabilities and become consumers for Canada. Canada's economy is based on exports and exports are an area of our economy which has driven the growth in the economy over the last little while and it will continue to do so.

The proposals that we see before us are proposals that deal with the competitiveness of the Canadian industry, which translates into greater opportunity for Canadians in employment and into lower prices for Canadian consumers. That is what this bill is all about. I again thank the hon. member for the intervention.

• (1310)

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Madam Speaker, I do not think that we should go all day with this but there is one thing I do not understand.

With all of the agreements we have signed, such as the free trade or the MAI or whatever, I find that the Atlantic provinces are not on the map anymore. Nobody is working down home.

If we find a new program I hope we will try to put the Atlantic provinces back on the map.

Mr. Tony Valeri: Madam Speaker, the only comment I have is that there was a conference held in the Atlantic provinces to deal with the future and the vision of Atlantic Canada. It was partly funded by Industry Canada to ensure that Atlantic Canada has an

Government Orders

opportunity to express and build its own economic future. There was representation from various ministries along with the premiers and other stakeholders in Atlantic Canada.

The government is very committed to ensuring that all regions of Canada have an opportunity to grow and develop. We will participate, as we have in the past, in ensuring that Atlantic Canada is a strong participant in this great country.

Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, NDP): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a correction and a few points, because I attended the Vision for the Atlantic.

I will tell you how I attended it. It was against the will of the premier of New Brunswick. That is the type of vision which they have. The social groups were not invited. No workers were invited and the people who spoke at the conference were not representing the people of the Atlantic.

It is very important to start wondering whose vision it is for the Atlantic. The New Democrats were certainly not invited, a lot of PCs were not invited and actually we were told that they were not welcome there. Tell me what kind of consultation that was?

An hon. member: Shame.

Mr. Tony Valeri: Madam Speaker, we are drifting away somewhat from the legislation. I am perfectly willing to respond to the intervention.

As far as I understand it, the participants at the conference were the premiers of the Atlantic provinces. The last time I checked those premiers were elected by the constituents of the Atlantic provinces. They were there to make representations with respect to developing that economic vision.

As a member of the finance committee, and I would welcome the presence of the hon. member, I want to assure her that we were in Atlantic Canada this past week. We heard from Atlantic Canadians on what to do with the fiscal dividend, and to ensure that Atlantic Canadians had an opportunity for input. The chair of the finance committee has requested an assurance that Atlantic Canadians, as well as all members of the House, have the opportunity to hold town hall meetings, to hear from their constituents and to bring the message back to the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Private Members' Business

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, October 27, 1997 at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

• (1315)

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Madam Speaker, discussions have been held among all parties in the House and we have reached agreement for the recorded division to be held on Tuesday, October 28, at the conclusion of Government Orders.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): The recorded division is therefore deferred to the conclusion of Government Orders on Tuesday, October 28.

[English]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Madam Speaker, I believe if you sought the consent of the House to see the clock as being 1.30 p.m., we could proceed to Private Members' Business.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government of Canada should make major changes in the employment insurance system, particularly by lowering contributions and improving benefits for seasonal workers and workers who have joined the labour market only recently.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased that the House is considering this motion I have tabled today, which concerns a matter of national importance. It is important for all of Quebec, for all of Canada, since the entire employment insurance program is obviously completely unfair for all seasonal workers and all new entrants to the work force.

At the same time, I wish to condemn what I call the employment insurance fund scandal. Imagine today that, by the end of 1997, there will be a surplus of \$13 billion in the employment insurance fund. Two years ago, we started with a deficit of \$6 billion. We have since accumulated a \$19 billion surplus, which will leave us with \$13 billion as at December 31, 1997, and some \$15 or \$16 billion by the end of the fiscal year.

At the same time, the decision was made to increase the number of weeks required in order to be eligible for employment insurance, and to decrease the number of weeks of benefits people were entitled to receive.

It might be said that the government was not listening to the public when it did this, not listening to what had been said during consultations, but that it instead carried out evaluations that could have justified its point of view. Now we are faced with a fait accompli, faced with reality, and they ought to support a motion such as ours.

It may be said that opposition motions are always against the government. But I want to point to the position set out in my motion, which reads in part:

—should make major changes in the employment insurance system, particularly by lowering contributions and improving benefits for seasonal workers and workers who have joined the labour market only recently.

This is the same position that was taken by all of the provincial premiers at St. Andrews on the occasion of their last interprovincial conference.

This is not, therefore, just the position of the Bloc Québécois, although it is precisely the platform we defended during the election campaign.

• (1320)

Our party was the only one saying there could be both a reasonable reduction of benefits and a healthy surplus, but a reduction that would allow us to reinvest money in the economy by allowing employees and employers to use additional funds. We also said that part of the surplus in the employment insurance fund could have been used to improve the working conditions of seasonal workers.

The facts speak for themselves. In the early 1990s, 60% of people contributed to the employment insurance fund and eventually became eligible for benefits. This percentage is now below 40%, between 30% and 35% actually.

If we were in a private system, in similar circumstances people would have chosen another insurance company long ago. You can be sure that no private system could survive in such circumstances because contributors would have found another insurer.

That is an important aspect. The system is financed by the employees and their employers. The Government of Canada does not contribute a penny. The system is entirely financed by the employees and their employers. It would only be fair to allow them to control the money in the fund. No wonder they find it surprising

Private Members' Business

that it has become some kind of insurance against the deficit instead of an employment insurance plan.

The federal government, through its finance minister, decided that there would be two main contributors to deficit reduction: the people who pay into the employment insurance fund, that is to say, the employees and their employers. Fancy that, every two weeks money comes in from the premiums paid by workers and employers. However, this money people think will provide them with an adequate income in between jobs is no longer used to this end. Instead, the Canadian government is using the employment insurance fund to reduce its deficit.

Everybody agrees that the deficit should be lower, but nobody thinks it should always be the same people who pay for it. The people who contribute to the employment insurance plan are those who make 39 000 \$ or less. This means that most of the deficit reduction burden has been borne by workers and employers, and not by the most well-off in our society.

This even penalizes labour intensive businesses. This means that employers who pay little more than the minimum wage—for instance, seasonal businesses where workers make between \$7 and \$12 an hour—are penalized compared to those employing fewer workers, such as high tech companies.

Sure, we must promote the high tech sector, but there is no reason why we have to create a system that penalizes businesses with many employees. This leads to the situation we are witnessing today. In the forestry or fishery industries, people face a totally unacceptable situation, and more and more of them can no longer afford to live in the area where they reside.

This reform has created what I call the spring gap, something that is more and more prevalent, as we will see. I am willing to predict something, which will occur as surely as what we were predicting last year about employment insurance. At the end of next winter, when people have exhausted their entitlements, after the 10 or 12 week period, when they no longer qualify for employment insurance, we will have a very ugly situation, because many of these families will not be able to qualify for welfare since they own their own home.

As a government, we cannot act that way, and if we do, people will decide they no longer need government. If we decide that the market place must always win, that we are a strictly market economy, we might as well close down a number of regions. It amounts to the same thing, and I am under the impression that this is the choice the government made.

Two years ago, I went to Gander, Newfoundland, with the Committee on Human Resources Development. In the employment centre, on a display rack, I did not see a single program to diversify the local economy, I did not see a single program to allow people

to find another job in their area. I saw a folder explaining how to move out west, because there were jobs out west.

• (1325)

When a government reaches such a point, there is definitely something very wrong, because it is not true that moving people around will make the country liveable.

The solution is in the principles that would ensure that people in each region can develop the resources in that region. Also, when they develop the resources in their region, they promote economic development in that region.

Let us remember that at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the situation was quite different from what it is today. The whole maritime region was self-reliant, self-sufficient in Canada. But in the 1960s, under the wonderful regime of Mr. Trudeau, the government made what I would call a deal. It said that manufacturing processing, the serious economic activity, would be done in Ontario. It would give transfer payments to the provinces east of Quebec, that it would be forthcoming, that it would be generous, that it would give them a handout. This is how the model was developed and how we ended up with the aberrations we have today.

However, what it did not expect, or what it said others would take care of after the Trudeau era, is that people finally realized that the tap could not be left on forever. At one point, it said it was no longer able to produce wealth and send it to the maritimes to keep people alive.

The solution that it found was not to diversify regional economies, but to turn off the tap. It decided to create such things as TAGS because it was faced with the real problem of dwindling fish stocks. So it developed a program, but did not implement it as planned. It did not respect the objective, which was to diversify the economy.

Today, the government has the gall to say that local communities chose to benefit from the system. Canada's central government has a fundamental problem because it thinks it knows best, as far as people in the regions are concerned. It ought instead to think about how important it is to look for solutions at the grassroots level, to see what they have to suggest and what it can do about it, so that regional economies can adjust and develop.

Therefore, the motion proposes that 50% of the surplus in the employment insurance fund be kept as a working margin, because there might be other recessions and we should not repeat the mistake we made in the past, when the unemployment insurance fund had a running deficit. We are willing to accept that 50% of the present surplus be used for that purpose, but we want the other 50% to be divided in two parts: one half would be applied to lowering contributions by 35 to 50 cents for each \$100 of insurable

Private Members' Business

earnings, and the other half to improving benefits for seasonal workers.

I think there is a lesson the Liberal government, and especially Liberal members from the maritimes, should have learned from the last election. There were even members on TV yesterday evening debating the issue. There was a member of the NDP who, after the election, said the same thing as she was saying before. And then there was a Liberal member, who had changed her tune since the election. I find this unacceptable.

It seems the situation we have before us is one the government will not be able to ignore. We have been back here for two months and a half, and every opposition party has asked questions on the employment insurance issue. Everybody has said that the system should be changed. This morning, we had an extra reason to ask for changes. We have figures showing a phenomenal increase in the number of independent, self-employed workers who represent a new feature of the labour market.

During the election campaign, the Bloc Quebecois suggested that these people should be able, on a voluntary basis, to be eligible to employment insurance. If the system is not changed, we will have a system that will be suited to the problems of ten years ago, but that will in no way be suited to the problems of today and the years to come.

As provided in the act, the government is required to report every year to the parliamentary committee to propose amendments to the act. Basically, if the government had taken its responsibilities and had recognized that there are indeed changes to be made and had decided to go ahead with them, there would be no need to debate this motion.

There is another demand on the table. Yesterday, the premier of Quebec stated that he would come to the federal-provincial meeting next December, provided that the issue of the employment insurance surplus was on the agenda. What he said was "to help improve the living conditions of seasonal workers".

• (1330)

So, I think we should answer this appeal, the appeal made by the premiers and even by the human resources development committee, which did in fact pass a motion asking the finance minister to give priority during his prebudget consultations to the issues of employment and employment insurance.

The premier of Quebec, all of the premiers and the human resources development committee, that is a lot of people asking the government to use common sense and to listen to good sense.

I ask the government to endorse my motion as soon as possible and to come back to the House with a government bill that will meet the goals of the constituents in my riding and in all of eastern Canada, and I hope that all members will give proper consideration to this issue.

We are talking about managing the government surplus. The best way to manage this surplus properly is to be fair, so that everyone gets his or her share. Since employers and employees have generated most of the surplus, they should benefit most from its redistribution.

[English]

Mr. Robert D. Nault (Kenora—Rainy River, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to debate the hon. member's motion.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): A point of order, Madam Speaker. I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to have the letter that was referred to in question period tabled at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Resuming debate.

Mr. Robert D. Nault: Madam Speaker, the first thing I would ask the hon. member to consider is that if we adopted his motion it would not give due consideration to all the hard work that has gone into restructuring the system and the positive approach in helping unemployed Canadians that other members and myself were involved with in the last session.

When the government set out to redesign the way in which we helped unemployed workers get back to work, we made a dramatic shift from passive assistance to active measures that would act as an incentive for individuals to return to the workforce as soon as possible.

The new system is not yet 16 months old. Most reasonable people would agree that it is not long enough to determine how effective it is going to be.

I will now address some specific points in the hon. member's motion. He is asking the government to lower premium contributions. In 1994 the government took action to stop rates from increasing, setting the rate that year at \$3.07 instead of the scheduled \$3.30. Since 1995 premium rates have declined each year. They are now at \$2.90 for every \$100 of insurable earnings and the government is committed to bringing the rate down even further.

As for weekly maximum insurable earnings, we rolled them back to \$750 and froze them at that level rather than allowing them to increase to \$875 as they were scheduled to do. But we did not stop there.

Is the hon. member familiar with the new hires program? Under that program up to 900,000 employers are eligible to pay virtually no premiums for jobs they create this year.

Combine these three measures and the government is saving workers and employers \$1.7 billion in payroll taxes in 1997. By anybody's arithmetic, those are substantial savings to both employers and employees.

• (1335)

The hon. member is asking the government to improve benefits for seasonal workers and new entrants and re-entrants. First let us consider seasonal workers.

When the old UI system was reformed, the government was determined to make the new system more flexible to accommodate changing conditions in the workplace. Those changes included improvements in the way benefits are calculated for seasonal workers.

With EI we have an hours based system. That hours based system enables an additional 45,000 workers in seasonal industries to qualify for benefits they would not have qualified for under the old system.

Because of the hours based system some 270,000 seasonal workers are eligible for an average of three additional weeks of EI benefits. For families with children whose incomes are under \$26,000, the family income supplement assists them financially. By the year 2000 their EI benefits may be as high as 80% of their insured earnings.

Furthermore, an \$800 million annual reinvestment in employment benefits by the year 2000 will help workers in seasonal industries extend their regular season or find work in the off season. Besides that, the government has a very active \$300 million transitional jobs fund to help create sustainable employment in areas of high unemployment.

Let me give the House some statistics for those who are interested in the transitional jobs fund. So far more than 400 projects have been approved. We have spent \$150 million on TJF. Some 20,000 new jobs have been created due to this program and some \$1.3 billion has been leveraged by the private sector because of this fund.

Anyone who has been involved in this fund in high unemployment areas, such as my area of northern Ontario, can attest to the fact that this is a very creative program which will create sustainable employment. It is being used. The significance of this program is that it has also been agreed to by the provinces, by members of Parliament, by non-profit organizations, all working together in their regions to create sustainable employment.

At the same time the government recognized the issue of so-called small weeks, that is, weeks in which a worker earns less

than \$150. There was a disincentive, which we recognized, for some workers to accept these small weeks of work because it would lower their benefits.

A major objective of the new EI program is to encourage people to accept available employment. The government brought in adjustment projects which target 29 high unemployment regions across Canada, including the introduction of projects in the hon. member's province of Quebec. Over three years these projects will return an estimated \$247 million in EI benefits to workers in the 29 regions.

We will continue to monitor the impact of the new system on seasonal workers so appropriate adjustments can be made, but it is far too early to start tinkering with the program.

As for new entrants and re-entrants, yes, the requirements are higher. There is a very good reason for that. Higher entrance requirements ensure that workers who qualify for benefits establish a solid attachment to the labour force before receiving benefits.

One of the big problems under the old system was that people became dependent on UI. Some people used it to supplement their income and there is evidence that some young people left school early so they could collect income benefits. I am sure the hon. member would not want to create that kind of incentive for young Canadians.

Under EI higher entrance requirements will reduce the chance of workers, especially young workers, from developing a dependency on the system early in their work life.

The government has a number of programs under the youth employment strategy to help young Canadians make a successful transition from school to work. As was announced in the Speech from the Throne, we intend to take further measures to reduce barriers to post-secondary education. As well, we will work with our provincial and private sector partners to ensure that young men and women develop the skills necessary to thrive in the emerging knowledge based economy.

• (1340)

At the same time, we are not unaware that more women than men are re-entrants to the workforce. We have implemented special measures to help ease the effect of higher entrance requirements on women.

Let us take the case of a woman re-entering the workforce who has collected maternity or parental benefits in the last five years. To mitigate the impact of higher entrance requirements, this individual has access to EI's active employment measures, measures that will help or make a more stable attachment to the labour market.

As I mentioned earlier with regard to seasonal workers, about 350,000 low income claimants, two-thirds of whom are women, are eligible for the family income supplement. And benefits for low

Private Members' Business

income, single parent families headed by women will increase, as we all know, in these new changes by 13%.

Is it not fair that we have helped women who are at the low end of the income scale by increasing their benefits by 13%? Obviously, that is never mentioned by members opposite.

In closing, I would remind the hon. member that the transformation from UI to employment insurance was the most massive overhaul of the program in 25 years. Part of that overhaul was a commitment by the government to monitor and assess the impact of the changes.

That process is currently under way. As required under the Employment Insurance Act, early in 1998 the minister will report to Parliament on just how well the new system is working.

I believe the new EI system deserves a fair trial period. For that reason, I am opposed to the hon. member's motion and I think we should give change a chance to take place.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Madam Speaker, we are debating today a private member's motion introduced by my hon. colleague from the Bloc proposing some changes to the new EI system. We find the change in wording from UI to EI just a little difficult.

What my colleague is proposing is to make "major changes" to the EI system. He is proposing lower contributions and increased benefits for both seasonal workers and for new entrants to the labour market. That is what we are talking about today.

The hon. parliamentary secretary for the government pointed out that since the new EI system is barely in its infancy, it is not the time to make major changes. He also argues that there have been some fairly significant elements of the new EI program to help both seasonal workers and to help those who are new entrants to the job market.

That is the point of debate, to have proposals for change, to have the merit of those debated. I hope I can add a few cogent and helpful thoughts to our deliberations on this motion.

The main point of this motion is to talk about the need for lower contributions, to lower the contribution, to lower the amount of money going into the EI system.

As has already been pointed out, the surplus in the EI fund will reach \$14.9 billion by the end of this fiscal year. That is a fairly big chunk of money. In fact, it is about as much as the GST takes out of the economy. Now we have another \$15 billion being taken out and in surplus with the EI fund.

It has been said many times in this House before—I do not think it has really been rebutted or denied—that high payroll taxes particularly discourage employment and discourage hiring.

Here we have a government elected on the promise of jobs, jobs, jobs in 1993. That was their rallying cry for Canadians. Yet in the four years the Liberals have been running the affairs of our country they have done tremendous damage to the job creators of this country.

• (1345)

Taxes keep rising. Here we have a totally unnecessary chunk taken out of the hides of employers and workers in this country simply so the finance minister can brag about what a good job he has done in getting rid of the deficit. Sure, if you tax everyone to the max you should not have to borrow any money. That is nothing to brag about but that is essentially what has happened.

On top of the tax increases which have been \$24 billion more revenue taken in by this government than when it was elected, there will be \$15 billion from the EI surplus. There is another \$10 billion a year coming out of our pockets for the increase in the Canada pension plan premiums. We wonder if the finance minister and the government think Canadians are made of money.

Then the Liberals play the violin and put their hands over their hearts about child poverty. It is no wonder our families are poor. It is a wonder our families are able to eat anymore with all the taxes, taxes and taxes this government seems to feel so free to rip out of our pockets on an ongoing basis.

Here we have one that has proven to be unnecessary. It is a surplus in a fund that is to help unemployed people. It is like being forced to pay \$30,000 for a \$20,000 car. We wonder why we must have a system that costs far more than it is acknowledged is appropriate.

We must agree with my colleague from the Bloc that there should be and must be lower contribution rates to the EI program. Cutting EI expenditures in terms of premiums needed to operate the system would save most working Canadians about \$300 a year, and \$300 could buy a lot of milk for poor children in the country. It could buy a lot of warm clothing for our children. It could make sure our mortgages get paid and the heat bills get paid. But no, this taxaholic finance minister needs that money to play with, and so of course we have to keep paying unnecessary dollars into the hands of this government.

Therefore the real engines of job creation, the small and medium size businesses, are actually penalized unnecessarily for every single person they hire. It is no wonder hiring is cut back. When every person you hire takes a big chunk of your profits and your business capital naturally you will conserve and hire as few people as you can possibly get away with instead of expanding your

business and the economic opportunities in this country. I am not quite sure how long it will take some people in the House to realize that and to seriously deal with it, in particular those on the government side.

I would say to the government that as long as this government keeps EI premiums unnecessarily high, Canadians have every right to say that it is not really serious about job creation in this country.

The EI surplus has been used for fully 22% of deficit reduction, which means that over \$1 in every \$5 that the finance minister is bragging that he is no longer borrowing is made possible because workers and business people are subsidizing his deficit reduction efforts by 22%. Sometimes you have to balance the cost and the benefit of some of these measures.

Canadians' disposable income at the same time has decreased. It has decreased by about \$3,000 per family since this government was elected. Three thousand dollars per family would buy a lot of milk, a lot of warm clothing and would make sure our families had adequate shelter. But this heavy increase in taxation, of which this EI surplus is just a part, is responsible for a tremendous amount of the suffering in this country.

The Business Council on National Issues states tax cuts would help alleviate the problem of child poverty. The BCNI also said it is terrifying that many low and middle income Canadians face this steep tax burden and that this government is sitting on a time bomb on taxation.

• (1350)

I urge the government to recognize the suffering and the hardship being caused to Canadians by its insatiable appetite for our tax dollars so that it can politically brag about what it has done or is going to do. It is nice to do these things, but they must be done in a way that is fair to the only source of revenue in the country, hard working Canadians.

The government really must be serious about this change. The parliamentary secretary said in the debate that the new hires program waives or does not collect the UI premiums for jobs that businesses create this year under the program, absolutely underlining and acknowledging the fact that these job taxes are keeping new jobs from being created. If these job taxes were not a significant factor, why did the government tell businesses they will not have to pay them as long as they hire new people? It knows this is an impediment and that is why it has removed it under the new hires program. It has also put in place the family income supplement for low income Canadians, again acknowledging that under our tax regime low income Canadians cannot make ends meet.

On behalf of struggling families I appeal to the government not to continue taking these dollars out of the pockets of hard working

Canadians who are trying desperately to care for their families and make ends meet.

[Translation]

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to address the House today and join with my colleague from Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques in demanding, as stated in his motion, that “the Government of Canada make major changes in the employment insurance system, particularly by lowering contributions and improving benefits for seasonal workers and workers who have joined the labour market only recently.”

During the last election campaign, we in the Bloc Québécois made a commitment to press the government into dealing with these issues, and we will keep doing it through special initiatives.

I would like to remind you of a few figures, if I may. The EI recipient-unemployed worker ratio dropped from 77% in 1989 to below 41% in 1996. Under the Liberals, this ratio has fallen from 60% in 1993 to 36% in January 1997.

Since 1990, successive cuts have deprived thousands of people of EI benefits, and many of them are now on welfare. Under the current system, the unemployed in Quebec will receive \$316 million less in 1997-98 and \$534 million less in 2001-2002. As a matter of fact, this new employment insurance plan is a systematic impoverishment program, and a hidden tax affecting many families in the Jonquière riding.

It looks like one of our initiatives will meet with great success in the Jonquière riding. Like my colleague from Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, I have mailed out to my constituents in Jonquière postcards they can send me back to indicate their support for changes to the employment insurance plan.

More specifically, we ask the federal government to stop unfairly penalizing seasonal workers and new entrants to the labour market by amending the Employment Insurance Act and lowering contributions significantly by 35 to 50 cents.

• (1355)

The people of Jonquière as well as the local community and labour organizations, which are sensitive to the situation of seasonal workers, reacted positively to our initiative. In several parishes of Jonquière the priests invited their parishioners to send back their cards on employment insurance to make the Liberal government aware of the very harmful effects of the present employment insurance system on the workers.

Many times during the last campaign, people from my riding told me they were outraged by the reduction in benefits while the premiums paid by workers allowed the government to collect

Private Members' Business

around \$5 billion a year in revenues that are not used to help the unemployed, but to reduce its deficit.

The people across the floor brag about this, but they should be ashamed of the mess they created. The federal government and the Minister of Finance may benefit from the cuts, but such is not the case for low income people.

It is now clear that it is the workers and the employers who make it possible for the Minister of Finance to artificially lower its deficit. But the Bloc is there to remind you of the interests of the men and women of Quebec. And believe me, we will constantly remind the government of the facts to bring it back to the people's true reality.

Together with the Government of Quebec, we are asking for changes to the EI system. Premier Lucien Bouchard, the head of the Government of Quebec, said that he will, at the next federal-provincial meeting, make a proposal to change the EI system for the benefit of both employers and workers.

He wants to put forward the following changes: reduced premiums for employers and workers and increased benefits, or a combination of both. We are in favour of such an initiative, which would improve the situation of Quebec workers. Mr. Bouchard said that these changes would allow seasonal workers to escape the terrible conditions they are living with now, and which increase welfare budgets.

In short, the Bloc Québécois reiterates its proposal that the Liberal government substantially decrease the EI premium rate and at the same time improve the program, which has become too restrictive, particularly for seasonal workers and new entrants.

I hope the Minister of Human Resources Development will take action on this issue. He will shortly have to respond favourably to Quebec workers' demands and needs, because year 2000 is fast approaching and he might be unprepared for what is coming.

Madam Speaker, I move:

That the motion be deemed votable.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Does the House consent to the motion?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): Resuming debate. The member for Acadie—Bathurst.

• (1400)

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Madam Speaker, I am speaking today in support of the motion of my colleague from

the riding of Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques—like the name of some families down home, the Basques—proposing major amendments to the employment insurance system.

My colleague proposes that the benefits for seasonal workers and new entrants be improved.

These are serious problems, and the government must address them immediately. I believe the Liberals have forgotten that these are real people who are suffering, that entire families have nothing to eat because of the changes to employment insurance. I will give you examples of the government's insensitivity and incompetence.

First, I would like to point out that we have a bit of a problem with the matter of reducing contributions. Allow me to explain what our problem is. Before reducing contributions, I think the first problem needs to be solved, the problem of employment insurance and the employment insurance formula. After that has been done, then would come the time to look at contributions, if there is any money left to reduce contributions.

I think it is really important to look at the employment insurance formula in order to be certain that it meets the requirements of the people who need it.

If we look at what employment insurance reform has brought to our area and other areas in Canada, we see mostly problems. I am going to give you a few examples from back home, which I am very familiar with.

First, when the government decided to make changes to employment insurance, what did it do? Not only did it decide to make changes for the future, but it suddenly decided to look at people's files, people who had been told by its officials they were eligible for employment insurance. Surprise, they found they had made a mistake three years back. They wrongly told some people they were entitled to employment insurance. The people concerned were poor—I will give you examples—they were not rich.

I will give the example of a man who came to see me in my office shortly after the elections, a man with a child. There were also a father, and a mother with 11 children from Caraquet, in New Brunswick. Because of the problems in the fish plants, that man went to see the government to find out whether he qualified for employment insurance. You know, employment insurance is supposed to provide some money to feed families. He went to the government and was told "Well, you have to work, to work hard. Go out there and find some work". The man said "I would be glad to work, but I cannot get a job". And he was told "We are creating jobs in New Brunswick now. We are making Christmas wreaths. Go and see the employer, he will give you a job". And he did get a job making Christmas decorations.

The poor man went to work and put in a number of weeks in order to qualify for employment insurance. The guy, his wife and

his kid would have loved to keep on making Christmas wreaths all year long, but that is not the way it works. After Christmas, wreaths are no longer in demand. So, they are out of a job again.

They applied for employment insurance to see if they qualified. "Of course. You are entitled to employment insurance, and your son too." So they get benefits for a year or two and then, all of a sudden, department officials come to their senses—I mean senior officers, I make the distinction because I do not want to offend low-level public servants who have no authority whatsoever—and ask for an investigation on these poor people because it would seem a mistake was made two years back. They tell these people they owe the government \$10,000 or \$15,000.

That is what Canadians got from the Liberals. The Liberals told seasonal workers back home to make Christmas wreaths, that great new job in New Brunswick.

• (1405)

I call on the Government of Canada not to blackmail Atlantic Canadians by telling them they are going to make them work full time.

An hon. member: That is a terrible thing to do.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Yes, it is terrible. Better yet, they should deliver on their threat, because our people want to work.

In any event, back to the Christmas wreathes, because this is an interesting case. This is what happens to our industries. We cannot get at the fish in the winter because of the ice, there are no Christmas wreathes in the summer, blueberries do not grow under the snow, and there is no peat on top of it. These are the kinds of industries in which the government invests.

There are secondary and tertiary industries, but that is too complicated for the government. They want to leave that for their friends in other countries: the Japanese and the folks in Boston get a crack at the secondary and tertiary sectors.

Back to the Christmas wreathes. The government told these people: "You do not have enough hours. Go and make Christmas wreathes". Off went 130 or 150 people to work for someone in New Brunswick. All of a sudden, the government decided this was not insurable employment, once again, three years later. Three years later, it decided that 130 to 140 of these people were not eligible. What the government has done is completely unacceptable.

Furthermore, these people went to the employment insurance offices and explained how they were making the wreathes. For the information of wealthy Canadians who do not have to make

Private Members' Business

Christmas wreathes, this is not something that you go into the woods to do. You do not strip the boughs off the tree in the woods and make the wreath with a supervisor standing beside you. For those who do not know about these things, you go into the woods, you cut branches, and then you have to strip them. Somebody then makes the wreathes. People went back home, opened their garage doors, set up tables and began turning out wreathes.

When they reported back to the employment insurance office, they explained all this. They were insurable. But, as I am telling you, the government needed money to pay down the national debt. It was not enough to cut employment insurance. They said they would digging into the pockets of the poor.

Reform Party members are asking for a decrease in premiums because companies are having a rough time. They never say that Canadians are suffering because of employment insurance cuts.

These people went to EI offices, and they were told they were eligible. In the Acadian peninsula today, for one company alone, 150 families owe between \$10,000 to \$15,000, and on top of that, they are seen as cheats. What the government has done to these people is totally unacceptable. That is what it did.

That is not all. They are now saying that we must encourage small and medium-sized businesses. If I had a small business today, I would naturally start by hiring my children. It would be normal because it would be my company and my investment. What did the government do? Relatives are not eligible for EI. So why encourage the development of small and medium sized businesses when their owners face such total discrimination in Canada? I thought we could expect fair and equal treatment in Canada.

There is also this black hole, this vacuum created because the government promised to make changes and to take care of them but did not follow through with the 910 hours now required, which people cannot accumulate.

To conclude, as I said over and over in my remarks, changes must be made immediately to the employment insurance plan. Seasonal workers are expecting the federal government to show some degree of compassion by passing immediately the motion put forward by the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, thereby ensuring that Canadian workers can look for work with dignity.

I want this motion to be a real motion that we could debate, instead of hiding like the hon. member for Moncton. During the election campaign, she promised the unemployed she would fight to improve the employment insurance system, but she now refuses to support the motion before us.

Private Members' Business

• (1410)

Ms. Angela Vautour (Beauséjour—Petitcodiac, NDP): Madam Speaker, I think it is important to debate of this motion. I support it fully, and I thank my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois for introducing it.

As my colleague mentioned earlier, there are serious problems in our region. The Liberal Party member mentioned earlier the dependence of the unemployment insurance—which they want to call employment insurance—system.

I should ask a question, perhaps. When you live in a region where the economy is primarily seasonal, people depend on employment insurance in order to live and to eat. This is dependence. They have a choice: either employment insurance or meagre social welfare. Most of them are not eligible for social welfare if one member of the family earns \$800 or more a month.

From what I understand, the government does not like having people depend on the employment insurance system for sustenance. In other words, it says that they should starve. As a member of Parliament, I disagree. Having something to eat is not a privilege in this country, it is a right.

When I get calls from people in my riding who receive \$39 a week from employment insurance I can see there is a problem, especially when there is a surplus of nearly \$12 billion in the employment insurance fund, which was paid by employers and employees.

The government says it is going to take it, and we will use the word “take” today, to pay its deficit, that it will decide to pay a debt, the deficit, on the back of the unemployed, people who have lost their job, small and medium businesses that have closed their doors. New Brunswick’s economy has lost a lot of dollars because of the cuts to pay the deficit.

Many businesses today say “enough is enough”. People don’t have money any more. So now more people than just the seasonal

workers are suffering. There are seniors as well. If we look at the example of the man making \$39 a week at home, with his 73 year-old mother looking after him. Do you think that this woman is earning enough to provide for her son?

Don’t tell me that cuts don’t hurt anyone; they hurt everyone. Take a good look of how much money it costs for our health care program today because of people who are stressed and end up in hospital because they cannot find a job and can no longer get employment insurance. It is easy for us, who make \$64,000 and \$70,000 a year to say: “No you do not get paid for three months of the year”.

Today, I am not hungry, but I have experienced hunger. I am not hungry today and I may forget what happens at home, if I like, as some people on the other side have done in creating reforms without thinking. There are children who go to school without breakfast, who will have no lunch or supper.

And yet they are saying people depend on employment insurance, that employment insurance should be eliminated because it creates dependence. I say that I was proud to depend on employment insurance when I needed it. I was unemployed until June 2, 1997. I needed employment insurance to feed my son and daughter. I am not going to turn around and tell people at home that they will lose their right. I can guarantee them today that I will fight to the last, because what the government is doing to our people is utterly inhuman.

• (1415)

The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault): I note that the time provided for consideration of Private Members’ business has now truly expired. The item is dropped from the Order Paper.

It being 2.16 p.m., this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.16 p.m.)

APPENDIX

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

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. DON BOUDRIA, P.C.

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

MR. STÉPHANE BERGERON

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

MR. RANDY WHITE

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

First Session – Thirty-sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay — Columbia	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary — Nose Hill	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alarie, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Alberta	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Rosetown — Biggar	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, André	Richmond — Arthabaska	Quebec	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Bailey, Roy	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West — Mississauga	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins — James Bay	Ontario	Lib.
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique — Mactaquac	New Brunswick	PC
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure — Gaspé — Îles-de-la-Madeleine — Pabok	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan — King — Aurora	Ontario	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg — Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	PC
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brison, Scott	Kings — Hants	Nova Scotia	PC
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Ontario	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth — Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin — Peel — Wellington — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Caplan, Elinor	Thornhill	Ontario	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie — Simcoe — Bradford	Ontario	Lib.
Casey, Bill	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	PC
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West — Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	Quebec	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 — Mégantic	Quebec	BQ
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Quebec	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup — Témiscouata — Les Basques	Quebec	BQ
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta — South Richmond	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	British Columbia	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	Manitoba	NDP
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	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, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver South — Burnaby	British Columbia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	Nova Scotia	NDP
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	Newfoundland	PC
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Quebec	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska — Restigouche	New Brunswick	PC
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	British Columbia	Ref.
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	NDP
Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister of National Defence	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Coquitlam — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	Quebec	BQ
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Girard-Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	Quebec	BQ
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Godin, Yvon	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	NDP
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Alberta	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	West Kootenay — Okanagan	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre — Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	British Columbia	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Coquihalla	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood — Assiniboine	Manitoba	Lib.
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	Quebec	PC
Herron, John	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	PC
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk — Interlake	Manitoba	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage — Lisgar	Manitoba	Ref.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce — Lachine	Quebec	Lib.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jones, Jim	Markham	Ontario	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karetak-Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	Nova Scotia	PC
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Middlesex — London	Ontario	Lib.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	Saskatchewan	NDP
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Henri	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	British Columbia	Lib.
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	NDP
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby — Ajax	Ontario	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie — Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Mancini, Peter	Sydney — Victoria	Nova Scotia	NDP
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Ref.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	Manitoba	NDP
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.
Matthews, Bill	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	PC
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	Nova Scotia	NDP
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Alberta	Lib.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney — Alouette	British Columbia	Ref.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering — Ajax — Uxbridge	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne — Blainville	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	South Surrey — White Rock — Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — East York	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills — Grasslands	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Muise, Mark	West Nova	Nova Scotia	PC
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse — Etchemins — Montmagny — L'Islet	Quebec	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Ind.
Nystrom, Lorne	Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Fanshawe	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Alberta	Ref.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North — St. Paul	Manitoba	Lib.
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Perron, Gilles—A.	Saint—Eustache — Sainte— Thérèse	Quebec	BQ
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau — Saint—Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent — Essex	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	Newfoundland	PC
Pratt, David	Nepean — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Price, David	Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	PC
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	Saskatchewan	NDP
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Ontario	Lib.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver — Sunshine Coast	British Columbia	Ref.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount — Ville—Marie	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Douglas	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Saada, Jacques	Brossard — La Prairie	Quebec	Lib.
Saint—Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Quebec	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk — Brant	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma — Manitoulin	Ontario	Lib.
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	Quebec	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	Quebec	PC
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville — Eastern Shore	Nova Scotia	NDP
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Quebec	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	New Brunswick	PC
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Mitis	Quebec	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Kent — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour — Petitcodiac	New Brunswick	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno — Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Ontario	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Ontario	Lib.
White, Randy	Langley — Abbotsford	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Ontario	Lib.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
VACANCY	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: Lib.—Liberal; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada; BQ—Bloc Québécois; 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

First Session — Thirty—sixth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary—Nose Hill	Ref.
Anders, Rob	Calgary West	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Lakeland	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Casson, Rick	Lethbridge	Ref.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Goldring, Peter	Edmonton East	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Edmonton North	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Jaffer, Rahim	Edmonton—Strathcona	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kenney, Jason	Calgary Southeast	Ref.
Kilgour, Hon. David, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Lowther, Eric	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Manning, Preston, Leader of the Opposition	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Edmonton West	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Obhrai, Deepak	Calgary East	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay—Columbia	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Victoria	Lib.
Cadman, Chuck	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta—South Richmond	Ref.
Davies, Libby	Vancouver East	NDP
Dhaliwal, Hon. Harbance Singh, Minister of National Revenue	Vancouver South—Burnaby	Lib.
Duncan, John	Vancouver Island North	Ref.
Elley, Reed	Nanaimo—Cowichan	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Nanaimo—Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	West Kootenay—Okanagan	Ref.
Grewal, Gurmant	Surrey Central	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George—Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan—Coquihalla	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George—Peace River	Ref.
Leung, Sophia	Vancouver Kingsway	Lib.
Lunn, Gary	Saanich—Gulf Islands	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo—Chilcotin	Ref.
McNally, Grant	Dewdney—Alouette	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	South Surrey—White Rock—Langley	Ref.
Reynolds, John	West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby—Douglas	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.
VACANCY	Port Moody—Coquitlam	
MANITOBA (14)		
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
Borotsik, Rick	Brandon—Souris	PC
Desjarlais, Bev	Churchill	NDP
Duhamel, Hon. Ronald J., Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Saint Boniface	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Charleswood—Assiniboine	Lib.
Hilstrom, Howard	Selkirk—Interlake	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Portage—Lisgar	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
Mark, Inky	Dauphin—Swan River	Ref.
Martin, Pat	Winnipeg Centre	NDP
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North—St. Paul	Lib.
Wasylycia-Leis, Judy	Winnipeg North Centre	NDP
NEW BRUNSWICK (10)		
Bernier, Gilles	Tobique—Mactaquac	PC
Bradshaw, Claudette, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Moncton	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dubé, Jean	Madawaska—Restigouche	PC
Godin, Yvon	Acadie—Bathurst	NDP
Herron, John	Fundy—Royal	PC
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	Lib.
Thompson, Greg	Charlotte	PC
Vautour, Angela	Beauséjour—Petitcodiac	NDP
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC

NEWFOUNDLAND (7)

Baker, George S.	Gander—Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Matthews, Bill	Burin—St. George's	PC
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Bonavista—Trinity—Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Power, Charlie	St. John's West	PC

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)

Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.

NOVA SCOTIA (11)

Brison, Scott	Kings—Hants	PC
Casey, Bill	Cumberland—Colchester	PC
Dockrill, Michelle	Bras d'Or	NDP
Earle, Gordon	Halifax West	NDP
Keddy, Gerald	South Shore	PC
Lill, Wendy	Dartmouth	NDP
MacKay, Peter	Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough	PC
Mancini, Peter	Sydney—Victoria	NDP
McDonough, Alexa	Halifax	NDP
Muise, Mark	West Nova	PC
Stoffer, Peter	Sackville—Eastern Shore	NDP

ONTARIO (99)

Adams, Peter, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Brampton Centre	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke—Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton West—Mississauga	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Timmins—James Bay	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bélanger, Mauril	Ottawa—Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton—Gloucester	Lib.
Bennett, Carolyn	St. Paul's	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	Vaughan—King—Aurora	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Bonwick, Paul	Simcoe—Grey	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Glengarry—Prescott—Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville	Lib.
Bryden, John	Wentworth—Burlington	Lib.
Bulte, Sarmite	Parkdale—High Park	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Caplan, Elinor	Thornhill	Lib.
Carroll, Aileen	Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West—Nepean	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Guelph—Wellington	Lib.
Clouthier, Hec	Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor—St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M., Minister of Transport	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay—Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	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 of National Defence	York Centre	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London North Centre	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia—Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Toronto Centre—Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Deputy Prime Minister	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity—Spadina	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce—Grey	Lib.
Jones, Jim	Markham	PC
Jordan, Joe	Leeds—Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough—Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont—Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin—Middlesex—London	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York North	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Lastewka, Walt, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough—Rouge River	Lib.
Longfield, Judi	Whitby—Ajax	Lib.
Mahoney, Steve	Mississauga West	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea—Gore—Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie—Lincoln	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister for International Trade	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McKay, John	Scarborough East	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Pickering—Ajax—Uxbridge	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview—Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches—East York	Lib.
Mitchell, Hon. Andy, Secretary of State (Parks)	Parry Sound—Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark—Carleton	Lib.
Myers, Lynn	Waterloo—Wellington	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora—Rainy River	Lib.
Nunziata, John	York South—Weston	Ind.
O'Brien, Pat	London—Fanshawe	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria—Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Niagara Centre	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga Centre	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peterson, Hon. Jim, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Kent—Essex	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Pratt, David	Nepean—Carleton	Lib.
Provenzano, Carmen	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Redman, Karen	Kitchener Centre	Lib.
Reed, Julian, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Halton	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence	Perth—Middlesex	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Health	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming—Cochrane	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand—Norfolk—Brant	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma—Manitoulin	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron—Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Minister of the Environment	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Brant	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Kitchener—Waterloo	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose—Marie	Lambton—Kent—Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	Stoney Creek	Lib.
Vanclief, Hon. Lyle, Minister of Agriculture and Agri—Food	Prince Edward—Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton—Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough Southwest	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex	Lib.
Wilfert, Bryon	Oak Ridges	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Minister of Labour	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Alarie, H��l��ne	Louis—H��bert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, G��rard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Andr��	Richmond—Arthabaska	PC
Bachand, Claude	Saint—Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Ahuntsic	Lib.
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier—Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, St��phane	Verch��res	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure—Gasp��—��les—de—la—Madeleine—Pabok	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	T��miscamingue	BQ
Canuel, Ren��	Matap��dia—Matane	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivi��re—des—Prairies	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chr��tien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint—Maurice	Lib.
Chr��tien, Jean—Guy	Frontenac—M��gantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Cr��te, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivi��re—du—Loup—T��miscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
Desrochers, Odina	Lotbinière	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent—Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil—Soulanges	Lib.
Drouin, Claude	Beauce	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier—Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil—Papineau	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Folco, Raymonde	Laval West	Lib.
Fournier, Ghislain	Manicouagan	BQ
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gauthier, Michel	Roberval	BQ
Girard—Bujold, Jocelyne	Jonquière	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans	BQ
Harvey, André	Chicoutimi	PC
Jennings, Marlene	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun—Saint-Henri	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot	BQ
Marceau, Richard	Charlesbourg	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec East	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle—Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull—Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga—Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food) (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds—Dollard	Lib.
Perron, Gilles-A.	Saint-Eustache—Sainte-Thérèse	BQ
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau—Saint-Denis	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Price, David	Compton—Stanstead	PC
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Westmount—Ville-Marie	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Saint-Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St-Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St-Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
Thibeault, Yolande, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Saint-Lambert	Lib.
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski—Mitis	BQ
Turp, Daniel	Beauharnois—Salaberry	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert	BQ

SASKATCHEWAN (14)

Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar	NDP
Bailey, Roy	Souris—Moose Mountain	Ref.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton—Melville	Ref.
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board	Wascana	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Blackstrap	Ref.
Konrad, Derrek	Prince Albert	Ref.
Laliberte, Rick	Churchill River	NDP
Morrison, Lee	Cypress Hills—Grasslands	Ref.
Nystrom, Lorne	Qu'Appelle	NDP
Pankiw, Jim	Saskatoon—Humboldt	Ref.
Proctor, Dick	Palliser	NDP
Ritz, Gerry	Battlefords—Lloydminster	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre	NDP
Vellacott, Maurice	Wanuskewin	Ref.

YUKON (1)

Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP
---------------	-------	-----

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: George Baker

Vice-Chairmen: Charles Hubbard
Gary Lunn

Yvan Bernier
John Duncan
Wayne Easter
Howard Hilstrom

Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gar Knutson
M. Sophia Leung

Bill Matthews
Lawrence O'Brien
Carmen Provenzano

Yves Rocheleau
Paul Steckle
Peter Stoffer

(16)

Associate Members

Gilles Bernier
René Canuel
Paul Forseth

Ghislain Fournier
Bill Gilmour

Philip Mayfield
Svend Robinson

Mike Scott
Angela Vautour

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairs: Colleen Beaumier
Bob Mills

Sarkis Assadourian
Jean Augustine
Réginald Bélair
Scott Brison

John Cannis
Maud Debien
Gurmant Grewal
Ted McWhinney

Denis Paradis
Charlie Penson
Julian Reed
Svend Robinson

Benoît Sauvageau
Bob Speller
Daniel Turp

(18)

Associate Members

Claude Bachand
Sue Barnes
Eugene Bellemare
Bill Blaikie
Paul Bonwick
Claudette Bradshaw
Sarmite Bulte

Aileen Carroll
Raymonde Folco
Monique Guay
Joe Jordan
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi

Richard Marceau
Keith Martin
Paul Mercier
Bob Nault
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Charlie Power

George Proud
Karen Redman
Nelson Riis
Jacques Saada
John Solomon
Pierrette Venne
Bryon Wilfert

HEALTH

Chair: Beth Phinney

Vice-Chairs: Elinor Caplan
Reed Elley

Carolyn Bennett
Aileen Carroll
Claude Drouin
Maurice Dumas

Grant Hill
Dan McTeague
Lynn Myers

Pauline Picard
Greg Thompson
Rose-Marie Ur

Maurice Vellacott
Joseph Volpe
Judy Wasylcyia-Leis

(16)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Libby Davies
Pierre de Savoye

Michelle Dockrill
Antoine Dubé
Christiane Gagnon

Sharon Hayes
John Herron
Keith Martin

Réal Ménard
Caroline St-Hilaire
Stéphan Tremblay

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Vice-Chairmen: Art Hanger
Bob Wood

Leon Benoit
Hec Clouthier
Maurice Godin
Peter Goldring

Judi Longfield
Pat O'Brien
John O'Reilly

David Pratt
David Price
Dick Proctor

George Proud
John Richardson
Pierrette Venne

(16)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Jim Hart

Peter Mancini
Patrick Martin

Bob Mills
Daniel Turp

Elsie Wayne

NATURAL RESOURCES AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Vice-Chairmen: David Chatters
Ben Serré

Gérard Asselin
Gilles Bernier
Jocelyne G. Bujold
Gerry Byrne

Roy Cullen
Raymonde Folco
Yvon Godin

Jim Gouk
Ovid Jackson
Jerry Pickard

Carmen Provenzano
Darrel Stinson
Bob Wood

(16)

Associate Members

Hélène Alarie
Chris Axworthy
Bernard Bigras
Pierre Brien

René Canuel
Jean-Guy Chrétien
Ghislain Fournier
Bill Gilmour

Gerald Keddy
Derrek Konrad
René Laurin
Réjean Lefebvre

Gilles Perron
Nelson Riis
Angela Vautour

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chairman: Peter Adams

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
Chuck Strahl

George Baker
Stéphane Bergeron
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Norman Doyle
Ken Epp
Mac Harb

Bob Kilger
Rey Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

John Richardson
John Solomon
Randy White

(16)

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Bill Blaikie

Michelle Dockrill
Jay Hill

René Laurin
Bill Matthews

Réal Ménard
Suzanne Tremblay

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chairman: Yvon Charbonneau

William Blaikie
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Normand E. Doyle

Ken Epp

Carolyn Parrish

(6)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: John Williams

Vice-Chairmen: Ivan Grose
Andrew Telegdi

Mark Assad	Odina Desrochers	René Laurin	Lynn Myers	(17)
André Bachand	Gurmant Grewal	Steve Mahoney	Lorne Nystrom	
Sue Barnes	Mac Harb	Philip Mayfield	Rey Pagtakhan	
Elinor Caplan	Jason Kenney			

Associate Members

Roy Bailey	Rick Casson	Antoine Dubé	Derrek Konrad
Garry Breitkreuz	Bev Desjarlais	Michel Guimond	Gilles Perron
Jocelyne G. Bujold	Michelle Dockrill	Jim Jones	Peter Stoffer

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Roy Cullen
Lee Morrison

Roy Bailey	Bill Casey	Ivan Grose	Inky Mark	(16)
Gerry Byrne	Bev Desjarlais	Michel Guimond	Paul Mercier	
Murray Calder	Claude Drouin	Stan Keyes	Carolyn Parrish	
John Cannis				

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy	Pierre Brien	John Cummins	Rick Laliberté
Yvan Bernier	Paul Crête	Ghislain Fournier	Yves Rocheleau
Rick Borotsik			

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Co-Chairmen:

Vice-Chairmen:

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc	Philippe D. Gigantès	Marlene Catterall	Gurbax Malhi	(23)
Eymard G. Corbin	Jerahmiel S. Grafstein	Hec Clouthier	Philip Mayfield	
Mabel M. DeWare	Louis J. Robichaud	John Finlay	Paul Mercier	
Richard J. Doyle		Deborah Grey	Louis Plamondon	
		Howard Hilstrom	David Price	
		Jim Karygiannis	Karen Redman	
		Raymond Lavigne	Jacques Saada	
		Wendy Lill	Brent St. Denis	

Associate Members

Libby Davies	Maurice Dumas
--------------	---------------

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Co-Chairs: Sen. Rose–Marie Losier–Cool
Sheila Finestone

Vice-Chairmen: Denis Coderre
Rahim Jaffer

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Gérald A. Beaudoin
Jean–Robert Gauthier
Noël A. Kinsella
Jean–Claude Rivest

Fernand Robichaud
Louis J. Robichaud
Lucie Pépin
Jean–Maurice Simard

Sarkis Assadourian
Eugène Bellemare
Claudette Bradshaw
Cliff Breitzkreuz
John Godfrey
Yvon Godin
Bob Kilger

Ted McWhinney
Val Meredith
Denis Paradis
Louis Plamondon
Diane St–Jacques
Suzanne Tremblay

(25)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Lorne Nystrom

Angela Vautour

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Co-Chairs: Céline Hervieux–Payette
Derek Lee

Vice-Chairman: Ted White

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Michael Cogger
Marisa Barth Ferretti
Normand Grimard
William M. Kelly

P. Derek Lewis
Léonce Mercier
Wilfred P. Moore

John Bryden
Bill Casey
Paul DeVillers
Ken Epp
Marlene Jennings
Gary Lunn
John Maloney
Richard Marceau

Inky Mark
John McKay
Ian Murray
Lorne Nystrom
Alex Shepherd
Caroline St–Hilaire
Tom Wappel

(25)

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy
Michel Bellehumeur

Michel Guimond

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE
THE QUEBEC SCHOOL SYSTEM

Co-Chairs: Sen. Lucie Pépin
Denis Paradis

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Gérald A. Beaudoin, Fernand Robichaud
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein Dalia Wood
Thérèse Lavoie-Roux
John Lynch-Staunton

Representing the House of Commons:

Reg Alcock
Mauril Bélanger
Gerry Byrne
Paul DeVillers
Nick Discepola
Sheila Finestone
Christiane Gagnon
Yvon Godin

Peter Goldring
Rahim Jaffer
Marlene Jennings
Réal Ménard
Val Meredith
David Price
Paddy Torsney

(23)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. IAN McCLELLAND

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. YOLANDE THIBEAULT

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Deputy Prime Minister
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David M. Collenette	Minister of Transport
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister of National Defence
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Health
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Minister of Labour
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Don Boudria	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Alasdair Graham	Leader of the Government in the Senate
The Hon. Lyle Vanclief	Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
The Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Andy Scott	Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew	Secretary of State (Children and Youth)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)
The Hon. David Kilgour	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Jim Peterson	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Andrew Mitchell	Secretary of State (Parks)
The Hon. Gilbert Normand	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food)(Fisheries and Oceans)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Wayne Easter	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Gerry Byrne	to Minister of Natural Resources
John Godfrey	to Minister of Canadian Heritage
Julian Reed	to Minister for International Trade
Walt Lastewka	to Minister of Industry
Claudette Bradshaw	to Minister for International Cooperation
Tony Valery	to Minister of Finance
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Eleni Bakopanos	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Brenda Chamberlain	to Minister of Labour
Karen Kraft Sloan	to Minister of the Environment
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
George Proud	to Minister of Veterans Affairs
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Peter Adams	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
John Harvard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada

CONTENTS

Friday, October 24, 1997

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Customs Tariff

Bill C-11. Second reading	1083
Mr. Peterson	1083
Mr. Lowther	1086
Mr. Bigras	1087

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

The Environment

Mr. Finlay	1089
------------------	------

Correctional Service Canada

Mr. Kerpan	1089
------------------	------

United Nations Day

Mrs. Bakopanos	1090
----------------------	------

Small Business Week

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral	1090
----------------------------	------

Canada Council

Ms. Bulte	1090
-----------------	------

Spencerville Legion

Mr. Jordan	1090
------------------	------

Communications

Mr. Pankiw	1091
------------------	------

Pornography

Ms. Carroll	1091
-------------------	------

United Nations Day

Mrs. Guay	1091
-----------------	------

Peacekeeping

Mr. Clouthier	1091
---------------------	------

The Constitution

Mr. Obhrai	1092
------------------	------

Volunteers

Mr. Maloney	1092
-------------------	------

Multilateral Agreement on Investment

Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	1092
------------------------------------	------

Canadian War Museum

Mr. Pratt	1092
-----------------	------

Taxation

Mr. Jones	1093
-----------------	------

Poverty

Mrs. Gagnon	1093
-------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

The Environment

Mr. Kenney	1093
Mr. Gray	1093
Mr. Kenney	1093
Mr. Gray	1093
Mr. Kenney	1094
Mr. Gray	1094

Mr. Gilmour	1094
Mr. Collenette	1094
Mr. Gilmour	1094
Mr. Collenette	1094

Employment Insurance

Mr. Crête	1094
Mr. Nault	1094
Mr. Crête	1095
Mr. Nault	1095

Canadian Ambassador to France

Mr. Turp	1095
Mr. McWhinney	1095
Mr. Turp	1095
Mr. Gray	1095

Aboriginal Affairs

Mr. Laliberte	1095
Mr. Patry	1095
Mr. Laliberte	1095
Mr. Patry	1095

Search and Rescue

Mr. Herron	1095
Mr. Richardson	1096
Mr. Herron	1096
Mr. Richardson	1096
Mr. Richardson	1096

Goods and Services Tax

Mr. McNally	1096
Mr. Peterson	1096
Mr. McNally	1096
Mr. Peterson	1096

Correctional Service of Canada

Mr. Fournier	1097
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	1097
Mr. Fournier	1097
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	1097

Health Care

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	1097
Mr. Peterson	1097
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	1097
Mr. Peterson	1097

Railway Transportation

Mr. Dubé (Lévis)	1097
Mr. Collenette	1097
Mr. Dubé (Lévis)	1097
Mr. Collenette	1097

Search and Rescue

Mr. Hart	1098
Mr. Richardson	1098
Mr. Hart	1098
Mr. Richardson	1098

VCN Marine Radio

Mr. Bernier	1098
Mr. Easter	1098

Government Contracts

Mr. Bellemare	1098
---------------------	------

Mr. Gagliano	1098
Canada Pension Plan	
Mrs. Ablonczy	1098
Mr. Boudria	1098
Mrs. Ablonczy	1099
Mr. Gray	1099
Non-profit Organizations	
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	1099
Mr. Nault	1099
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	1099
Mr. Nault	1099
Criminal Code	
Mr. MacKay	1099
Ms. McLellan	1100
Mr. MacKay	1100
Ms. McLellan	1100
Human Resources	
Mrs. Redman	1100
Mr. Nault	1100
Solicitor General	
Mr. Bretkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	1100
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	1100
Mr. Cadman	1101
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	1101
Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Hardy	1101
Mr. Patry	1101
Mr. Stoffer	1101
The Deputy Speaker	1101
Search and Rescue	
Mr. Matthews	1101
Mr. Eggleton	1101
International Trade	
Ms. Alarie	1101
Mr. Reed	1102
Computer Systems	
Mr. Laurin	1102
Mr. Massé	1102
Solicitor General	
Mr. Thompson (Wild Rose)	1102
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	1102

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Nunavut Implementation Commission	
Mr. Patry	1102
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Adams	1102
Parliament of Canada Act	
Bill C-265. Introduction and first reading	1103
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	1103

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1103
--	------

Committees of the House

Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion for concurrence	1103
Mr. Adams	1103
(Motion agreed to)	1103

Petitions

Canada Pension Plan	
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	1103
Justice	
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	1103
The Family	
Mr. Szabo	1103
Labelling of Alcoholic Beverages	
Mr. Szabo	1103
Public Safety Officers Compensation Fund	
Mr. Szabo	1103
Human Rights	
Mr. Maloney	1103

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Adams	1104
-----------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Customs Tariff

Bill C-11. Second reading	1104
Mr. Bigras	1104
Mr. Laliberte	1105
Mr. Jones	1108
Mr. Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	1109
Mr. Stoffer	1110
Mr. Valeri	1112
Mr. Stoffer	1112
Mr. Stoffer	1112
Mr. Valeri	1113
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	1113
Mr. Valeri	1113
Ms. Vautour	1113
Mr. Valeri	1113
Division deferred	1114
Mr. Kilger	1114

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Employment Insurance

Mr. Crête	1114
Mr. Nault	1116
Mr. Bretkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	1116
Mr. Nault	1116
Mrs. Ablonczy	1118
Ms. Girard-Bujold	1119
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	1120
Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	1121
Ms. Vautour	1122

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

03159442

Ottawa

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

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 Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

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 à :

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9