



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 107 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, May 15, 1998

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, May 15, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*English*]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Hon. Allan Rock (for the Minister of Labour, Lib.) moved that Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, be read the third time and passed.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to rise in the House to begin our final debate on Bill C-19. We have come nearly full circle in our efforts to modernize Part I of the Canada Labour Code. Perhaps a more accurate description would be that it has been a long and winding road.

By now all members of the House will know that this road has been marked by extensive consultation. There were numerous written and oral submissions made to the Sims task force. The labour management consensus group wrestled with the difficult issues we debate today. Parliamentarians debated with much vigour and passion in the last session the provisions of Bill C-66 and those in this session have contributed their ideas and suggestions over the past few weeks in the House of Commons and in committee.

At this time I wish to note that the Minister of Labour is in the House. Generally he would be the one to give this speech. However, he graciously asked me to do this because I have put so much effort into the bill. I would like to pay tribute to him because sometimes we can work a long time on legislation and never get a thank you. I would like to say that the minister is a real gentleman.

All of us have been part of this important debate, so no one will ever accuse us of rushing to judgment in determining labour relations legislation for the 21st century.

Let us cut to the chase and look once again at some of the contentious items in this bill, items that no matter what decision we make about them, we may just have to agree to disagree.

• (1005)

The first has to do with dispute resolution mechanisms. Some opposition members have wanted to push back the clock of history and tradition by insisting that the code has built within it binding arbitration provisions. They believe that this sort of “when in doubt, let us rely on the government to bail them out” mechanism is the best way to go.

We beg to disagree. Any built-in system of compulsory arbitration flies in the face of a century of deliberately developed labour legislation.

It would certainly be a departure from the practice of all Canadian jurisdictions. As a nation we have made commitments to the principles of freedom of association, the right to organize, the right to bargain collectively and the ultimate right to withdraw labour.

I hear the Reform heckling and saying garbage. Unfortunately this bill has been tough because of the Reform. They have not been supportive of the labour movement. Clearly we believe in a democratic process in this country and we will continue to make laws for that purpose.

These commitments are embodied in our membership in the International Labour Organization. The system works very well at least 95% of the time. To be sure, there are some disputes that will go to impasse and unfortunately work stoppages will occur, but this is the motor that drives the system and no one has found a better one. If we move to a situation where lurking in the background there is some standing system of binding arbitration that can be imposed upon the parties, the result can only inhibit the principle of good faith bargaining. Such a broad based weapon that could be imposed at the will of the government of the day has no place in our democratic tradition.

Government Orders

The first deputy minister of labour was a very wise man. He held that post in 1900 and went on to become the minister and then the prime minister. At the beginning of the last century he knew that the government had a role in the collective bargaining process, a minimal one. His view, and I am talking about none other than the Right Hon. William Lyon McKenzie King, was: government intervention if necessary, but not necessarily government intervention.

It was a good view then and it remains so today, which leads us to the next topic of contention, grain handling.

The issue which has perhaps given rise to most comments and correspondence both for and against is the provision in the bill which requires the continuation of services to grain vessels in the event of a work stoppage at our ports. While the provision could apply in all regions, its main application would be on the coast. Those hon. members who have been in this House for some years will be well aware that west coast longshore strikes and lockouts have all too frequently required attention by way of back to work legislation.

In the last 25 years or so nine longshore work stoppages closed our west coast ports and seven of them had to be terminated and settled by legislation.

Two independent studies found that longshore employers and unions have avoided their collective bargaining responsibilities by using disruptions to grain exports to trigger back to work legislation. The result has been more frequent legislative interventions than in other Canadian ports and industries.

While the parties avoided their responsibilities and passed them over to parliament, they did not avoid damaging the west coast ports' reputation. Frequent work stoppages at the ports severely undermined their reliability in the eyes of international customers. Still, those who opposed the bill's provision, like the Reform Party, made it clear that they fear losing the assurance of legislative intervention. Yet I say that no group in this country has the right to hold parliament to its beck and call. No group should be allowed to do so.

For our part, we remain committed to the basic principles of free collective bargaining, even in sensitive areas such as this. The Sims task force agreed. It examined the issue of essential services. It concluded that, except for reasons of public health and safety, the right to strike or lockout should not be removed from any group of workers or any employer subject to the code.

• (1010)

The compromise that is included in the bill is specific and narrow in its focus. It will enable the longshore industry to retain grain vessel work, but will remove grain from the equation in longshore collective bargaining. It will also reduce disruptions to exports grain movements and discourage reliance on parliament to resolve port work stoppage. At the same time collective bargaining

rights will be maintained in both the grain handling and longshore industry.

Claims that this provision discriminates against other resources by singling out grain for special treatment overlook the fact that grain has already been singled out by longshore employers and unions using it as a trigger for back to work legislation. We have refrained from following recommendations which would have divorced the longshore industry from grain handling and otherwise have intruded into its bargaining structures.

This provision has the full support of our western grain farmers and those in the grain industry who, unlike some other resource producers, have no relationship or influence on collective bargaining between the longshore employers and unions. It is hard to understand how Reform cannot be responsive to their farmers, the grassroots of this country. It is hard to understand. We are committed to reviewing the effectiveness of this provision in 1999, following completion of the next round of west coast longshore bargaining.

It is not in my nature to issue dire warnings, but any indications of deliberate sabotage of this provision by the parties would not be looked on kindly. Parliament cannot be consistently required to resolve labour disputes. The parties have the ability to negotiate with each other and conclude agreements which are good for them and for the health of the ports. They can and must give up the narcotic of government intervention and solve their own problems.

Committee members also expressed concern about the off-site worker provisions. Debate centred around two fundamental rights. The first is the right to know. In this case, the right of workers to know about unions and the right to bargain collectively are rights they have under the code. Even if they are against joining a union they still have the right to know about organizing activities so they can make informed decisions for themselves. The competing right is the right to privacy, the right to be free from what they might perceive to be harassment. Any reasonable interpretation of the way the provision is currently worded leads to the conclusion that both rights are well protected.

We have gone the extra mile and have accepted the committee's recommendation in its second report. It provides that the board may offer employees the option of refusing to give their name and address to the trade union representative if that is their wish.

The bottom line is that we live in an open society. People have the right to communicate with each other. They have a right to be informed. With all the safeguards now proposed, I believe we now meet the test of providing both their right to privacy and their right to know.

Nowhere was the scope of disagreement so wide among certain opposition members than on the issue of replacement workers. The problem for consensus seeking was that their views were categorically in opposition to one another. Some wanted to allow no

replacement workers at all in the case of a strike or lockout. Others wanted no restrictions on their use.

The time has come to deal with the question. We carefully looked at concerns with the earlier wording in the previous version of the bill. The provision now reflects the carefully crafted words of the Sims report. To remind hon. members, the bill specifically prohibits the use of replacement workers for the demonstrative purpose of undermining a union's ability to represent its workers. That would constitute an unfair labour practice and will not be tolerated by the government.

• (1015)

Yet some members from both ends of the question remain totally unconvinced on the answer. If the art of politics is about compromise then the art of labour relations is about balance and, just as important, the perception of balance. Reasonable compromise and balance are what the current provisions represent.

We have heard much in the debate at report stage about the certification provisions of the current code, the measures contained in the bill concerning remedial certification and the view expressed about them being undemocratic. I must disagree.

There is nothing undemocratic about union certification procedures under the Canada Labour Code which are similar to procedures in a number of provincial jurisdictions. Majority support has always been and will remain the basis for union certification. This is clearly stated in section 28 of the code and Bill C-19 does not amend that provision.

As to the question of mandatory votes, the Sims task force recommended that the board's authority to certify a union based on evidence of majority support should remain as should the board's current discretion to hold a representation vote in any case, and that is what Bill C-19 does.

We have incorporated in the bill a provision similar to those in other jurisdictions, and that is remedial certification. Its objective is really quite simple: to change the conduct by those employers who would put a chill on organizing efforts, efforts which could intimidate employees from joining a union. It allows employees the representation they would have achieved but for the employer's misconduct.

In commenting on this issue a University of Toronto professor of law told the standing committee:

The ultimate purpose of the provision—reflects a very fundamental legal principle, and that is no one should profit from their own wrongdoing.

Employers should not get the result they seek as a consequence of violating the code. That seems only fair.

We have debated long and hard on the bill but the time for words is fast coming to a close. Those who are subject to the Canada

Government Orders

Labour Code do not want us to delay further. In fact many witnesses appearing before the committee wanted fast action.

Most responsible observers, regardless of any particular concerns they may have about one clause or another, must conclude that Bill C-19 on balance meets the spirit and intent of the Sims task force, and by extension the very intentions of the stakeholders who played such a big role in determining the form of the legislation we are debating today.

We will never agree to every last detail of every last clause and subclause. However I think by any definition of the word we have in Bill C-19 struck a reasonable balance. The time has come to put our words into action.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I ask the House for unanimous consent to share my time in such a way that I could allow 10 minutes of my time for my colleague from Prince Albert.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member suggesting 30 minutes for him and 10 minutes for his colleague?

Mr. Dale Johnston: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member for Wetaskiwin to split his time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: There is no consent.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the government does not see clear to allow me to split my time with the member, but so be it.

When I visit my riding school students, they ask me to relate my experiences and activities as a member of parliament to the lessons in democracy they are studying. I am glad to do that, but on occasions like this one I have to ask myself just how democratic the House is. Imposing time allocation on the bill at both report stage and third reading stage is simply not democratic.

• (1020)

Scheduling third reading on the shortest debating day of the week is a great example of a cheap shot. I have so many speakers lined up for this debate that we could spend at least a day on it. I have not been recruiting. People have been knocking on my door and sending notes over saying that they would certainly like to speak to the aspects of the bill. This is our last shot at the bill.

Let us have a look at how time allocation has been used in the House recently. Parliament is about eight months old and time allocation has been imposed five times. This bill had time allocation imposed on it the last time it came through the House known as Bill C-66.

Government Orders

I guess time allocation is getting to be the rule of thumb for a government that does not plan ahead. The last time the bill came to the House there was an impending election. I assume the government thought it had to get this off the order paper and over to the other place before the election was called.

Right now the government has a slim majority. It has a new mandate. It has no intention of calling an election. There is no possibility of this piece of legislation dying on the order paper over the summer, so what in the world is the panic?

There is an old expression that sums it up quite nicely and it goes something like this: lack of planning on your part does not necessarily constitute a crisis on my part.

Why is the government shutting down debate on a bill that would radically change labour relations without giving all members in the House an opportunity to participate in debate? This is an important piece of legislation. The government thought it was important enough as a matter of fact to make it the first item on the order paper of the 36th Parliament. It was the very first piece of business listed.

This piece of legislation languished on the order paper for months. It was November 6, a full eight weeks, before the minister actually introduced the bill in the House of Commons. I guess hon members got into the Christmas spirit early because the bill, which the minister described as important as any bill to be introduced in this session, was not brought forth for second reading until February 19, five months after it first appeared on the order paper.

The minister is correct in his assessment that this is an important piece of legislation. It is very likely the most important one that we will be dealing with this year. That is precisely why many of my colleagues want to speak to the bill. They say that the bill will have a direct impact on labour relations and in their words it will strike a balance. That is where we disagree with the Liberals.

At this point, after having the bill come before the House in the 35th parliament and run into all kinds of trouble in the other place, the government suddenly decided that it must ram the bill through before the summer break so that the Senate will have an opportunity to deal with it. Of course we are coming up to a log jam.

I ask again if members would consider giving a division of time between myself and my colleague from Prince Albert.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its consent to divide the time on the basis of 30 minutes to the hon. member and 10 minutes to the hon. member for Prince Albert with no questions or comments? Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dale Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the House leader of the government. I think there may be some other forces at work as far as opposition to the bill is concerned.

• (1025)

We asked a question in the House about whether the ministers from British Columbia were feeling heat with regard to how their constituents felt about Bill C-19. It was very apparent that the entire British Columbia caucus including the ministers had expressed concerns about the bill. It is obvious they would like to get the bill through the House and out of sight before there is any more dissension in the ranks.

Could it be that some of the Prime Minister's compliant backbenchers were questioning the impact the provisions of Bill C-19 would have on their constituents? I really think that is the case.

Having talked about the undemocratic aspect of time allocation, I will talk about some of the undemocratic aspects of the bill. This bill and its predecessor which died in the last parliament were based on recommendations of the Sims task force in "Seeking a Balance". Seeking a balance is a great approach to labour relations. I do not think anybody in the House wants to see one side totally outweighed by the other side. The scales in any negotiation should be more or less at a balance so that both parties have equal footing.

Let us examine the bill to see if it attains a balance. I begin with a little history. The code has not been altered in any significant way for the last 25 years. It was indeed an important piece of legislation and it is time to update it.

If we are making changes that will be in effect for another quarter of a century, we had better make sure we get it right and that the balance is there. If we are to open up this area only every quarter of a century we had better make sure we get things pretty well balanced right from the start. From what I have seen the bill is neither fair nor balanced.

Many of the witnesses appearing before the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities called for changes to the bill. Government members are fond of saying that both labour and management have problems with the bill and therefore, if they both dislike it equally, it must be balanced. That is rather weird logic.

What would they say if both sides said that they agreed with the bill and think it is fair and balanced? I suppose the Liberals would respond by saying that the bill had to go back to the drawing board. This seems like a rather shortsighted approach to the whole problem because it fails to take into account the impact the bill will have on the national economy and on innocent third parties.

Federal jurisdiction in labour matters is interprovincial and international in scope. While less than three-quarters of a million Canadians work in industries covered by the labour code, federally regulated businesses are service oriented and involve the free movement of goods, services, capital and people across Canada. Because of the unique nature of the federal system alternative sources are not readily available. In a lot of cases they are simply not available at all.

The operation of these industry sectors is vital to the daily functioning of the national economy. We have seen that time and time again. As recently as December we had a work stoppage at Canada Post that cost small and medium size business \$240 million a day. Over 10,000 people were laid off in mail dependent businesses. Charities that rely on the generosity that emerges during the Christmas period saw their fundraising activities go flat. The government eventually legislated everyone back to work, but after months of arbitration consensus a collective agreement has not been reached.

Bill C-19 will not protect innocent third parties that lose millions of dollars when government run monopolies cease to provide essential mail service. It has nothing to offer those workers at Canada Post who lost salary as a result of the disruption.

• (1030)

Bill C-19 is missing a dispute settlement mechanism that would protect innocent third parties and the national economy from devastation when the services of a monopoly are withdrawn.

That is why the Reform Party supports final offer selection arbitration or some other dispute settlement mechanism that would accomplish the same goals. Our aim is not to tie the hands of labour and management but to give them the tools to resolve their differences. It is definitely not, as the parliamentary secretary suggested in her comments, to be the big brother who makes all the decisions, the government that makes all the decisions for management and labour. Not at all.

I do not know how many times I have tried to explain the way this mechanism works in this House. Later on I will endeavour to explain again. I certainly hope that at some point the government will come to its senses and realize that this is the sort of thing that has to be done in order to protect innocent third parties and the economy of Canada in general, along with the jobs of people who work in all sorts of spin-off industries that rely on federally regulated businesses. Stable labour relations will promote investment and reinvestment.

It is in the interests of labour, management, producers and processors that these disputes be resolved without parliamentary intervention. I emphasize without parliamentary intervention. It is in the interest of all Canadians that we have a reliable access to essential services to keep employment within our borders and to

Government Orders

establish and maintain our reputation worldwide as a reliable exporter of goods.

As I have mentioned many times in this House, final offer selection arbitration does not favour one side or the other. How does it work? For the umpteenth time, if and only if the union and the employer cannot make an agreement by the conclusion of the contract, the union and employer would provide the minister with the name of the person they jointly recommend as an arbitrator.

The union and employer would be required to submit to the arbitrator a list of all the matters that they agreed upon at that point and a list of all the matters that were still in dispute. For disputed issues each party would be required to submit their final offer for settlement. The arbitrator then selects either the final offer submitted by the trade union or the final offer submitted by the employer, that is, one or the other. There is no compromise position. The arbitrator's decision would be binding on both parties.

Is this government intervention? No, this is not government intervention. This is a last ditch effort that the parties must go to if they cannot come to an agreement by themselves. We believe that a permanent and fair resolution process must be put in place, removed from the whims of government.

Back to work legislation has become too predictable and management and unions have come to count on it. What does it solve? We legislated the postal people back to work but they still do not have the contract settled. What does it resolve? We got the mail moving, reluctantly I suppose in lots of cases, but we do not have the contract resolved. How is that ever going to be resolved?

Would it not be far better if we did that sort of thing up front rather than wait for a work stoppage that polarizes everybody? Everybody has an opinion on whether or not there should be a work stoppage at the post office or other essential services. Then they are still faced with the dilemma of having to settle this contract. Sure the people are back to work but what has really been settled?

We believe that it is time for permanent legislation that would provide both sides with predictable rules and a timetable by which to negotiate.

The risk to Canadian jobs should be minimized as well. Not only will a significant number of jobs be lost in the export sector if these disputes cannot be resolved, but jobs at the ports will be at severe risk when alternative means to ship goods are utilized. The use of more reliable U.S. west coast ports would result in a loss of cargo and a loss to British Columbia ports.

• (1035)

The costly interruption of government business should not be allowed to occur. While there is a need for regulation by various levels of government, it is unnecessary to put emergency measures

Government Orders

in place each time labour and management are unable to reach a satisfactory agreement. Resolving the differences of the two groups can be achieved without interrupting the regular flow of government proceedings.

We are not talking about ending the collective bargaining process but making it work better through final offer selection arbitration. Every time back to work legislation is used, it usurps the collective bargaining process. Final offer selection works best when it is not used at all.

I would like to cite the Manitoba case. On February 10 an hon. member from Winnipeg told the House that this sort of mechanism was used sparingly. In fact the Manitoba relations board received only 97 applications in all the time that there was legislation in that province.

Of those 97 applications, only seven were ever ruled on by a final offer selector or arbitrator. Four went to the union package and three were ruled in the favour of the company. In the vast majority, 72 cases, the application was withdrawn because the parties returned to the bargaining table and found a satisfactory resolution by a more conventional means. This is a perfect example of final offer selection.

If the government does not like final offer selection, if it thinks that it has a bad connotation because it came from the Reform Party, which I suspect it does think that, then let it conjure up its own dispute settlement mechanism and call it whatever it wants. The government can call it the Liberal solution for all I care, as long as it works. A lot of people in Canada depend on these services, not only those people who directly depend on the service but, as I said before, also those people in downstream jobs and spin-off economies.

Any mechanism that causes both parties to work out an agreement through their normal negotiation process is a lot better than any legislation that puts an end to a contentious work stoppage.

Instead of including a dispute settlement mechanism in this bill, the drafters sought a solution to the problem at west coast ports. They ignored the recommendation of the west coast ports inquiry and opted for a provision that was not considered by the Sims commission.

We definitely support the concept of farmers moving their grain to markets unimpeded by labour disputes beyond their control. We think it is absolutely within the farmers' rights to be able to transport their product from the farm gate to the high seas. Maybe that is not an inherent right, but I believe that they should be supplied with the mechanisms to do that.

I have said before in this House when talking on agriculture bills, the problems of production are largely overcome, except for natural disasters which are caused by weather related problems.

The farming community has the technology, the expertise and the grain varieties to produce great crops if weather conditions prevail.

The production of crops is not the biggest barrier to making a living on the farm. Nowadays you have to pay attention to the marketing of those crops. If those crops are not marketed properly, you simply are going to go backward in your farming operation. It is absolutely vital that when the farmers' crops are ready to be sold, and there is a willing seller and a willing buyer, that they are able to be transported as far as the high seas to get them to their customers.

• (1040)

That sums up the fact that we believe farmers deserve a better deal than they are getting from this government.

Right now we have the assurances that if the grain gets to the port, I said if, it will be loaded on the ships. But there are a lot of unions between the farm gate and the port. If there is a work disruption anywhere along there, the grain simply does not get to the port. So what good is a mechanism that loads grain that is not in the port? It is absolutely worthless.

Besides, if we were to talk to people in the alfalfa dehydrating business who are also farmers, chemicals, sulphur and potash exporters and lumber producers all stand to lose millions of dollars. They would say that and ask "Where are our assurances that we can move our product? Our products are important too". Certainly they all admit that grain is important. Certainly they all admit that the work stoppages always seem to occur when there is grain to be shipped through the ports. But other products are extremely important to the producers, to the people they employ and to the Canadian economy.

People on the other side would say yes, yes but the work stoppages always come when grain is moved, and grain has been used as the ace in the hole. Now we are going to move grain. What now is going to become the ace in the hole?

Are we going to find that petrochemical producers can put as much political pressure on the government as the grain farmers did? Are we going to find that work stoppage somewhere in the transportation or at the ports is going to require parliament to reconvene and legislate people back to work because of a work stoppage in the transportation area? It is altogether possible.

Does this bill actually improve anything? I guess it improves things provided that grain continues to move to the port. It is a small baby step forward but we are not content with baby steps. Why not make some real progress? If this act is not going to be opened up for another 25 years, it is incumbent on us to do as much as we can in the time that we have.

I would like to talk a little about replacement workers. The provision on replacement workers could further impede the

Government Orders

movement of goods and services in Canada. The new Canada Industrial Relations Board created by this act will be able to deny employers the right to continue to operate, to earn a living by utilizing replacement workers or in some cases maybe even to reassign their own management employees.

Did it ever occur to the powers that be that if we had a dispute settlement mechanism in place, something of the type about which I have been talking, there would be no need for replacement workers in federally regulated workplaces? If the disputes could be settled without having to have these painful, polarizing, agonizing work stoppages, then there would be no need for replacement workers.

This is how the replacement worker issue should be addressed. I hear my colleague from Winnipeg saying not to call them replacement workers, to call them scabs. Some would say that a scab is something temporary while the healing process takes place underneath. I am not sure if that is exactly what my friend from Winnipeg is talking about.

I do not think it is fair either that we should be allowing any group of people, particularly in this case the industrial relations board, to get into a position where they can certify a union without a majority.

I heard the parliamentary secretary explain that the basis for union formation is that it will be done where there is majority support. That is all very well. I have no reason to distrust my colleague, the parliamentary secretary, but I would feel a lot better if those very thoughts of hers were codified, for instance, if we said in this bill something if we have indications that there may be the need, the want or the demand of the workers to form a union, the way to determine that is through a secret ballot vote. It would be exactly the way we are selected for this place, through a secret ballot vote.

● (1045)

Representatives from the labour movement say they we do not want that because there could be intimidation. I do not think there would be any more intimidation there than there is during a federal, provincial or municipal election. That is a tried and true process. We have been using it here for over 125 years, based on the model used in Britain.

It is very interesting to note that Britain has gone to the secret ballot method. Even the Labour government that has taken over from the Thatcherites has seen fit not to change that part of the labour law. I do not know what all the protest is about a secret ballot vote. Perhaps some day that will be addressed in this House.

Very unfortunately we only have less than two and a half hours to debate in the entire day today, so I am sure that this will not get

addressed. But I would like very much to be in a position where I could question the government on that very aspect.

We talk about certifying the union without a majority. Although the parliamentary secretary assures us this is not the intention of the bill, we have to look at recent history. There is a case in Ontario where the people at a Wal-Mart store in Windsor voted 151 to 43 against being certified by the union and had their wishes overturned by the Ontario labour relations board and had the union certified against the obvious wishes of the majority. There was a more than three to one majority and the Ontario labour relations board said "we think you people would have voted otherwise in different circumstances and therefore we are going to certify the union whether you want it or not". That is absolutely undemocratic at the best and totally asinine at the worst.

This bill, as its predecessor Bill C-66, is a piece of legislation that the Reform Party simply cannot support. We believe firmly in the right of people to organize and to withdraw their labour if necessary. But when we are talking about the only game in town, as in the case of the post office, or the ports, or the railways it is not as though a corner store goes on strike. It is an inconvenience but it is not a catastrophe. We can go to a different store, a store that is not in trouble with a work stoppage. But when the ports or the railway go on strike, we have no alternative at all.

That is the basis on which I base my remarks today. I thank the House again for allowing me to share my time with my colleague from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the undemocratic Bill C-19, an act to amend the labour code.

Much has been said about this controversial bill and I would like to begin with the fact that it is undemocratic in that the board does not necessarily have to consult employees on union matters.

● (1050)

This is absolutely unbelievable. In this country, as we are approaching a new millennium, that a board could force a union on employees without consulting them is simply unacceptable.

I am also shocked and disappointed by the way the Liberals have shut down debate on this bill. Their undemocratic action in imposing time allocation on such sweeping legislation reflects a complete abuse of their power and a contempt for the House.

Today, however, I would like to concentrate on something else. I would like to emphasize that the bill guarantees only protection for the movement of grain products in the case of a strike or a lockout. This is such an important issue in my riding. This is provided for in subsection 87.7 of the bill which ensures that grain, once it reaches port, will be shipped out to its final destination.

Government Orders

Although I am delighted to see that grain product movements are protected in these events, I have news for this government. Grain products are not the only agricultural products nor are they the only products subject to transportation and shipping which could be paralyzed in the event of a strike or a lockout. The transportation of such important commodities as pulp and paper, lumber and dairy products could also be paralyzed.

I find it ironic that the government has declared grain transportation essential in this case so long as it is ready to leave the country, while the government does not see fit to declare the movement of grain from the farmer to the port as an essential service, as we have all seen with the problems that have come out of rail line abandonment. This double standard is really puzzling.

In my home province of Saskatchewan the mining association is also concerned that only grain products will be guaranteed movement during a strike or a lockout. What about its products? What will happen to mining products in the event of a strike or a lockout? Has that question been addressed? No. This has been completely ignored. The question that needs to be asked is why one and not the other.

Such action is typical of this government. We have seen it time and again, people divided for the sake of being divided. We have seen this with the hepatitis C file dividing victims into before and after a certain date. We have seen this with Bill C-68, the gun control bill, which divides rural and urban Canadians on a line that did not need to be drawn.

By allowing only grain to be shipped out in such events could cause serious damage to the economy and to the country in terms of people getting along with one another.

I illustrate this by pointing out that in 1996 the total value of cargo that went through the port of Vancouver was \$30 billion and grain accounted for \$4 billion of that total. What does that amount to? It amounts to 15% grain and 85% for all other products. What about the other \$26 billion? Do we just ignore it if we are faced with a strike? It sounds like economic suicide for Canada or economic murder of unprotected sectors or individual businesses and their employees and shareholders.

Another important industry in my riding is the alfalfa dehydrating industry. I would like to thank the people from the industry who came here from my riding of Prince Albert for being effective in communicating their concerns about this bill to the official opposition. Obviously the government did not listen.

The alfalfa dehydration industry represents about \$100 million in exports. In my riding this industry accounts for approximately two-thirds of Saskatchewan's output. What about it? Shall we just ignore a \$100 million industry that forms an integral part of total

farming? I would think not. All products and commodities should be offered protection from arbitrary shipping disruption.

It is time we start protecting the economy of this country. For this reason we proposed to extend this provision of protection. This government, in its lack of wisdom, refuses such action. In fact, the miserable level of protection afforded Canada's agricultural sector in this legislation is comparable to allowing Canadian Tire to continue selling barbecues in the face of a company-wide strike. How much help would that be?

Section 87.4 of this bill allows for the continuation of service in a strike or lockout if there is a danger of public health or safety, which is a good thing, but there is no provision to protect the national economy which affects the livelihood of all Canadians. We feel this is necessary since the national economy is the key factor in providing Canadians with a good standard of living essential to the nation's health and well-being. Therefore it is not asking too much to want to see the national economy protected in a bill along with innocent third parties that could be affected by a strike or lockout.

• (1055)

We know labour strikes rarely affect only the company that suffers the strike. Some strikes cripple entire sectors of the economy. For example, we can look at the 1994 west coast port strike in which the direct costs of the strike were estimated to be more than \$125 million. The indirect costs suffered by third parties is twice that. It is estimated to be over \$250 million. This is a significantly higher number and it is important that third parties and the national economy be protected. Unfortunately our government did not see things in that light.

In the case of communication and transportation infrastructures any disruption to these sectors would have devastating consequences for the Canadian economy. A strike would not affect only our exports, it would have a dire impact on Canada's reputation throughout the world, possibly affecting future investors and clients interested in Canadian made products.

In light of this it will come as no surprise that the Reform Party is of the firm belief that the economy needs to be protected and that companies must always maintain the right to operate. Furthermore, unionized employees need timely resolution of their concerns which is not ensured under the present legislation. The right to operate means that a company faced with a strike has a right to hire replacement workers if they are available and willing to work, which is not always guaranteed. That is their right as well.

I was disappointed in the government when I found that section 94(2)2.1 of this bill prohibits the use of replacement workers if the Canadian Industrial Relations Board determines that their presence undermines the union. It is our opinion that this puts too much power in the hands of the industrial relations board and undermines the rights of the employer since it is unfairly biased in favour of the union. We find that unacceptable as well.

S. O. 31

We would have liked to see this bill amended so that in the event of another Canada Post strike such as the one we saw last year an arbitrator could be chosen by both the union and the employer to resolve the outstanding differences between the two parties. The arbitrator's final decision would be binding on both parties. That only makes good sense to the official opposition and to most right thinking Canadians.

For the reasons I have mentioned we oppose Bill C-19 and we call on all hon. members prior to voting on the bill to seriously consider the consequences of Bill C-19 if it becomes law. I am sure that if they do they will join with the official opposition in opposing this flawed and undemocratic legislation.

• (1100)

One notable senator in my home province of British Columbia is Senator Pat Carney. Senator Carney has been in the forefront of British Columbia issues such as the salmon treaty with the U.S. and retaining lighthouses on the west coast. Both of these are issues that the Liberal government has either failed to act on or has bungled miserably these past four and a half years.

Yesterday it was reported that Senator Carney checked into hospital in Prince Rupert with cardiac related problems. I want to take this opportunity to wish Senator Carney a speedy recovery. We want her back in her seat. Good senators are hard to come by.

* * *

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

STUDENTS

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, spring flowers are now in full bloom but I am not speaking about the flowers like the thousands of tulips around this fair city. I am referring to all the graduating students throughout our nation.

Our students are much like flowers. First we prepare the soil as a food rich base. As the flowers grow we take care by watering them and then beautiful colourful blooms reward our efforts.

For our students the soil is their educational institutions. The water is our assistance such as Canada student loans, the various tax credits or some 60,000 annual summer student jobs. Soon we will offering some 100,000 millennium scholarships each and every year starting in the year 2000. At the end we are rewarded with highly educated participants in the workforce, the blooms of our labour force.

I congratulate all the students in my riding of Hillsborough on their graduation. May all their colours shine through as they enter the labour force.

* * *

THE SENATE

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Fathers of Confederation established the Senate to give Canadians regional representation.

However, with the current patronage system most senators represent the political interests of the parties that appointed them. Few are accountable to the provinces they are supposed to represent. However, there are a few good senators who represent their regions and serve their constituents well.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North—St. Paul, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, National Police Week ends tomorrow. Canadians from coast to coast have been paying special tribute to those officers on the front line in the fight against crime. But police officers do much more than fight criminals.

This was recently displayed when two RCMP officers in Manitoba quickly stopped a wayward vehicle and administered CPR to the unconscious man at the wheel until the ambulance services arrived. The quick thinking and bold actions by Constables Claude Rochon and Marc Simard saved the life of that man who had suffered a heart attack while driving.

Let us salute Constables Rochon and Simard and all police officers in Canada during this special week. Their selfless dedication to protecting and serving our citizenry is testimony to our brave, capable and caring Canadian police officers who work hard to make our communities safer and who often do their job beyond their usual call of duty.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF FAMILIES

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian United Nations Association is marking the International Day of Families, which reminds us of the importance of the family as an institution.

As this millennium comes to a close and the concept of the traditional family has to share space with blended families and single-parent families, the family is still vital to personal development. Despite our greatly changing social institutions, the family survives, and its role continues to grow. It is a vital and influential element of society.

S. O. 31

Something that was said back in 1928 by a former Swedish Prime Minister, Mr. Hansson, is as valid today as ever: "In the home, there is equality, consideration and mutual assistance. Applied on a larger scale, this could lead to the breaking down of social and economic barriers between the privileged and the disadvantaged, between master and underling, between rich and poor."

* * *

[English]

SPEECH AND HEARING AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. Carolyn Parrish (Mississauga Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House and all Canadians that May is Speech and Hearing Awareness Month across Canada.

This is an opportunity to educate Canadians about the challenges faced by the deaf and hard of hearing. An estimated one in ten Canadians is deaf or has some degree of hearing loss. Those most likely to be affected are seniors.

In this era of advanced technology we recognize the importance of being aware of and improving the situation of those with hearing related communication disorders. Speech and Hearing Awareness Month is recognized by voluntary and professional organizations across Canada. These organizations are planning special activities for the month of May.

Please join me in congratulating the national, provincial and regional organizations, service agencies, consumer groups, professionals and volunteers who through their programs continue to improve the quality of life for the deaf and the hard of hearing in Canada.

* * *

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Guelph—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of attending the official launch of the North American Occupational Safety and Health Week. It is being held from May 18 to 24.

The week has become an annual event which runs concurrently in Canada, the United States and Mexico. It is sponsored by the Commissioner for Labour Co-operation created under the North American Agreement on Labour Co-operation.

The objective of the week is to focus attention on the importance of preventing injury and illness in the workplace. This year's theme is "Occupational, Safety and Health: Partners Together in Safety".

Increasing awareness and promoting safe and healthy work practices can save lives. This is why this annual event is so important.

I know hon. members join me in wishing the participants much success in the important educational work they will undertake next week.

* * *

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, besides verbal jabs from members opposite, parliamentarians face few work related dangers. Many other Canadians however are exposed to serious occupational hazards on a daily basis.

For the second consecutive year, the three NAFTA partners designated the week of May 18 as North American Occupational Health and Safety Week. This year's theme "Partners Together in Safety" emphasizes the ongoing need for a balance in labour-management relations.

Just as it is the employer's responsibility to provide employees with safety training and a secure work environment, it is incumbent on workers to take precautions to prevent accidents. The onus is on each one of us to become safety conscious to protect our co-workers and reduce workplace injuries. The reality is that while accidents can happen to anyone, anywhere and in any job, most accidents can be avoided.

● (1105)

Since many of us will visit businesses, farms and factories during the recess, it is an opportune time for us to spread the word about the need—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Perth—Middlesex.

* * *

NORTH AMERICAN AEROSPACE DEFENCE COMMAND

Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 40th anniversary of the formal creation of the North American Aerospace Defence Command, known as NORAD.

I am proud to acknowledge the dedication and professionalism of the men and women of the command, both Canadian and American, past and present, who have stood shoulder to shoulder in the common defence of our continent.

NORAD has been a cornerstone of Canada-United States defence co-operation for 40 years. It has evolved significantly from its earliest mission of defending against Soviet manned bomber attack.

As well as monitoring any threats to North American airspace, NORAD monitors manmade objects in space to warn of possible accidents and assists law enforcement agencies in monitoring aircraft that may be involved in drug trafficking.

I know my colleagues will join me in offering a heartfelt thanks to those vigilant guardians who continue to provide all Canadians with a sense of security by watching over our airspace.

* * *

THE FAMILY

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is International Day of Families. The United Nations initiated this day to encourage everyone from every community around the world to celebrate the importance of families in our lives.

The family plays a vital role in the well-being of humankind. Throughout much of the developing world the family is the sole support for its members. For these people, the family is their society and their strength.

In Canada we enjoy an excellent social support system, but nothing could be more important than the support of our families. The relationship between parents and children, brothers and sisters, grandparents and grandchildren should be celebrated today.

This holiday weekend is an excellent opportunity for all families to get together. I encourage all Canadians to plan activities and celebrate with their loved ones.

* * *

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the Minister of Justice issued a discussion paper on reforms to the Young Offenders Act.

In June 1997 the same minister proclaimed that amending the Young Offenders Act was a priority. Here we are almost one year later and there is no sign of legislation, no sign even of draft legislation. Instead Canadians are given a document which contains few specifics, few details and no concrete proposal for changing the act.

If the minister lacks the leadership and the political skills to address the important issue of youth crime, then perhaps she should get out of the way and allow the official opposition to take up the mantle.

The Reform Party advocates a three-pronged approach in dealing with youth crime. This would include an early detection and prevention strategy, community based sentencing for non-violent offenders and ensuring that the Young Offenders Act applies to youth between the ages of 10 and 15.

The bottom line is that Canadians are concerned about their safety. It is too bad that—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Oakville.

S. O. 31

NATIONAL NURSING WEEK

Ms. Bonnie Brown (Oakville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to remind members of the House and all Canadians that this week, May 11 to 17, is National Nursing Week. The theme is "Nursing is the Key" which appropriately emphasizes the pivotal role that nurses play in delivering quality health care to all Canadians.

This year, 1998, marks the 90th anniversary of the Canadian Nurses Association. This association has consistently worked to advance the quality of nursing by promoting high standards of practice, education and research.

There are now over 200,000 nurses practising in Canada. Please join me in recognizing their committed caring service to Canadians.

To the nurses of Canada I want to say, we salute you and we thank you.

* * *

BANKS

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week in London at the opening of Canada House, an embassy that is really owned by the people and the parliament of this country, guess who held a dinner at Canada House? The BCNI, the Business Council on National Issues.

Guess who was at the dinner? The Prime Minister was there and Al Flood was there. He is the president and CEO of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce. Guess what they were doing? They were sipping champagne and eating caviar. And they were doing this at taxpayers' expense. Ordinary people of this country, senior citizens like George Armstrong in my riding, are paying for the Prime Minister to sip champagne and eat caviar with the president of a big bank.

• (1110)

Guess who this bank wants to merge with? It wants to merge with the Toronto-Dominion Bank. Who was on the board of the TD bank a few years ago? The Prime Minister was on that board a few years ago.

Earlier in the day the Prime Minister was also sipping champagne and who was he doing that with? Matthew Barrett, the president of the Bank of Montreal. That is improper—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle.

S. O. 31

[*Translation*]

SOMMET DE LA FRANCOPHONIE

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today in Moncton the minister responsible for Francophonie is officially opening the offices of the secretariat for the Sommet de la Francophonie, in preparation for the next summit, to be held in 1999.

This summit is a significant landmark in the increasing recognition of francophones. The summit also offers a forum for the exchange of information and cultural values between countries which share a common language and the desire to map out a consistent path toward extending their influence throughout the world.

This stage in the process also marks a concrete commitment by the Canadian government to ensuring that this summit will contribute to the unity of all francophone peoples sharing values as essential as language and culture.

We wish every success to those who will be working so diligently in these Moncton offices in preparation for a summit that is important for the future of all francophones.

* * *

[*English*]

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER UNIVERSITY

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, on May 3, St. Francis Xavier University, situated in my riding in Nova Scotia in the beautiful town of Antigonish, added hundreds of new faces to its illustrious alumni with the graduation of 733 students during the university's spring convocation.

I had the privilege of attending this momentous occasion for graduating students and their families. I was pleased to meet many of the new members of the class of 1998 who are poised to make a significant contribution to their communities, their country and in some instances the world.

In particular I would like to salute the graduating students from my riding who earned university medals. The medal winners were: Kristina Fabijancic and Janise MacIsaac, both of Antigonish, and Belinda Ann Cameron of New Glasgow. As stated by this year's honorary degree recipient, His Eminence Cardinal Carter, St. Francis Xavier is a treasure for the country.

Congratulations to the St. F.X. graduates, the latest riches of our country's treasure.

CALGARY DECLARATION

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with Monday's report describing the results of Ontario's consultation process on the Calgary declaration.

Ontarians clearly support this declaration. This has been demonstrated by the responses received during the public consultation process. The poll released at the same time shows that 87% of Ontarians support the Calgary declaration and 73% of Ontarians recognize the unique character of Quebec society.

[*Translation*]

In the light of the results of this vigorous poll and the many other positive results of polls across the country, the figures the Bloc keeps repeating on the Calgary declaration have lost a lot of meaning.

Clearly Canadians support the values of compassion, equality, tolerance and diversity expressed in the Calgary declaration. Canadians should be proud of this demonstration of support for one another.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, at the defence committee in response to hearing about the mistreatment of injured soldier Master Corporal Dohlan, the chief of defence staff said that he would personally ensure that the family was well looked after.

That was three weeks ago, but when I phoned Mrs. Dohlan Wednesday night, what she reported was quite frankly sickening. "The military has abandoned us", she reported. Mrs. Dohlan must look after her husband, who was seriously injured in a parachute accident, as well as her five young children. She feels desperate. All she asks is that the military pay her expenses for driving her injured husband to the hospital twice a week and cover child care. Some home care would be nice, she said.

She is not exactly asking for \$2 million for some big retirement party. Instead she has been given a duty driver who is expensive and unwanted.

Is this how an injured soldier and his family are treated when they are getting the special attention of the chief of defence staff? If that is the way they are treated, then how on earth are all other injured soldiers being treated?

Oral Questions

[Translation]

**ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE POUR
L'AVANCEMENT DES SCIENCES**

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this week, Laval University is hosting the most important scientific get-together in the francophone world: the 66th congress of the Association canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences, which is taking place in Quebec City from May 10 to 15 with, as its theme, the future of science in Quebec.

There are 5,000 delegates to the ACFAS conference, and some 10,000 visitors are expected to spend the week on the university campus where they will have the opportunity to hear 3,000 scientific talks on subjects ranging from polymer physics to the family to computer art.

• (1115)

Research and development are the pillars of the knowledge economy. They present a major challenge for the future for all societies wishing to advance into the 21st century.

Quebec has closed the gap between it and the other regions of Canada and is now ahead of Denmark, Italy and Norway. In this regard, ACFAS will continue to act as a catalyst, especially by promoting science in Quebec society and encouraging young people to take up the challenge.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hep C compensation meetings yesterday were, in my view, a farce. The victims left those meetings feeling betrayed. They felt betrayed because the health minister went to that meeting and sat meekly in the corner without a position. He was seeking a consensus, while the victims wanted a position from the federal government.

How could this minister have gone to those meetings without a well researched, well thought out federal government position?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the meeting yesterday produced progress. The member should know that although no final conclusion was reached, the ministers agreed that a working group would examine options which will enable us to do something meaningful for all those who suffer from hepatitis C as a result of the blood system. That working group will get

under way immediately. It will work over the short term to present fully researched options to all ministers.

We continue to prefer a national approach to this issue. That was the view of those around the table yesterday. Unilateral action is not the answer. We will continue to work in the public interest.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the hepatitis C issue has degenerated into face saving for the Liberals. The Prime Minister is on record as saying that on his watch there will be no resignations, no backsliding and no face saving. This has ended up saving the image of the Prime Minister rather than looking after the victims. Is this not taking the politics of stubbornness to its newest low?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows there was a consensus among all governments in late March. Two governments rejected that consensus and went off in a different direction. At yesterday's meeting that sort of unilateralism was deplored by the vast majority of Canadian governments. Instead we renewed our commitment to finding a national approach to this issue. A working group has been put in place over the short term to look at the options for a national approach. That is the way governments can act most effectively in the interest of all those infected with hepatitis C through the blood system.

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health may use this study group as a hiding tactic, but the victims will not let that happen. They are willing to follow this minister and every Liberal this summer. They are going to go to every parade. They are going to go to every ribbon cutting. They are going to go to every celebration. The hepatitis C signs will be there. They will not give up. The opposition will not give up until the the victims of hepatitis C have fair and just compensation. When will they get it?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if it was not evident before now what this man is, we all see it for ourselves today. He is the ambulance chaser of Canadian politics.

It was pathetic. While ministers yesterday were upstairs working toward a solution, this man was in the lobby straining to get into the camera shot with the victims. He is a disgrace. He lowers the level of debate.

Those of us who are committed to a real solution will continue to work toward it.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will tell you about the commitment of the member for Macleod. He has had to help people who have been in ambulances. This minister may have seen them in court, but he has never in his life helped a person out of an ambulance.

Oral Questions

This health minister has failed dismally every step of the way. The file has been pried open despite his efforts to keep it closed. Why does the minister not admit that he did not take a position into that meeting yesterday because he did not want the meeting to succeed? The hepatitis C victims have been let down and this minister let them down by leading the way.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member has no idea what went on inside the meeting yesterday, so I will tell him. Ministers sat around the table and examined the options available to governments to help those who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system.

• (1120)

We agreed that a national approach with all governments working together is the best approach. The governments ought not to act unilaterally. Then we agreed over the short term to ask a working group to examine the options available to us so we can select the best one.

That is the responsible way to proceed in these circumstances.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the leadership of the Hepatitis C Society now openly condemns the health minister, saying, from firsthand experience, that he cannot be trusted. They have said that he has a duty to help those people in need and he has failed miserably. He had a duty to bring a position to that meeting and he failed to do that.

He has but one duty left. Will he perform it? Will he do his duty and resign as the health minister of this country?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a result of this government's leadership there are 22,000 victims of hepatitis C who received an offer of compensation from all governments. Where was the Reform Party last year? Where was the Reform Party last winter when that work was going on? It is this government which led that effort.

Yesterday this government led the effort to pursue a national approach to this issue and we will work with governments, as we have in the past, until a solution is found.

I can tell the hon. member that all governments are committed to an approach that is in the interest of all those who suffer from hepatitis C as a result of the blood system.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Health.

If the minister had truly shown leadership, as he claims, he would have had something to show us yesterday. He should admit his responsibility and be prepared to put up the money to resolve the hepatitis C problem. Instead, he has done nothing.

Will he admit what all observers are saying today, that his real mandate was to make sure the conference failed?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is mistaken. Yesterday, we discussed a co-ordinated approach by all governments with all ministers, including the minister from Quebec. We agreed to have a task force and to look at all our options together.

We feel that a co-ordinated Canada-wide approach is in the best interest of hepatitis C victims. That is this government's objective.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister should understand that what victims want is not studies, but compensation. They are fed up to the teeth with this minister's studies, which keep going over the same ground, but never produce a solution.

Will the minister admit that his government is quite simply incapable of showing compassion, although it is not for lack of funds.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was the Government of Canada that initiated the process to compensate hepatitis C victims 12 months ago.

Quebec declined to take part last July, last fall and in January of this year. We have finally persuaded them to join us. It was the Government of Canada that set this process in motion.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Today, we expect the federal government will announce a budget surplus of between \$4 and \$8 billion for the 1997-98 fiscal year.

Does the minister realize that, with such a surplus, the government has ample means to express its compassion and that it should compensate all victims of hepatitis C?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, together we are looking for a way to treat all those who have contracted hepatitis C through the public blood supply system appropriately. This is the objective of all governments. We are trying to come up with a collective approach.

Every year, Quebec and the other provinces receive money for their health care systems from the Government of Canada through transfers. We share this responsibility annually.

• (1125)

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health could not get cabinet to accept his viewpoint. He has lost all credibility. Why does he not resign?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I reflect cabinet's, the caucus' viewpoint. We are all committed to a national approach in looking after the interests of those people who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system. This is the aim of every member of caucus on this side of the House.

[English]

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, you can lead a horse to water but you can't make him drink.

The health minister had an opportunity yesterday to show leadership, to make a difference. He failed and he failed miserably. He claimed he would be going to the table with an open mind. The truth is that he went to the table with a closed wallet.

Will the health minister now admit that he sabotaged the hepatitis C talks yesterday by failing to put any federal money on the table?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable how knowledgeable all these members opposite are about a meeting which they did not attend.

The members opposite should know that the Government of Canada has a responsibility to co-ordinate the efforts of all the provincial governments which will act together to find a solution that is co-ordinated in the interest of all those who have hepatitis C as a result of the blood system.

They can say what they want about the meeting they did not attend. We are going to work away to find a solution that is in the interest of those who are affected.

[Translation]

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health has lost sight of reality. The victims of hepatitis C are appealing to the values of justice and compassion dear to the hearts of Canadians. Compensation for all is fair and income support for victims is compassionate.

The Minister of Health has no heart. When is the government going to call a meeting of the premiers to respond once and for all to the needs of the victims?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reality is that all those who have contracted hepatitis C need a united and co-ordinated approach by all governments in Canada. This is the process we are committed to.

Oral Questions

Yesterday we began, with a working group, to look at all available options and, in the coming weeks, we will clarify the government's positions in order to find a consensus. This is the responsible approach.

* * *

[English]

CANADA CUSTOMS

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Minister of Health is like talking to a brick wall, so I will go in another direction.

The Cedarville wharf on Lake Mephrmagog is an official Canada-U.S. border crossing site for boaters and snowmobilers. However, Canada Customs has decided to download the cost of maintaining the wharf to the municipality of Ogden. Now Ogden has requested assistance from the government to help maintain the wharf, since it is a border crossing, and the request has been flatly denied.

Will the Minister of National Revenue explain the government's policy regarding offloading costs to municipalities and tell this House why Ogden's request was denied?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows with regard to the Cedarville wharf that the wharf was sold to the municipality by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for one dollar.

It is the responsibility of the municipality to maintain that wharf, not the responsibility of Canada Customs. Under section 6 of the Customs Act there should be no charges imposed, just as it is across the country in all of our other facilities.

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, what the minister does not seem to understand is that the other ones are federal wharves. This is not a federal wharf. It is a municipal wharf. In the meantime, the municipality is now charging other people to use the wharf.

Canada Customs is now using the wharf also, parking trailers on the wharf, using all kinds of services and not paying a cent for them. That is not fair.

Maybe the minister could try to explain how he can get away with this.

• (1130)

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Revenue Canada is following its normal policies where facilities are provided. This is very normal in other parts of Canada and in other locations where facilities are provided for customs people.

Oral Questions

We would be happy to provide more information for the hon. member. Obviously he is not aware of the way we respond to the same matter across the country. I would be happy to provide more information for him.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government has again failed the victims of tainted blood. The meeting yesterday between the federal health minister and his provincial counterparts was a disaster. It was a disaster because the senior partner, the federal Minister of Health, went to this negotiation with absolutely no position.

Is the minister prepared to accept responsibility for that failure, or will he simply blame the victims of tainted blood for wanting justice?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we all understand why it is in the interest of the member to speak that way. It is part of the political process for him, I suppose.

Those of us who were at the meeting know there is a continuing interest on the part of provincial governments to find a co-ordinated response to this national tragedy and to find a way to deal with the matter that is in the interest of all those who got hepatitis C through the blood system.

The member and his colleagues can prattle on about what they think happened yesterday, but I am here to tell them what happened yesterday. What happened yesterday was the first step toward another co-ordinated approach to find a national—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Okanagan—Coquihalla.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians heard the government's position yesterday from the victims of hepatitis C who were at the meeting. The government's position lacks compassion and is extreme.

The person to blame is the Prime Minister of Canada. The Prime Minister of Canada has been teasing the victims of hepatitis C. The Minister of Health for weeks has been holding out hope that a new deal would be reached and nothing new was produced yesterday.

What is the government doing? What kind of twisted game is being played?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member what we are doing. We are working with all governments in the country to find a way to deal with the interest of all those who got hepatitis C through the blood system.

Yesterday at the meeting of ministers there was strong agreement that it is not in the interest of the people who got hepatitis C for governments to act unilaterally. The way to deal with the matter is to look at what care is needed, efforts to find cures and treatments, and efforts to deal with the needs of those who are sick or have other compelling circumstances. Doing that together is the answer. Yesterday was an important milestone on the road—

* * *

[Translation]

DAVID LEVINE

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

The government has a responsibility to ensure the enforcement of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Yesterday, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs once again added fuel to the fire by refusing to clearly condemn the demonstrations in opposition to David Levine's hiring to head the Ottawa Hospital.

By sanctioning this witch-hunt at Mr. Levine's expense, is the government not sending a message that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms does not apply to Quebec sovereignists or those under suspicion of being sovereignists?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see that the Bloc Québécois is now fully accepting the Canadian Constitution, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on the one side, we have the hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester also adding fuel to the fire by calling for Mr. Levine's dismissal because of his alleged political views. On the other, we have the hon. member for Ottawa—Vanier making far more respectful comments.

What, exactly, is the government position?

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, the federal government is not the one to hire or fire hospital directors, as you know. That is the role of the hospital board.

I too am very pleased to hear about the Bloc Québécois' respect for the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, particularly when, on September 29, 1994, the Deputy Premier of Quebec made a statement concerning a government employee to the effect that "A diplomat representing Quebec abroad who is unable to present the aspect of Quebec reality that is our path toward sovereignty is not qualified for his job".

Oral Questions

• (1135)

*[English]***HEPATITIS C**

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on the hepatitis C issue, the health minister does not even know how to get to the end of a parade. How would we expect him to get to the head of the parade and show some compassion when the Prime Minister has directed or dictated to him otherwise?

Why does this health minister not simply admit that the Prime Minister ordered him not to offer compensation to all hepatitis C victims?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to finding a way, with other governments in Canada, to assist those who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system. Yesterday we established a working group that will examine all options which will enable us to do that.

I think Canadians know, and certainly those infected with hepatitis C through the blood system know, that unilateral action by one province or another is not the answer. A co-ordinated approach is necessary, and it is that approach to which we are committed.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, he very typically avoided the question again. The health minister was simply obeying his master in all this. If his master, the Prime Minister, had shown some leadership, hepatitis C victims would not be worrying today about how they will care for their families.

The Prime Minister has stubbornly refused to show compassion so we do not have a fair deal today. Why is the Prime Minister proving to be the single greatest obstacle to reaching an agreement that will end the oppression of these people?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remind the member that it is through the leadership of the Prime Minister and his government that 22,000 people who contracted hepatitis C through the blood system have been offered very reasonable compensation and assistance.

That is the kind of leadership that galvanized the provincial ministers who were initially unwilling to move and that resulted in a very significant change in that regard.

* * *

*[Translation]***IMMIGRATION**

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

A protectionist American law restricts the hiring of foreign players by any major baseball team by limiting to 50 the number of work permits for non-American players coming up through their minor league system. A perverse consequence of this legislation is that Canadian baseball players need an American work permit to play with the Ottawa Lynx.

Does the minister think it is right that a protectionist American law should also apply in Canada and prevent Canadian players from playing baseball in their own country?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised an interesting question that has more to do with American than Canadian law.

Speaking on behalf of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, we will take the question under advisement and provide the hon. member with a more complete answer at a later date.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is what is needed, more complete answers.

Does the minister intend to take steps to end this discrimination, which limits opportunities for Canadian baseball players to play professionally, as soon as possible?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, I must thank the hon. member for taking a pan-Canadian political position instead of a separatist one.

* * *

*[English]***HEPATITIS C**

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

He tells us that the meeting went fine yesterday and that everything is moving ahead. We were not there so we have to take his word for it.

Let us listen to what the minister for Ontario says. The Ontario health minister says:

The lack of proposals from Ottawa will frustrate victims and disappoint Canadians.

We came looking for actions and asking the federal government to provide financial assistance to those who were infected with hepatitis C prior to 1986 and we did not get any response.

Will the minister stop attacking the member for Macleod who has brought this issue to Canadians and to where it is today and tell Canadians what their—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the government a year ago putting this item on the agenda and if it were not for the government persuading provincial

Oral Questions

governments to take the issue seriously, there would be no discussion of hepatitis C compensation and no offer to the 22,000 victims between 1986 and 1990.

Coming to the member's question I can report from yesterday's meeting another development. The governments of the country deplored the kind of unilateral action taken by Ontario. When the minister from Ontario goes to the microphone to condemn the Government of Canada she is asking—

The Deputy Speaker: On a supplementary question, the member for Edmonton—Strathcona.

• (1140)

Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this working group is a step backward, not a step forward. It will not be working on ways and criteria for compensating all hepatitis C victims like Krever recommended. Its mandate is to determine whether or not there can be compensation. What a joke.

Why is the minister putting the so-called working group ahead of the royal commission report? Why will he not compensate all hepatitis C victims instead of coming up with more excuses?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should know that Jeremy Beatty of the Hepatitis C Society has said that he and his group are prepared to work with the working group examining the options. So have other representatives of affected groups.

The options that the working group will examine are options that will enable governments to act together to deal with the interest of all those who got hepatitis C through the blood system. That is the purpose. Those options are constructive and they will all be examined.

* * *

[Translation]

VARENNES TOKAMAK PROJECT

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

Two weeks ago, in response to my question concerning the Tokamak project in Varennes, the Minister of Natural Resources said it was unlikely that any results in the short term, say within five or ten years, could help further issues like climate change.

Does the minister recognize that the impact of climate change will be extremely long lasting and that a sound vision for the future in this respect depends on research and development of renewable energy of the type that was being conducted at Tokamak in Varennes?

[English]

Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this department and this government are very concerned about environmental issues.

As a department we are very engaged in research. Science is the basis of the department. We are working collaboratively with provinces across the country to make sure that we focus on major priority issues.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

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

In view of the latest proposal in Newfoundland to export water, and considering the important non-commercial role water plays within its natural watershed in the maintenance of a healthy ecosystem, could the Minister of the Environment indicate whether she plans to introduce legislation this fall banning water exports?

Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned as Minister of the Environment for the security of our freshwater resources.

My department is reviewing our freshwater policy which has been in place since 1987. As part of our review I am meeting with provinces this summer to set our priorities with them.

At the moment we do not have legislation which specifically legislates against the export of freshwater, but one of our priorities could be to put such legislation in place.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, all victims who contracted HIV tainted blood prior to 1986 were compensated.

Could the minister explain why hepatitis C victims who contracted their disease by the same tainted blood during the same period of time will not be compensated?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have had this exchange before in the House. The government of the day which offered compensation to those infected with HIV acknowledged that there was something that could have been done and should have done during that period but was not done. It accepted responsibility for that.

I want the member to recall that all governments will be participating in the working group which over the next several weeks will look for ways we can act together to accommodate the interest of all those who contracted HCV through the blood system.

Oral Questions

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for weeks now we have heard from the Liberal backbenches that there was hope the file was open.

The member for St. Paul's, the member for Sarnia—Lambton and the member for Gatineau all made promises of compensation. Yet the government delivered nothing.

Is the Deputy Prime Minister proud of the fact that he killed both the hopes of the victims and the integrity of his backbenchers?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we would not be having this exchange in question period at all if the federal government had not shown leadership, brought the provinces to the table and put \$800 million on the table. That is why we are having this discussion.

Now that two of the provinces broke the original consensus, as the Minister of Health has said, we have gone back to talk with them to try to develop a new consensus. That is why this working group is taking place. If Reform is sincere and serious it should be supporting this working group process instead of attacking it.

• (1145)

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday B.C.'s minister of health said that the federal government knows it will have to move in some direction, but we just do not know what direction.

The federal government seems to be the only government which came to the table yesterday without any position at all.

How can a consensus be developed when we do not know the views of all the players? How could the Minister of Health in all conscience have gone to the table yesterday with no money and nothing to say?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday there were a number of views expressed around the table. There was also a clear awareness first of all that governments should try to find a way acting together to accommodate the interests of those who got hep C through the blood system.

Second, there was no consensus yesterday and there cannot be one until the options are fully understood, their implications investigated and we have the facts before ministers. That is what Canadians would want us to do, take a responsible position, not simply act unilaterally, to find a truly lasting solution.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the matter of hepatitis C has been before the House and the Canadian public daily for six weeks.

The Canadian consensus is clear, fair compensation for all. What other options are left for the minister to consider?

Yesterday the minister did a great disservice to blood injured Canadians by not bringing a position to the table.

Today could the minister tell all Canadians what is the position of the federal government? Is there new money on the table for compensation, yes or no? Does the government support the principle of fair compensation for all hepatitis C victims, yes or no?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada as an objective has a consensus position among governments that will deal with the interests of those who got hep C through the blood system.

Yesterday we identified a variety of options, put them before a working group to come back to ministers with the facts and the implications so that ministers can recommend to their governments a co-ordinated approach. That is what Canadians would want responsible governments and ministers to do.

* * *

JOB CREATION

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, a major Liberal promise of the 1993 election campaign was job creation.

We have all heard those promises of jobs, jobs, job. However, according to the 1996 census there are over 2,500 fewer jobs in my constituency of West Nova than there were in 1991.

When is the government going to live up to its promise of job creation and by what means will it going to encourage industry to invest in our small rural communities?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, jobs have been the preoccupation of the government.

This is why since we took office there have been over 1 million new jobs created, 450,000 in the last year alone. Unemployment has gone from 11.4% down to 8.4%. We have the highest job creation growth in the G-7. We have the highest economic growth rate in the G-7. Interest rates across the board are now lower than American rates.

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. member that there are provinces other than Ontario.

With the serious downturn in the fishery and with the agricultural sector struggling to overcome numerous obstacles including last year's devastating drought West Nova residents are very concerned about the kind of future they will be able to offer their children.

Oral Questions

The 1996 census report recorded a decline of over 2,600 people in West Nova since 1991. Our children, our future, are leaving our rural areas in droves.

Can the Minister of Human Resources tell us what specific programs he is looking at to assist our young people to stay in our rural communities?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the future of Canada's young people is the future of all of us.

This is why we have allocated so much in tax cuts and new funding to ensure that young Canadians are the best trained and the best educated in the world.

We have been able to do this in spite of incredible budget difficulties.

• (1150)

We have been able to do this at a time when we have balanced our budget, the first in the G-7, when we are now paying down our debt without ripping the guts out of our social programs.

* * *

MET LIFE

Ms. Marlene Catterall (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions.

The proposed purchase of Met Life, an Ottawa institution, by Mutual Life has already led to layoff notices for hundreds of people and will lead to hundreds of more people losing their jobs within the next year.

The severance packages offered to these unfortunate people are far less generous than the average that have been ordered by the courts, well at the bottom range and even less for lower income workers.

What will the government do to make sure that these hundreds of people—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions.

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for Ottawa West—Nepean who is also the chair of the national capital Liberal caucus.

From the very start, when this merger was announced, the member has taken a leadership role in bringing these concerns to the attention of the government and our caucus.

I assure the member we have been listening. We will continue to consult. We will continue to work with her. The merger has not yet been approved.

I thank her for the very diligent work and the leadership role she has shown.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, while hepatitis C takes up permanent residence in the liver and blood of thousands of Canadians, it is becoming obvious that compassion has been evicted from the government they trusted.

Does anyone on that side of the House have the courage to look Canadians straight in the eyes and tell them they belong to a government that cares?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we can say to Canadians that we are the government that put this issue on the agenda, that encouraged provincial governments to join with us in taking responsibility for a period when people were infected because something could have been done that was not.

We are the government that is now co-ordinating efforts toward a national approach in the interests of all hep C victims. This government is very proud of the commitment it has shown for that cause.

* * *

[Translation]

INDONESIA

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

At a time when there is growing public pressure to demand that the dictator in Indonesia leave, we learn that a rebellion is brewing within his government.

Jakarta is now the scene of bloody riots. What concrete action, other than simply trying to book seats on commercial flights, does the government intend to take to bring home safely and as quickly as possible any Canadians and Quebeckers who may still be in Indonesia?

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Laval East, with whom I just spent 12 days touring Latin America.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. David Kilgour: It's true. Arrangements are being made as we speak to evacuate all Canadians from that country. We are trying to avert any danger in this situation. There is full agreement still on the points raised by the hon. member. I think I can assure my colleague that Canada is doing everything to evacuate everyone who has to be evacuated.

DAVID LEVINE

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, there is a witch hunt going on in the national capital. Some are calling for the resignation of David Levine, the new director of the Ottawa Hospital, because of his political beliefs.

All the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs had to say about it was that it is deplorable, but understandable. Indeed, it violates the charter of rights and freedoms.

Does the Deputy Prime Minister realize the damage caused to Canadian unity by the narrow-minded attitude of his colleague?

Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hiring of hospital directors does not concern the Canadian government in any way.

• (1155)

It is up to the individual to invoke the charter of rights and freedoms if he feels that the policy of Ottawa hospitals infringes on his rights.

I think the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has done and continues to do a great job.

* * *

[English]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, in the past week the government has asked the RCMP to investigate leaks in relation to TAGS and the justice minister's youth crime policy. Both these leaks are important but probably do not have criminal consequences.

On the other hand, when a very serious leak of confidential information from HRDC to the office of the Treasury Board to a criminal Liberal Party fundraiser happens, the government does not see any reason to investigate.

We know the RCMP has investigated illegal influence peddling. When will the government investigate the HRDC Treasury Board leak?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been an inquiry in all the facts that have been mentioned. That inquiry has taken place at the request of the government. The government has fully co-operated with that inquiry, and I say it slowly because it takes time to penetrate.

That inquiry is concluded. There has been one person charged. That person has pleaded guilty and has been convicted.

*Oral Questions***THE FAMILY**

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that the quality of early childhood care has a significant impact on the physical, mental and social health outcomes of children. We also know that healthy children mean stronger families and ultimately a stronger country.

As today, May 15, is the international day of the family, can the Secretary of State for Children and Youth tell the House what the Government of Canada is doing to promote and strengthen the Canadian family?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. The government's commitment to families is solid and abundantly evidenced by way of the national children's—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew: I know they do not care about families over there. They do not care about anything, actually.

We will have made an investment of \$1.7 billion by the year 2000. We have made provisions in EI for low income family supplement. We are also working with our provincial partners to develop the national children's agenda. There is much more that can be said.

* * *

HEPATITIS C

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, for months now we have listened to this Liberal government on the hepatitis C issue and this minister, excuses, blaming others, hiding behind the working groups' coat tails. He even takes those who look after the victims and calls them ambulance chasers.

Might I remind him that to a lawyer an ambulance chaser is the lowest of the low, but to a doctor an ambulance chaser is trying to do what is right. He is a lawyer. I am a doctor. I say no more. There is only one thing left to do. Will the health minister resign?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think we struck a nerve. We have identified exactly what the member has been doing these last few weeks. He showed it again yesterday when he tried to get into the camera shots with representatives of the hepatitis C groups.

On this side of the House we are focusing on solutions. On this side of the House we are working with governments. On this side of the House we are committed to a co-ordinated approach by all governments that will be in the interests of the victims, not for

Routine Proceedings

narrow political purposes but because we are concerned about the health and the care of those who are ill.

* * *

[Translation]

SNOW GEESE

Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Saint-Eustache—Sainte-Thérèse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment.

The snow geese management plan included an experimental project to look at the effectiveness of various hunting techniques. Environment Canada has just released its integrated management plan for snow geese, but there are no provisions on reducing the number of geese.

Will the federal government pledge to compensate farmers for the damage done to their fields by the geese?

• (1200)

[English]

Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity this past fall to visit with those people in Quebec who are most affected by the issue of the large population of snow geese in their area. A multisectoral group is working with the federal government to find a solution to the problem. I am very pleased to report significant progress is being made by this group.

* * *

SENIORS BENEFITS

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. It is now well known that the government is making changes to the proposed seniors benefits package. Despite those changes, the seniors benefit would still end universality of old age pensions in this country. Universality is a principle strongly supported the Canadian people.

In light of that, will the Deputy Prime Minister today make a commitment to withdraw the seniors benefits package and maintain universal old age pensions for all Canadians?

Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have taken very responsible actions to ensure seniors pensions will be there, that seniors will be given a secure and dignified retirement. We have brought down a package that would increase the pensions for 75% of seniors.

At the same time, we continue to work with seniors groups and we continue to listen. We have this case under advisement and we want to make sure we do the right thing for our seniors. That is why

we will continue to consult and to work on this package. I thank the member for his question.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A), 1998-99

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates (A) for the financial year ending March 31, 1999 was presented by the President of the Treasury Board and read by the Deputy Speaker to the House.

* * *

[Translation]

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the great honour to table in the House today, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments which were made recently by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the appropriate standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to two petitions.

* * *

• (1205)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**NATIONAL DEFENCE**

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs in relation to its consideration of Bill C-25, an act to amend the National Defence Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as amended.

I would also like to mention the excellent co-operation of committee members from all parties, and thank the staff of the Library of Parliament's research branch, as well as Table staff, for their constant and vital support.

[English]

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the eighth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights. This is on the drafting of a bill to amend those sections of the Criminal Code that deal with impaired driving.

On behalf of the committee we take no great delight in making this report. This report indicates to the House that we were unable to meet a deadline of May 15 in terms of the work on this subject matter.

The committee has placed the subject matter on its agenda for the fall and we will attempt to deal with it in an expeditious manner. The level of work that we have had has been quite incredible during this term.

In addition, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the ninth report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee proceeded to review the present DNA provisions of the Criminal Code adopted during the 35th Parliament as Bill C-104. That report is complete.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 11th, 12th and 13th reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, respecting chapters 35, 32 and 31 of the December 1997 report of the auditor general.

As acting chair of the committee and on behalf of government members of the committee, we wish to thank the members drawn from our colleagues across the aisle. Their spirit of co-operation and hard work has enabled us to bring five reports to this House this week. This is an example of how all members of this House can best serve all our constituents.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 the committee requests the government to table comprehensive responses to these reports.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-406, an act to amend the Criminal Code (search and seizure without warrant).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this private member's bill is twofold. It is to amend section 139 of the Firearms Act to first of all remove the power to search and seize weapons without a warrant

Routine Proceedings

when there is no evidence that an offence has been committed or suspected to have been committed.

Second, when a search has taken place and if unnecessary damage has been committed restitution will be paid.

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

* * *

[Translation]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A) 1998-99

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 81(5) and 81(6), I wish to move a motion concerning reference of supplementary estimates to standing committees of the House.

I move:

That the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, laid upon the Table earlier today, be referred to the several Standing Committees of the House as follows:

As there is a lengthy list attached to the motion, if it is agreeable to the House, I would ask that the list be printed in *Hansard* as if it had been read.

• (1210)

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: List referred to above is as follows:]

To the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development
—Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Vote 15a

To the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food
—Agriculture and Agri-Food, Votes 1a, 10a and 11a.

To the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage
—Canadian Heritage, Votes 1a and 5a

To the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration
—Citizenship and Immigration, Vote 5a

To the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development
—Environment, Votes 1a and 10a

To the Standing Committee on Finance
—Finance, Vote L11a

To the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade
—Foreign Affairs and International Trade, Vote 5a

To the Standing Committee on Health
—Health, Votes 1a, 5a, 15a and 20a

To the Standing Committee on Human Resources Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities
—Human Resources Development, Votes 5a and 10a

Routine Proceedings

To the Standing Committee on Industry

—Industry, Votes 55a, 60a, 70a, 80a, 90a, 95a and 100a

To the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights

—Justice, Votes 1a and 5a
—Solicitor General, Vote 10a

To the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs

—National Defence, Vote 10a

To the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and Government Operations

—Natural Resources, Votes 1a and 10a
—Privy Council, Votes 26a and 27a
—Treasury Board, Vote 1a

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

PETITIONS

ABOLITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is my pleasure to present a petition concerning nuclear disarmament.

The petitioners consider that the proliferation of nuclear armament is a threat to the health and survival of human beings and their environment. In addition, they state that Canada and the signatories of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons reaffirmed their commitment in May 1995 to pursue negotiations with a view to halting the nuclear arms race.

More specifically, the signatories are calling on Parliament to support the conclusion by the year 2000 of the international convention which will set out a binding timetable for the abolition of all nuclear weapons.

[*English*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today I will be presenting three petitions.

The first deals with a group of Alberta residents concerned about the government's setting greenhouse gas target emissions given the lack of consensus about how effective such targets might be or how costly they will be to implement.

ADULT ENTERTAINMENT

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the second petition deals with individuals concerned about adult entertainment in the city of Kanata.

These parlours are showing up in their communities and the petitioners are concerned with the effects such parlours have on the innocence of young people and on crime in that area. They are requesting that parliament make legislative changes to enable municipalities to prohibit these establishments which degrade

women and foster pornographic mentality which is harmful to their communities.

CRTC

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the third petition individuals draw attention to the fact that last summer the CRTC licensed the pornographic Playboy channel while refusing to license numerous religious broadcasting services. They also point out that the CRTC has a track record of such decisions and call on parliament to review the mandate of the CRTC and direct it to administer a new policy which will encourage the licensing of religious broadcasters.

I currently have a motion, Motion No. 392, which deals with this subject.

TAXATION

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, May 15, the international Day of the family, I am pleased to present a petition about the family. It is signed by a number of Canadians, including Canadians from my own riding of Mississauga South.

The petitioners bring to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to our society.

The petitioners also agree with the national forum on health which observed that the Income Tax Act discriminates against families that choose to provide direct parental care in the home to preschool children.

The petitioners therefore call on parliament to pursue initiatives to eliminate that discrimination in the Income Tax Act for families that choose to provide care in the home for preschool children.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 65, 76, 89 and 90.

[*Text*]

Question No. 65—**Mr. Chuck Strahl:**

What steps has the government taken to implement the recommendations contained in the Matter of Fisheries and Oceans. Special Review re: Sto:lo Fisheries Authority based on Documentation Available and Procedures Performed As at February 28, 1995 and, specifically, what action is being taken with regard to Recommendations numbered 3.01, 3.02, 4.11, 4.12, 4.23, 4.24, 4.28, 5.14, 5.16, 5.17, 5.18, 6.44, 6.45, 6.46 and 6.47?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): After the 1994 report "Special Review Re: Sto:lo Fisheries Authority", significant changes were made to the operation of the Sto:lo Fisheries Authority, SFA, as it pertains to financial accountability. In the year following the review, all funds were provided to an independent administrator and only released in accordance with proper accounting procedures. Since then the financial control has been moved from the SFA to the financial arm of Sto:lo Nation. The fiscal accountability of Sto:lo Nation has been reviewed by DFO Finance, Pacific Region which is satisfied with the accounting processes in place.

In the last two years, DFO has been more involved in the financial aspects of the agreement. DFO staff have participated in the monetary aspects of the levy, referred to as the "Contribution Fishery" in the report, and excess salmon surplus to requirements, ESSR, fishery arrangements. Active management controls including the laying off of staff to avoid overexpenditures are now routine.

Specific Recommendations:

3.01 The quarterly Progress Reports submitted to DFO by the SFA are reportedly prepared internally by the SFA and are not reviewed by the external auditor prior to submission. Given the nature and extent of the issues raised through our review, there is an opportunity to increase the reliability and accuracy of the reports by having the auditor involved in the preparation and/or review of the progress reports.

The quarterly reports are now prepared by the Sto:lo Nation's director of finance and his staff, not by Sto:lo fisheries authority staff, as was the case prior to the report. Given that the processes used are accepted by the external auditor and DFO Finance, Pacific Region, the participation of the auditor in the preparation of the quarterly reviews is not required.

3.02 SFA apparently received two letters relating to accounting matters, dated February 7, 1994, and recommendations arising from audit, dated June 27, 1994, from Mr. Robert Nicklom of Goldfinch, Nicklom and Northcott, SFA's auditor for the fiscal year 1993-94. DFO reportedly did not receive copies of the auditor's management letters. As it appears that certain recommendations made by SFA's auditor have not been implemented, there is an opportunity for DFO to more proactively monitor SFA's management and operations by receiving such management letters.

Since the submission of the report, the subsequent implementation of the independent administrator for 1995 and procedures put in place since then, no management issues have been identified in the audit.

4.11 SFA should carry out a complete evaluation of the financial controls regarding the contribution fishery. Controls that were in place should be documented and analysed in conjunction with SFA's auditor to assess the effect on the audit opinion for fiscal 1994-95. In particular, a reconciliation of the fish caught per the landing slips issued to the revenue recorded should be performed. The numerical continuity of the landing slips should also be reviewed. In addition, the controls

Routine Proceedings

regarding future contribution fisheries should be reviewed to ensure appropriate improvements are made.

No contribution fisheries were conducted in 1995 or 1996. In 1997, DFO was highly involved in the design and implementation of the fishery. DFO's involvement included designing the bid package, opening the bids and selecting the highest bidder, and ensuring the funds were properly dealt with. The design of the fishery was such that numerical control of landing slips was not required.

4.12 A complete analysis of a particular individual's transaction should be performed. The analysis should address such questions as:

- a. Why was a deposit of \$125,000 received when the invitation to bid indicated that a deposit of \$150,000 was required?
- b. Does the bidding process, the amended bid, the outstanding receivable and the accounting controls regarding the related revenue raise concerns regarding the management of the contribution fishery?
- c. Did the individual sell the fish to a third party and, if so, was he paid for them?
- d. What is the likelihood that the receivable from the individual will be collected? Should the receivable, or a portion thereof, from the individual be provided for as a doubtful or uncollectable account?
- e. What effect would the non-collection of the receivable from the individual have on the First Nations' and/or STC's performance under the agreement?

There has been discussion with Sto:lo Nation and Sto:lo fisheries on the involvement of the individual in this particular interaction. The total amount of the receivable monies from this transaction was deducted from the 1995 agreement amount DFO was to pay SFA. This left the Sto:lo Nation responsible for the outstanding amount, and this has had the effect of making the Sto:lo Nation more accountable for their practices. Further, the individual has not had any further involvement with projects of this nature.

4.23 SFA should assess their requirements to pay GST and, as recommended by their auditor, should review the accounting treatment of GST paid. After determining the extent of refund available, a GST return and/or refund claim should be filed in accordance with the Excise Tax Act.

4.24 The DFO should consider the position they will take with respect to amending past progress reports to properly account for GST that may have been included as allowable costs.

The GST was applied for and received in the 1994 agreement. Since then GST has been applied for on an annual basis.

4.28 SFA should review their policy with respect to accounting for capital assets particularly with respect to the treatment of disposals of capital assets. If necessary, progress reports should be revised for any accounting errors.

The accounting of capital assets including disposal is done in accordance with acceptable accounting procedures.

5.14 Insurance coverage should be reviewed to ensure that SFA is only insuring boats to which they have title. Excess insurance should be canceled and inquiries should be made as to the possibility of a refund. In addition, the existence and possible disposal of any excess boats should be reviewed.

Insurance coverage is now only on vessels operated by the SFA.

Routine Proceedings

5.16 SFA should implement a system to monitor the personal use of cellular phones and vehicles. The level of use should be reviewed for any potential abuses. In addition, SFA should review the requirement, if any, to issue T4 slips for taxable benefits.

Managers within Sto:lo Fisheries are now provided a budget to work within. One of their responsibilities is to ensure that equipment is operated in accordance with acceptable procedures, including limiting the personal use of equipment. There have been instances where managers have limited the use of equipment due to abuses. The costs are deemed, by AFS staff who review the reports, to be within an acceptable range.

5.17 DFO should review their position with respect to SFA assets used for non-SFA business, such as travel to and from work.

DFO has reviewed the level of assets support including use for non-SFA business and has concluded this should be left to the discretion of the SFA managers who are accountable for their budgets.

5.18 DFO should request the travel expense claim forms for honoraria described in the general ledger as relating to CA-104.

A flat rate is now paid for honoraria—\$75.00 per half day or conference call or \$150.00 per day plus mileage at government approved rates. The authorization for this payment is the minutes of meetings. Minutes are provided by the independent chairman of the planning committee. Given the controls that are already in place, it is not necessary for DFO to view travel expense claims.

6.44 Generally the financial controls in place at SFA warrant improvement as various accounting errors appear to go undetected, notwithstanding the fact that SFA was apparently informed of the nature of many of the errors in February 1994.

6.45 We recommend that a thorough review of financial controls take place with a view to detecting and preventing future errors from taking place. Controls currently in place such as inter-company and bank reconciliations do not appear to be performed on an accurate basis as evidenced by the undetected errors.

6.46 The involvement of the external auditor in the preparation of the progress reports may result in the earlier detection of accounting errors and a greater assurance level regarding the reliability of the progress reports.

6.47 Additional training and education of in-house accounting personnel may also alleviate some of the problems that are currently being experienced.

Since the accounting regime and reporting relationships have been changed significantly, these recommendations have been addressed.

Question No. 76—Mr. Keith Martin:

Will the Minister of National Revenue explain what taxation guidelines apply to tobacco 'sticks' in comparison to taxation guidelines of cigarettes?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Tobacco sticks are provided for in the federal Excise Act which was amended in 1991 to include the new rate of excise duty and the definition for tobacco sticks. At the time it was acknowledged that partially-made cigarettes, requiring some preparation prior to smoking, did not fit into any existing category.

Tobacco sticks can only be made by a licensed tobacco manufacturer under the same regulatory requirements as cigarettes.

At the federal level, cigarettes and tobacco sticks attract both excise duties and excise taxes. On the total sale price of a carton of 200 cigarettes, excise duties represent \$5.50, while on a carton of 200 tobacco sticks, excise duties represent \$3.67. As a result of the increased taxes announced on February 13, 1998, excise taxes on cigarettes and tobacco sticks vary from \$2.25 to \$5.35 for a carton of cigarettes and from \$1.85 to \$2.93 for a carton of tobacco sticks, depending in which province the tobacco products are offered for sale. This situation is due to the fact that the federal excise tax rate is linked to the provincial tax rate for tobacco products. For example, in Quebec, a carton of 200 cigarettes would attract \$7.75 in federal duties and taxes compared to \$5.52 for 200 tobacco sticks. In Alberta the duty and tax is \$10.85 on a carton of cigarettes and \$6.60 on tobacco sticks.

The government has also indicated its intent to review the tax differential existing between the two products.

Question No. 89—Ms. Val Meredith:

Could the Minister responsible for Revenue Canada Customs list the total revenue for the PACE/CANPASS program at each of the British Columbia border crossings for 1996-97 and 1997-98?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): The total fees collected by Revenue Canada for the CANPASS/PACE lanes at Pacific Highway, Huntingdon, Boundary Bay and Douglas are \$694,139.18 for the 1996-97 fiscal year and \$729,269.98 for the 1997-98 fiscal year. All of these revenues are tabulated and summarized at the CANPASS processing center situated in Douglas. A breakdown of the revenues collected by individual border crossings in British Columbia is not available.

Question No. 90—Ms. Val Meredith:

Could the Minister responsible for Revenue Canada Customs, list the total cost of administering the PACE/CANPASS program at each of the British Columbia border crossings for 1996-97 and 1997-98?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): The administration cost for the CANPASS/PACE program at each of the British Columbia border crossings has been estimated at \$219,000 per year for the CANPASS/PACE lanes at Pacific Highway, Huntingdon, and Boundary Bay, and \$279,000 per year for the CANPASS/PACE lane at Douglas. To arrive at these figures the total cost for the program including the centralized processing of membership applications and the associated headquarters administrative costs were apportioned to the four

sites. The estimated costs are the same for both the 1996-97 and 1997-98 fiscal years.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 68 could be made an order for return, that return would be tabled immediately.

The Deputy Speaker: It is agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 68—**Mr. Guy St-Julien:**

With respect to the new RCMP detachment building in Rouyn-Noranda, designed to house one secretary, at a cost of over \$1,000,000: (a) was that project covered under the heading "Other", on page 55 of the 1997-98 Estimates; and (b) what are the other controlled capital projects with costs of between \$400,000 and \$3,000,000?

Return tabled.

• (1215)

[English]

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I was really straining my ears today hoping that we might get an answer to Question No. 21.

Yesterday the parliamentary secretary indicated that the government would be providing an answer to Question No. 21 some day but that it was taking a long time because the government had to canvass all the different departments.

The question is fairly simple. It is a question about ministers who visited Drummondville and Trois-Rivières during the time that there was Liberal illegal fundraising going on.

Clearly it would not take seven months to canvass the diaries of 30 ministers to find out where they were during that time period.

Again I would ask the hon. parliamentary secretary please, not in a timely fashion and not in due course, but that we get an answer to this question that has been on the Order Paper now for over seven months.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I did explain the delay yesterday and the member has explained very well my position. I would also like to say that I have never used the expression "in a timely fashion". I have been very careful to avoid that term. I may well have used the term "in due time". I assure him that I am looking into the response to that question and I will continue to do so.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. parliamentary secretary recommending a disposition for the remaining questions?

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the other questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CANADA LABOUR CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-19, an act to amend the Canada Labour Code (Part I) and the Corporation and Labour Unions Returns Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Yves Rochelleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted once again to speak to Bill C-19. This bill is similar to last year's Bill C-66, which unfortunately was not passed by the Senate following the Prime Minister's decision to call an election.

Bill C-66 accordingly became Bill C-19. I think it should be put in context. I will try in the 40 minutes I have to illustrate as well as I can the position of the Bloc, which is opposed to this bill.

It implements reforms to the industrial relations provisions of part I of the Canada Labour Code, to provide a framework for collective bargaining that enhances the ability of labour and management to frame their own agreements and allows workplace disputes to be resolved in a timely and cost effective manner.

The highlights are as follows:

- (a) the creation of a representational board, the Canada Industrial Relations Board, with appropriate powers to allow for the timely and cost effective administration of the regime;
- (b) streamlining of the conciliation process;
- (c) clarification of the rights and obligations of the parties during a work stoppage, including requirements for secret strike and lockout votes and advance strike and lockout notices;
- (d) a requirement for parties involved in a work stoppage to continue services necessary to protect public health or safety;
- (e) a requirement for the maintenance of services affecting grain shipments in the event of legal work stoppages by any third parties in the ports;
- (f) making the undermining of a trade union's representational capacity during a strike or lockout an unfair labour practice; and
- (g) improving access to collective bargaining for off-site workers.

Government Orders

I must also mention that the text repeals the provisions of the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act respecting trade unions.

The summary indicates the government's position and the scope of the issue. More specifically, the bill is a major one that will be part of the Canada Labour Code once it is passed.

It is a code, a regulated procedure that affects many Canadians. In fact, some 700,000 workers, or about 10% of the Canadian labour force, are governed by the Canada Labour Code, and 115,000 workers in Quebec are included and thus covered by the code.

• (1220)

It applies to very important areas of human activity in Canada and Quebec. It covers vast areas of endeavour: banking, international and interprovincial transportation, airports and air carriers, broadcasting and telecommunications, port operations and long-shoring, grain handling. In addition, many crown corporations are covered by the Canada Labour Code.

The bill before us is a very important bill which affects a great many Canadians and Quebecers in their daily lives.

In dealing with the matter at hand today, that is, part I of the Canada Labour Code regarding industrial relations, it is important to know that part II deals with occupational health and safety, and part III with labour standards in areas under federal jurisdiction.

To get where we are today, at third reading, large numbers of stakeholders first had to be consulted—the government deserves credit for that—and consultations have been under way since 1995, which produced what we have before us now, regardless of what we make of it as Quebecers in Canada: a document which is moving the issue forward.

That is probably why our colleagues from the New Democratic Party supported this bill, which we, as Quebecers, cannot support however as we consider, among other major reasons, that Quebec has a head start and should be leading the way instead of taking the Canadian lead.

Consultations were held starting in 1995 and a report entitled "Seeking a Balance", better known as the Sims report, after the chairperson, was released in 1996 or 1997. In fact, there has been public recognition of this report and some consensus was reached on it in Canadian society. It is clear from the general satisfaction, except for some concerns, at times quite serious, expressed by many witnesses that this report was well received. There are however serious concerns which we share in particular with regard to replacement workers or scabs, as they are commonly referred to, where no consensus was reached.

Therefore, we feel this is an unfinished reform that made good sense at the start, but for which the necessary political courage was never displayed. This is what brings us to the negative assessment that we are making today. We are opposed to this legislation for a number of reasons and in spite of a seemingly positive attitude. Our reasons have to do with things that are in the bill, but also with things that are not in it.

Among the things that are included in the bill is the creation of the Canada Industrial Relations Board, which used to be called the Canada Labour Relations Board. Here, the minister is taking a leap he should not take, even though the board and the government are pleased to call the new body a "representational board". Of course it is representative of employer and labour organizations.

There are three union representatives and three management representatives on the board. However, the minister reserves the right to appoint board members, after consultation with the employer and labour organizations of his choice.

This, in our opinion, goes against the alleged representational nature of the board to be established under this bill. The minister should appoint people selected by each of the two groups, that is the employer organizations and the labour organizations. Instead, the minister prefers to choose among the employer and labour organizations that he will have selected himself.

• (1225)

This means that, ultimately, there will be members representing the employers or the unions who will not in fact be representative of these two groups, much to their discontent, particularly if the Minister of Labour decides to confuse things by appointing people who are not necessarily representative of the aspirations and concerns of either group.

This is a flaw that is difficult to explain, given the general atmosphere that seemingly prevailed at the end of the exercise.

What does not appear, however, are these five groups of workers who made historic representations to no longer be included in the Canada Labour Code. I am thinking of the flour mill workers. Following a difficult strike at Ogilvie in Montreal, a topic to which we will shortly return, the CSN requested that, in future, anything to do with flour mills should come under provincial jurisdiction, because they wanted nothing more to do with this Canadian approach, which left people battered at the end of a labour dispute that went on for 16 weeks, if I remember correctly.

There are undoubtedly valid historic reasons, but they are no longer valid today, in the opinion of these folks. What was acceptable in 1867 is no longer valid today and we question this desire on the part of the CSN, which wants to see its members—this is the primary reason and we will come back to this

later—working in flour mills safe from the intervention of scabs. This is a big step.

We condemn the government for not being more receptive to these representations.

There are groups of workers, employees of the Government of Canada, who are complaining about the way they are treated, beginning with RCMP employees who, like those of the Public Service Alliance and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, have been making representations for a long time, with the support of the Bloc Québécois.

This time, unfortunately, and it was not very nice of the government to have done this, it agreed to allow some groups to appear before the committee for hours, with very interesting results. These people honestly believed in the committee process, which is there to hear the parties, but they were told in the end that the Bloc Québécois amendments—flowing from these interventions and from our sympathy for these three groups of workers in the RCMP, the Public Service Alliance and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada—were out of order.

I quote from the letter I received from the deputy principal clerk of the House a few months later. I will read it, so that the RCMP employees, the Public Service Alliance and the Professional Institute may know we are concerned about them, but the government has proceeded in such a way as to make it impossible to table the amendments for procedural reasons, so the entire debate concerning these people was declared out of order for the following reason, and here I quote Mr. Marc Bosc, the deputy principal clerk:

The motions propose amendment of sections of the parent legislation which are not addressed in the bill—an amendment is not in order unless the section of the parent legislation—

This refers to the Canada Labour Code as a whole.

—addressed by the amendment is specifically covered by a clause in the bill. We cannot, consequently—put your motions on the order paper.

We tried to table the amendments. They were rejected with this explanation provided very honourably by the deputy principal clerk. However, we regret this tactic by the government which let people devote time and energy to this instead of warning them “Don’t waste your time. As Bill C-19 stands, there is no question of it involving claims by the RCMP, PSAC or PIPS”.

This is a bit disappointing, since the problem raised by these groups is certainly not an invention.

• (1230)

The RCMP is the only police force in Canada that cannot properly negotiate with its employer. Employees are represented by some kind of small shop union whose structure they themselves condemn. They cannot negotiate anything about their work conditions.

Government Orders

Years have gone by. They even submitted to the government a bill drafted by their own legal advisors, but the government decided to ignore it. What is most appalling is that these employees, who are part of the only non-unionized police force in Canada and are not entitled to any kind of collective bargaining, are subject to the arbitrary actions of the government.

Through the management of the RCMP, the government is acting as judge and jury. This opens the door to some rather serious abuse, because the employees are dealt with on an individual basis, instead of as a group of workers recognized by the RCMP.

Again, we deplore the fact that the government does not seem to be overly concerned about the situation. They should at least reply to these people, tell them to stop deluding themselves, that the government—at least the current government—will never grant them their wishes.

The situation with the Public Service Alliance and the institute is just as serious. They dream of the day when they will no longer be subject to the Public Service Staff Relations Act, but will come under the Canada Labour Code. In reality, it would give them the opportunity to talk more decently with their employer, almost as an equal, as workers have managed to do after a great struggle in the private sector and in Quebec in the public sector where the unions have much more recognition on matters that are not unimportant.

One need only have worked in big outfits, like the Government of Canada or the Government of Quebec, to know that talk of job security is not a trivial matter, especially when the employer is a partisan outfit known as the federal government. The people opposite, the Liberals, are pretty strong on this point, and can be judgmental.

We see that clearly today with the appointment of David Levine to head Montfort Hospital. How far can racism be pushed? Imagine discovering that an employee of the federal public service had sovereignist leanings. What danger lurks in this great Canadian democracy for such a person, given how they lynch a fine man, selected by a private company hired to find the best candidate. This is a man highly respected for his political opinions, his background and his professional ability. Look at the dirty deed being done with the support of those opposite.

When the people in the Public Service Alliance demand the power to negotiate as equals and decently with their employer, they are perfectly right to do so, in particular on the subject of job security.

There is the whole matter of technological change, which can land on the back of public servants, because there is no protection in this regard—we will come back to this—and the Canada Labour Code could have dealt with this, for private companies too.

Government Orders

However, public servants who are members of the Public Service Alliance cannot talk honestly about job classification or effectively about job descriptions, or of the appointment, promotion or transfer processes. These kind of things matter hugely when one works for a large body like the Public Service of Canada, with all the wheelings and dealings behind the scene one may have to contend with when there is no proper management framework and the employer can get away, as in this case, with being both judge and jury, employer and lawmaker.

This even goes as far as the right to arbitration. As far as we know, in the public service, arbitration decisions are final. No third party can step in to try to make things right. The right to grieve is affected as well.

This means that the employer, the Government of Canada, treats its employees pretty much like a small non unionized business would, because there is basically no recourse to deal with abuse.

• (1235)

Once again, we condemn this, and we deplore, in this instance, the fact that everything we just said was out of order to some extent, but the fact is that the government has chosen not to deal with this whole matter when it had a wonderful opportunity to do so.

The government has been completely insensitive to the central labour bodies' representations. I see this as a sign, a betrayal of the values the people on the other side supposedly stand for. I notice a number of very distinguished colleagues who are no doubt very sensitive to this kind of thing, like the situation of pregnant women working under conditions which may endanger their health and the health of their unborn child.

As I said, legitimate representations were made to the government, but once again it has been insensitive and failed to ensure that both it and private sector employers in Canada, who are covered by the Canada Labour Code, comply with similar requirements.

Let us see how this works in Quebec. It could be a source of ideas. In Quebec, the law provides for the protective re-assignment of pregnant women, to protect their health and the health of their baby.

All this is missing from the bill, and because of such deficiencies we cannot support it.

There is also the whole issue of technological changes which is very important in our changing economy, where the buzzwords are becoming scarier by the day, words like growth, productivity and contempt, and phrases like profit at all cost. I will come back later to the issue of contempt for the workers and their associations if I have the time.

Technological change is one of the dangers threatening workers because it is not curbed by the state. Yet, it should be the state's responsibility to ensure that the Government of Canada does not exclude its own employees and does not invite the private sector to do so.

Experience has shown that businesses in the private sector that have exhibited good management, open-mindedness and respect for their employees and that have recognized the role of their employees in managing technological change have benefited from that approach.

It would seem that it was asking too much of the Department of Labour's thinkers to address this issue, to include a provision so that workers and their associations would be invited to participate in managing technological change and to provide adequate authority for the protection of jobs and working conditions.

It is very disappointing. Since things are moving so fast, had officials in the Department of Labour been more forward looking, we could also have talked about the merger phenomenon, which may be justifiable. Mergers are not easy to manage in terms of opinions, especially bank mergers, but they may be justifiable on a macro level because of foreign competition.

However, what is definitely unacceptable is that workers end up paying the price for these mergers because productivity and greed become such primary concerns that people get laid off. We will have to find other ways to improve efficiency, in order to be able to compete on the international market. To say that costs were lower this year because 1,000, 2,000, 5,000 or 10,000 people were laid off—as was the case with some major corporations such as IBM and General Motors—is the easy solution.

Something is very wrong when one must have fired people over the last two or three years to be considered a good manager. We used to boast about job creation. Now, people are being laid off under the pretence of streamlining and improving effectiveness, productivity and growth.

One should wonder about growth. Anyone who ever heard Albert Jacquard talk on the issue of growth gets really worried about the evolution process. I am convinced that the hon. member, who really cares about the environment, is receptive to what I am saying. We must wonder about a concept such as growth. It might be negative growth.

• (1240)

Considering that natural resources are being systematically wasted, it might be appropriate to reflect, here and elsewhere, on where we are headed in terms of how we use our resources, and to urge other countries to do the same.

There is a problem with technological changes and also with protecting jobs following mergers. These issues should be dis-

Government Orders

cussed in a broad debate, and we should make sure that jobs are not affected. Otherwise, profits and money become our only values.

There is also a major problem that we do not have in the Quebec legislation, but that exists in the Canadian legislation. I am referring to the fact that there is no clause on "automatic renewal". This means, then, that when a collective agreement expires and negotiations start, what has already been acquired remains in place until there is a new collective agreement signed, so that a legal vacuum does not ensue, which could in certain cases lead to considerable abuse. This is a significant shortcoming in this bill. Once again, Quebec seems to be further advanced in this area. Why not take a page from our book when it is something worthwhile?

One area that is very worrisome is the business about the government and the minister giving themselves the right to intervene in the voting process for a strike or lockout. It is very worrisome in that it is stated that the vote should be secret, which can be justified, and time limits are set for notice, 60 days for a strike, 72 hours for a lockout. That part is highly questionable and we are opposed to it.

Having this time limit of 60 days hinders the strike process, because 60 days after the vote there must be a strike, even if negotiations are under way. When the 60 days are up, another mandate must be sought, and we know how complicated this can be in a country that stretches from Newfoundland to British Columbia. We are, therefore, not convinced this is wise.

What is still more worrisome is the entire matter of how the vote is held and how it can be invalidated. This is not all that impressive, particularly coming from a Liberal federal government, when we are aware that in its own backyard, with the Canada Elections Act, all manner of abuses are permitted by the letter and spirit of the legislation, since we know that the returning officers in the ridings are still partisan appointments and that certain things have been done that are a direct attack on Quebec.

I do not know how things are done in other provinces, but with the special polls and the postal voting, envelopes are traded back and forth in senior citizens homes. During the election campaign, I got a call from one of my constituents, who told me: "Mr. the incumbent, I just visited a friend of mine in a senior citizens home and I saw something that has me concerned. There was a man who took some people to the kitchen. He took out an envelope containing a ballot. Then, he put that envelope in another envelope." That is how postal voting is done and it gives free rein to every shady and unscrupulous party organizer with no respect for the law.

This may be a good idea, but it is so poorly regulated and controlled that it will open the door to all kinds of abuse. Yet, these are the people who are lecturing the unions about scrupulously polling the workers to find out their wishes, when it is clearly stated that the vote can be invalidated. It is a shame that these

people would write such things in the bill. We are dead set against this kind of intrusion.

Since my time is quickly running out, I want to talk about one of the reasons why we are fundamentally opposed to this bill, and that is the whole issue of replacement workers, the possible hiring of scabs.

Again, we do not want to brag, but perhaps we could follow the example set by Quebec, which shows that it is better from a societal point of view to have antiscab legislation than to have people yielding to their instincts. It undermines the balance of power and badly hurts the unionized workers when their picket line is not respected.

• (1245)

I am going to read, as I did at second reading, from an extraordinary letter that should give the folks at the Department of Labour food for thought. It was written by the president of the CSN union at Ogilvie ADM following the strike. It takes courage to write as Claude Tremblay has done, and I am pleased to read this letter once again. The letter reads in part as follows:

The 110 workers I represent were more or less forced out on strike on June 16, 1994 after close to two years of unproductive negotiations with our new employer, the American giant—

This is a very important piece of information that should get all Canadians thinking. I continue:

—the American giant Archer Daniels Midland (ADM). After an attempt to force us to accept its collective agreement, ADM took advantage of a loophole in the Canada Labour Code to impose it on us effective December 10, 1993.

In fact, legal precedents applying to the Canada Labour Relations Board allow an employer to unilaterally modify working conditions, once the right to strike or lockout is acquired, even though our previous collective agreement called for it to be in effect until renewed.

Incidentally, this was alluded to earlier. That is what tacit, or automatic, renewal means.

Unfortunately, these precedents provide—and the Canada Labour Code has nothing to say on the matter—that such clauses are illegal and do not prevent the employer from taking advantage of the legal vacuum.

Since this employer-imposed agreement did away with our seniority rights and the employer was threatening lay-offs that were not in order of seniority, we were forced to walk out in order to prevent the employer from doing this and also to force it to maintain what we had acquired over more than 30 years.

Powerful employers like ADM, and most of the employers subject to the Canada Labour Code, have plenty of power already without being given the additional power to impose their working conditions as soon as they are entitled to lock out workers.

As a union, we believe that collective agreements should be maintained by law, at least until the right to strike is exercised. As well, the act ought to permit inclusion in a collective agreement of a clause allowing the working conditions it contains to remain in effect until renewal.

The act not only authorizes the use of strikebreakers, it encourages it.

Government Orders

After nearly 16 months of striking we managed to wring an ordinary collective agreement, ordinary within the context of Quebec, out of ADM. However, it was extraordinary compared to the American pattern of agreement ADM had forced on its employees in over 138 collective agreements throughout its empire.

Day in and day out, week in and week out, month in and month out, we endured subtle, underhanded and persistent violence. The violence of watching scabs stealing our rights, trucks entering and leaving full of wheat or flour, the CUM police arresting colleagues for nothing, security guards hired by ADM spying on us with cameras on public roads and up to our doorsteps, as if we were some sort of scum.

The worst part was discovering on our return to work that the scabs had botched our production so badly as to threaten the quality of Five Roses flour. This reputation for quality is surely the best guarantee of our jobs. The law, however, encourages short-sighted employers to threaten the survival of a business by allowing them to use unskilled workers, only to give them a psychological advantage against us in negotiations.

How was this useful to ADM if, in its back to work agreement, the company not only agreed to fire these scabs but also promised not to rehire them for the duration of the collective agreement?

Not only does the Canada Labour Code not prohibit the hiring of scabs, but the employment office in Verdun—

This concerns the federal government.

—the employment office in Verdun was even called upon to recruit them.

We are talking here about scabs recruited by the federal government.

Two months after the end of a 15 month long strike, 29 of our members, those with the least seniority, were not called back to work. Yet, they too had fought for the seniority rules that eventually had those with more seniority called back to work. These guys all had between 12 and 26 years of seniority and good and loyal uninterrupted service. They had contributed to the UI plan during all these years. Just the same—

• (1250)

Those who were called back were not entitled to unemployment insurance.

Just the same, they did not qualify for benefits, while the scabs, who had worked unlawfully for 16 months, were treated with kid gloves and got full unemployment benefits.

It seems to us that this is a system that clearly works against workers who democratically decide to fight for their rights, against powerful and faceless companies like ADM, which pocket more than US\$5 million in net profits every year.

We are definitely in favour of prohibiting the use of scabs in the Canada Labour Code, in order to send a very clear message to foreign employers like ADM—

This is very modern, I repeat.

We are definitely in favour of prohibiting the use of scabs in the Canada Labour Code, in order to send a very clear message to foreign employers like ADM. Their investments are welcome in Canada and Quebec, provided that they show a minimum of respect for our ways. And these rules cannot be easily broken, because the

Government of Canada, supposedly the government of Canadian workers, will have given us the tools to resist if they want to challenge the consensus.

To those who think that prohibiting the use of scabs changes the balance unfairly in favour of the unions, I say—

This is still the union president talking, and I agree with what he says.

“Have a look at things in Quebec and draw your own conclusions”. Workers do not enjoy being on strike. They exercise their right to strike only when they have no other choice, because it always ends up costing them a lot. In passing, if you can get yourself a worthwhile job when you are on strike, you let me know, particularly when unemployment seems forever high.

Instead of changing the balance in favour of the unions, prohibiting employers to use scabs brings the forces back into balance to a point that favours more reasonable negotiations where both employer and union work to quickly find a common ground, develop relations that will enable them to reconcile their divergent interests and find solutions that reflect their convergent interests.

Despite such a clearly expressed and courageous letter, one must conclude that the Canadian federal government was insensitive to such a view, although it encourages in-depth reflection on the past, present and future labour relations of Canadian and Quebec workers faced with globalization and a world economy.

What is more, the federal government has caved in to the multinational lobby, and no doubt campaign bagmen as well, by adding the word “demonstrated” to the wording concerning scabs. It now reads “for the demonstrated purpose of undermining a trade union’s representational capacity”. This adjective adds to the burden of proof, because it is up to the labour union to prove that the hiring of scabs has undermined its representational capacity.

What goes still further is the motion made by Jean Charest’s people. It is no doubt he who inspired Motion No. 27 of last week in which my hon. colleague for Madawaska—Restigouche moved—and I shall read it for the benefit of our viewers—a motion which dates no doubt from the time of Mr. Charest and does not sound promising for the workers of Quebec:

(2.2) For greater certainty, an employer shall be deemed not to have undermined a trade union’s representational capacity by reason only of the employer’s use of the service of a person referred to in subsection (2.1).

This represents the pseudo-progressive Conservatives well, and no doubt also reflects the profound thoughts of a man like Jean Charest, who wants to be in control of the destinies of the people of Quebec before long. We have news for him, both on the constitutional front and on the labour relations front.

There are lessons to be learned from the Canada Labour Code and its effect in Quebec. There are three types of workers in Quebec. We have non-unionized workers, which is unfortunate for them. Then we have unionized workers under the Quebec labour code who—and the code is very clear on this—cannot suffer the humiliation of being replaced by scabs if they decide to go on strike. Finally, we have the workers regulated by the Canada Labour Code, who can suffer the humiliation of being replaced by scabs who undermine the effect of a democratically called strike.

Government Orders

• (1255)

Things will be better in a free, sovereign and independent Quebec. The Quebec labour code will apply. It was originally passed in 1977, under the minister responsible at the time, Pierre-Marc Johnson. This was under a government led by a great democrat, René Lévesque. At the time, there was no consensus in Canada. That is the excuse we have been given, that there is no consensus in Canadian society. There was no consensus either at the time, but the Lévesque government and Minister Pierre-Marc Johnson demonstrated the political courage that was required.

What has been the impact of the antiscab provision over the past 21 years? Conflicts are shorter and there is no longer any violence wherever the Quebec code applies. However, there is still violence where the Canada Labour Code applies, as we recently saw during the strike affecting the port of Quebec City. It was not until the pressure built up and the conflict got out of hand that the federal government intervened in an appropriate manner. Why? Because the Canada Labour Code still allows the use of scabs.

Businesses subject to the Quebec labour code can no longer use scabs, and Quebecers and the National Assembly must be praised for passing such legislation. Let us hope that the House of Commons will wake up some day and that the government in office will have the political courage to support workers in such an important matter.

[*English*]

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak at third reading, the final opportunity to talk about Bill C-19.

It has been an interesting process for me because as a rookie MP I have been able to watch the bill from the time it was tabled, through the various stages of debate, through some rocky times and through some very interesting manoeuvres in terms of some people with a will to try to stop the legislation. They have thrown everything they could to grind it to a halt and to avoid this day actually happening where we are finally at third reading.

Prior to question period we heard two very lengthy, long winded speeches that were very negative about Bill C-19. They were very critical about the content. They even went beyond the content and the actual amendments to the Canada Labour Code. They seemed to challenge and attack the whole idea of a strong and healthy labour movement in Canada. They seemed to have an underlying tone, almost a sinister undertone, to their comments and remarks that indicated to me they were not supportive of the idea of a free and active trade union movement in the country.

I regret there is a group of people and organizations that do not see the value of the trade union movement as an integral aspect of democracy. Even as we debated Bill C-19 the larger issue was not really the amendments to the Canada Labour Code. It was the

pursuit of social and economic justice and labour's role in that pursuit.

I personally do not believe that any legislation will lead us toward social justice. I do not think social justice can be achieved through parliamentary means. I think that is the role of the labour movement, but we do need to create the legislative framework within which unions can flourish, prosper and do their job and help to distribute the wealth of a great nation to larger groups so that we can narrow that gap between rich and poor.

That is really what the last two years have been about as we have been spiriting Bill C-66 and now Bill C-19 through the process whether or not it has been stated overtly.

• (1300)

We have been talking about the redistribution of wealth and the ability of unions to function, prosper and flourish in our community and in our society.

Some of the amendments put forward by the Reform Party were very worrisome. There is a point in law which states that a person can be presumed to have intended the probable consequences of his or her actions. Thinking that through, it is kind of scary.

I wonder if Reformers really did think through the probable consequences of some of the amendments they were putting forward. If they had, what they would be advocating is limiting the ability of labour organizations to elevate the standards of wages and working conditions of the people they represent. I think most Canadians would agree that is not a good thing, a valuable function or a valuable role.

As I listened to some of the amendments put forward by the Reform Party, there was a familiar theme. I almost felt that I was having déjà vu, that I had heard all of this before.

After going through committee stage and hearing speaker after speaker as they filibustered, and then coming to the report stage and listening to the same diatribe, the same tired, lame, old thoughts, it came to me where I had heard this before. It was all contained in the right to work doctrine being pushed by the Fraser Institute. It is yesterday's news. It is a tired and outdated ideology that somehow the Reform Party has stumbled upon and thinks it has come up with a new idea in labour relations.

In actual fact, the right to work means the right to work for less. There are 21 states in the United States that are burdened with this right to work legislation. The way we talk about the states in the United States now is that there are free states and there are right to work states. The 21 right to work states are not free for workers.

Government Orders

There is no free collective bargaining because they have essentially outlawed it. They have passed legislation that has stopped the ability of unions to do their job to elevate the standards of working people.

In those right to work states all the social indicators about social well-being, wages, mortality rates, infant mortality rates and the amount spent on education per student are far below the national average. In the right to work states they have managed to grind down the standard of living by eliminating the ability of unions to help keep the standard of living up.

If those are the consequences that the Reform Party has contemplated by its amendments, then I really wish it would reconsider them because what it is pushing is poison. It is bad for working people, it is bad for the economy because consumers have less disposable income and it grinds the economy to a halt.

The point of our caucus is that fair wages benefit the whole community. There is nothing wrong with the concept of workers earning fair wages and spending accordingly. That is a good thing.

We are very frustrated and frankly tired of listening to the right wing Reformers pushing this particular brand of poison.

Ms. Shaughnessy Cohen: Nobody listens.

Mr. Pat Martin: Nobody really listens. Some people do, unfortunately, in the west where I come from. It is kind of frightening.

The whole rise of the right wing is worrisome to working people.

We were here the other night speaking to a private member's bill about the Mac-Paps, the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion. I could not help but think there were parallels here. We heard about that courageous bunch of people in the 1930s who went to Europe to fight fascism, to fight right wing extremism. It took a lot of courage to do that. The right wing extremism was born out of a period of economic recession, much like we saw with high interest rates and the slowing of the economy. That kind of depression spawns right wing extremism.

Just as it took a lot of courage for those people in the 1930s to go to Spain to fight fascism there, it also takes a lot of courage for people to stand now to fight right wing extremism in our own country. I really saw a parallel there because there are people who think there is too much democracy in the world. I keep hearing the word misused. The right wing seems to have stumbled on the word democracy and finds that it likes it too.

However, the people who are promoting the MAI, the actual people who are pushing the MAI, are saying that there is a surplus of democracy in the world today that is interfering with the free movement of capital and investment. Is that not a frightening

thing? Some people actually believe there is a surplus of democracy. This is the same right wing that would like to keep the labour movement down. That is typical. Right wing zealots always go after the trade unions first when they start to repress rights. They lock up the trade unionists. They outlaw unions. It is a real trend and a real theme. It is a pattern that we see developing in the Reform Party. It is interesting to watch, but it is also frightening to watch when we see these parallels.

• (1305)

Time and time again we hear the Reform Party standing to defend the interests of capital. It is a good thing that some of us are looking at legislation that will defend the rights of working people to move forward the advantage of working people. That is exactly what Bill C-19 does.

The good thing about Bill C-19, without commenting on the changes to the labour code that Bill C-19 will introduce, is the process that took place. A spirit of co-operation resulted in what we know as Bill C-19. It was almost an unprecedented consultation process where government, labour and management sat down in a tripartite fashion and decided on things that would make the system work better. That is the kind of model we would like to see used in a number of other areas. In countries that are moving forward socially as well as economically, that is what we see. It is a truly tripartite model where business, labour and government sit down together to chart out the future.

The extreme right wing wants to deny the existence of labour. It wants to keep labour away from the table. It wants to stamp labour out. That kind of adversarial attitude is what is going to hold us back as a nation. The right wing might think it is progress. It is not progress. It holds us back. We all move forward when we move forward together. We are not trying to wipe out the right wing, so it should not be trying to wipe out labour.

One of the real contradictions about this whole debate has been the Reform Party trying to stall and block Bill C-19 when it claims to represent the interests of the prairie agricultural industry. There are 130,000 prairie farmers who are dying to see Bill C-19 go through so they can be confident their grain shipments will not be interrupted at the ports. What a contradiction. These champions of the western agricultural industry are doing everything they can to stall, delay and block Bill C-19 when 130,000 farmers want it. We do not only see an anti-worker sentiment, we see an anti-farmer sentiment. It seems like a real contradiction to me. I do not understand it.

It was awkward to watch some of the debate at the committee stage because, frankly, the Reform Party was handicapped by its complete naivety about industrial relations. We heard some things

Government Orders

at committee stage that would make people roll their eyes. If people knew the level of debate that went on in Ottawa about this complicated issue they would be horrified. They would be horrified because it was mean-spirited, it was narrow-minded, it was parochial and it was self-interested. It did not have the interests of labour relations in Canada at heart. It only considered the narrow, political self-interest of the very narrow population that it is serving.

I will use the bit of time I have left to talk about the four items that are most positive about Bill C-19 and why our caucus is proud to support it.

First, the restructuring of the labour relations board into a truly representational board is one of the most important things that came out of the Sims task force, Bill C-66 and Bill C-19. It was something that all parties could agree on. Labour had always complained. It was always frustrated that there was a lack of consultation in the process of making appointments to the board. With the new changes and the new Canada Industrial Relations Board we will see the representation which we felt was necessary.

There are other changes which we think are very positive. The single neutral chair will be able to hear certain cases to try to fix the backlog. There is a terrible backlog, especially in applications for certification. Some 90 applications for certification are currently pending. We are hoping with the speedy passage of Bill C-19 that some of that backlog will be alleviated.

We are critical in one respect. One of the recommendations that labour was making was that there should be consultation with labour and management when making appointments. The actual bill says that there should be consultation with members who represent employees, not necessarily the legitimate labour union. We are very concerned that some of the rat unions, the non-unions, for instance in western Canada, will claim they deserve to make appointments. I am referring to the Christian Labour Association of Canada and other employer-dominated unions that are not legitimate representatives of working people.

● (1310)

The General Workers Union, CLAC, all those unions are not real unions and they should not be consulted. It should be the legitimate labour unions that are consulted because they represent the working people.

The one place where we did part paths in terms of our support for this bill was with respect to replacement workers. We do not believe that the replacement workers' clause is nearly strong enough. We supported the amendment put forward by the member for Trois-Rivières to try to make that clause more powerful and actually prevent strikes and lockouts by banning replacement workers, period.

I was surprised that there was not more support from the other side of the House because in 1995 the House of Commons voted on a private member's bill, Bill C-317, introduced by a Bloc Québécois MP which had very strong anti-scab provisions in it.

Even though the bill was voted down, there were 104 MPs, including 49 from the government, who voted in favour of that bill. We were hoping to see those same 49 people vote in favour of anti-scab provisions this time, but hope springs eternal.

An hon. member: Unfortunately, some of them are no longer with us.

Mr. Pat Martin: Some of them are no longer here. I understand.

We hold strongly to the view that true anti-scab legislation minimizes the number of days lost due to strikes and lockouts.

I have made this point before. If industry is truly concerned about lost time and lost productivity, it is not strikes and lockouts they should be worried about.

In my province of Manitoba we lose 50,000 days per year to strikes and lockouts, but we lose 550,000 days per year to injuries and accidents. If they are serious about lost productivity and lost profits, it is not strikes and lockouts that are the problem, it is the carnage in the workplace that is the problem and that is easier to rectify.

We have heard a great deal of whining and bleating from Reform Party members that they do not like the idea of automatic certification. They want a mandatory vote.

They think it is undemocratic to try to level the imbalance in power that exists between employers and employees.

In actual fact, if 50% plus one have signed the cards, the people have spoken. To make them vote twice is undemocratic. How many times will they make them vote? Until they get the answer they want? Over and over and over again? How democratic is that?

An hon. member: It sounds familiar.

Mr. Pat Martin: You don't like that, so you shouldn't like this either.

Even if there are 100% of the cards signed, the way they envision it there would still have to be a supervised vote. It is fundamentally wrong. It is unethical and it gives the employer another chance to use intimidation and coercion to try to tilt the scale in its favour.

Unfortunately, there is not enough substance and background in labour relations in the entire Reform caucus to present that argument with any real substance.

It is put to bed now once and for all. Bill C-19 recognizes the legitimacy of 50% plus one constituting a majority and we are glad of that.

Private Members' Business

Successor rights are a very important aspect. These things have been improved in Bill C-19 and we are very pleased to see that.

In closing, the first task force chair described the following three beliefs that the Sims task force members shared as part of a vision statement.

First, that the existing Canada Labour Code basically continues to serve its constituencies well. Second, emphasizing stability, they said that pendulum like changes to the code are neither necessary nor desirable. They are a bad thing. Third, they said that consensus between the parties is the best basis for decision making on legislative change.

I am glad to say that after the years of consultation since the Sims task force we have held true to those three founding principles. We have managed to introduce changes that are meaningful and will serve the labour relations climate in this country very well for many years to come.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to give the speaker who just spoke an indefinite amount of time to continue. I think he is probably doing us a lot of good.

• (1315)

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House give its consent to give an indefinite amount of time?

An hon. member: No.

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid there is not consent.

[Translation]

It being 1.15 p.m., pursuant to order made Tuesday, May 12, 1998, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to complete the third reading stage of the bill now before the House.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 45 the recorded division stands deferred until Monday, May 25, 1998, at the ordinary hour of daily adjournment.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there is unanimous consent that we see the clock as being 1.30 p.m.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CRIMINAL RECORDS ACT

The House resumed from April 3 consideration of the motion that Bill C-284, an act to amend the Criminal Records Act and the Canadian Human Rights Act (offences against children), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The member for Souris—Moose Mountain still has approximately four minutes left to speak on this bill today as he was unable to finish his comments during the last hour of debate. The member would like to use this available time but has agreed to allow me to give my comments before him as I have to leave the Chamber shortly for an airplane trip and if I do not leave shortly I will not make it.

I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to be allowed to speak first during this hour on this private members' bill but still allow the member for Souris—Moose Mountain to finish his few minutes of comments later in this hour.

The Deputy Speaker: I understand that at the conclusion of the hon. whip's speech the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain will resume the floor for four minutes and then we will continue with the normal rotation.

Does the House understand the situation and is it agreed that we proceed in this manner?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all members present for allowing me to get this speech on the record.

It is a very important private members' bill. A tremendous amount of work has been done by my colleague in Calgary Centre on behalf of families, and on behalf of children. He tries to seek legislative and other ways to protect that valued institution in our country. I commend him for his efforts and I look forward to more in the years to come.

Private Members' Business

What does Bill C-284 do that is so important? In general Bill C-284 would enable those responsible for children, in other words institutions like daycare centres, elementary schools and any institution or group that works with children to be more fully informed about decisions on whom they are hiring and to be able to do a criminal records check on them that has not been covered up by a ministerial pardon. Specifically it allows for the limited disclosure of an individual's criminal record if the individual had been convicted of a sexual offence against a child and later applies for one of these positions of trust with children.

In a nutshell, Bill C-284 would ensure that we can always do a criminal records check on a sexual offender. We can ensure thereby that anyone holding a position of authority or trust for a child has had that record run against him.

Before I get into why this is so necessary I would like to reaffirm again the importance of the family in Canadian society. The protection of vulnerable people in our society is a job that this parliament has an obligation to fulfill. We have not done a glorious job of protecting families or protecting children. In the ongoing debate on the Young Offenders Act and the future of the tax system to help people raise children, and on all those other issues, the government has not done a great job in fulfilling the requirements of families.

• (1320)

Bill C-284 tries to plug one of the loopholes that has allowed a negative impact upon families and specifically upon children.

Let me talk about the genesis of this. It is not a nice story. It is a very tragic one. It has to do with a story about Bobby Oatway.

Oatway's real name is Stevens and he has a criminal sexual record against children which spans back as far as 1965 and includes all kinds of things, buggery, bestiality, gross indecency and sexual assault. He beat and raped his wife for eight years before she left him in 1973.

In 1996 he completed two-thirds of his latest 10 year sentence for sex crimes. He was serving three 10-year sentences concurrently in Mountain prison which was in my riding prior to the last election. He was granted statutory release in 1996 and his conditions last until 1999 which are monitoring conditions for this man.

He chose to move to Prince George and then Toronto. Everywhere he went neighbourhood protests in those cities caused him to move back to Mountain prison where he voluntarily reincarcerated himself because of those problems. Because he was in Mountain prison voluntarily he could ask prison officials to release him to a halfway house at any time. In other words, this could be done at any time without notice within three working days.

If that happened then he would automatically be sent to the Sumas correctional facility which is also in my riding. That means he would be released back into the community and no one would know. If Sumas centre did not want him or refused to take him, then there was nowhere else to let him loose and they would just open the doors and let him walk free.

CSC says they cannot notify the public if Oatway is released. They just do not have that authority.

As a result of Bobby Oatway's presence in my community in this way and the circumstances surrounding his potential release, his former victims co-ordinated the gathering of a 26,000 name petition from across Canada. It asks the government to focus more on the rights of the victims in legislation rather than on the convicted sex criminals or dangerous offenders who are at high risk to reoffend.

On October 8, 1996 as part of National Family Week, I tabled that 26,000 name petition in the House. It is one of the victim focused approaches to crime prevention that the Reform Party has suggested.

The petition specifically asked that the government amend the Criminal Code to prohibit for life all those convicted of sex offences against children from holding positions of trust or responsibility regarding children. That is an easy thing to support on all sides of the House.

During this current parliament, my colleague from Calgary Centre tabled a very similar bill with some improvements I might add.

That is the background of where my involvement in this bill came from.

Once criminals complete their sentence, any criminal can apply for a pardon. A pardon allows people convicted of a criminal offence to have their criminal record sealed and effectively erased from public scrutiny and the public record. Therefore once a pardon is granted to a person, that person even though convicted of a criminal offence will not have that record disclosed or made accessible to anyone without prior approval of the Solicitor General of Canada which practically speaking is nearly an impossible process.

It is possible that individuals convicted of sexual crimes can be released from prison, granted a pardon and obtain a job or a position of authority regarding children. No one will know about it and there is no way to even check the records to see if that person has had a prior offence involving sexual crimes against children. It is this kind of possibility that this bill would stop.

Third party childcare givers would be given greater certainty over who they are hiring and who they are welcoming into everything from a boy scout group to a childcare facility. They would have the possibility of checking on that person's criminal records.

Private Members' Business

Are our children at risk? Is this kind of protection really needed?

CSC's own studies show that about one-third of all sex offenders are convicted of a new criminal offence after release. About one in ten are convicted of a new sex offence during the follow-up period, which is the probationary period that follows.

British studies indicate that both homosexual pedophiles and heterosexual pedophiles recommit crimes at an alarming rate. So do our children need all the protection we can give them? The answer of course is yes.

Bill C-284 would reduce at least the risk of sexual offenders applying to agencies where they frequently use those facilities and opportunities as predators against children. Those people who are hiring people to work in positions of authority deserve the right to do a criminal records check on anyone applying for a job. That is what Bill C-284 would do.

• (1325)

What do the critics say to this proposal? They say that perhaps it violates a criminal's rights, that he should have the right to absolute privacy.

Bill C-284 does not propose that child sex offenders can never be pardoned. It does not say that. It does not propose that if one does commit a crime it should forever be on the public record and broadcast on television. It does however propose the following.

There should be a limited disclosure of an individual's criminal record if the individual being already convicted of a sexual offence against a child later applies for a position of trust of working with children. When he applies for that position whoever is doing the hiring should say "I will take your application. Be aware that I am going to do a criminal records check on you"—as they should anyway—"and if you are pardoned it will not wipe that record clean".

Right now you do not know. Once a pardon has taken place the records are sealed and even though you ask for that records check you cannot get that information.

It could be argued that Bill C-284 limits a criminal's rights ever so slightly. However in light of the high recidivism rate among sexual offenders, I would argue that it is a warranted and justified limited restriction on a criminal's rights because we must put the rights of children and the rights of law-abiding citizens ahead of the rights of the criminal in this kind of a situation.

The right to protect innocent, vulnerable children is a stronger and more prominent right than the right of a criminal to have his records forever sealed and never available to be checked in any way whatsoever. It is a stronger argument to protect children. It is a nobler argument to protect children and that is what this bill intends to do.

Obviously whenever children are at risk we must do everything we can to protect them. If we pass Bill C-284 and we do risk stubbing the rights of the Bobby Oatways of this world and forcing them to have their records available in a limited way to all those who might want to hire such a person unknowingly to work with children, then we may have to offend some of those rights in a small way.

In conclusion I would like to emphasize the importance of families and children to Canadian society. The House has the responsibility to protect the children who are most vulnerable, to build up the family and to look after the rights of those people to make sure they are not compromised.

Presently our legal system places children at an unreasonable physical risk because a sexual offender who has received a pardon could be hired unknowingly by a childcare agency without having his past criminal records scrutinized. This bill would eliminate that risk or at least drastically reduce it. It would fulfil our obligation to put the rights of innocent people and innocent children ahead of the rights of the criminal.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1998

BILL C-36—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Order 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the report stage and the third reading of Bill C-36, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 24, 1998.

[*English*]

Consequently I regret to inform the House that under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3), I must give notice that a minister of the crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration and disposal of proceedings at the said stages.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

CRIMINAL RECORDS ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-284, an act to amend the Criminal Records Act and the Canadian Human Rights Act (offences against children), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Private Members' Business

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the remaining four minutes of my previous address, I will raise four very serious questions.

If the House adopts my hon. colleague's bill these questions will not have to be answered again or at least not as frequently.

The government has a fundamental role to ensure the protection of its citizens. This is particularly true for those who are innocent and most vulnerable, our children. Protecting children is the ultimate responsibility. They must be allowed to grow up free from abuse and free from molestation.

• (1330)

First, what does one say to console parents who have had a child molested? There is no answer that can be provided unless we take steps at this time to pass the bill.

Thirty-one per cent of sex offenders released from federal correctional institutions commit another violation of some sort within three years. Pedophiles are at greater risk than rapists. It is likely that pedophiles, especially those men who offend young boys, are at greater risk to reoffend sexually than are rapists. As a matter of fact statistics show it is 19% to 8%.

Second, what does one say to parents after a child has been molested by someone who has already served time for a similar offence? Bill C-184 introduced by my colleague would provide measures so that employers and parents would know the past of the people they are hiring and thus provide protection to the most precious possessions they have, their children.

Currently when someone receives a pardon for summary or indictable offences there is no record accessible to the public that there was ever a criminal conviction or that pardon was ever granted.

Third, how would a parent or an employer feel knowing that the information was withheld from them when they hired someone who they did not know was a convicted pedophile?

Bill C-284 is specific in its intent. In order to protect our children from this type of element in society it is incumbent upon all members who sit in the House to make the right move to do that.

Fourth, why is Bill C-284 so important not just to my party, not just to the parties opposite, but to every member of the House? The responsibility now falls upon them. Essentially it sends a message. If the House wants that message to go out all across Canada to our constituencies in every province, we are saying by passing the bill that the protection of our children is important and is the most paramount thing we could do at the present time.

Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate today on Bill C-284 introduced by the member for Calgary Centre.

As we look at the bill we believe the purpose of its enactment is to provide for a specific instance where the public interest in a limited disclosure of the record of a conviction that has been pardoned supersedes the right to privacy of the pardoned person. The instance referred to is where the conviction was for a sexual offence against a child and the person convicted applied for a position of trust with respect to a child or children.

The disclosure would be made only to those with responsibility for the child or children who are considering the application. Unauthorized disclosure by them would be an offence as we understand the motion before us.

The bill also amends the Canadian Human Rights Act to provide that job requirement and hiring practice for child trust positions that discriminate against a person on the ground of a pardoned sexual offence against a child are not discriminatory practices giving rise to an offence under the act.

The bill addresses serious safety concerns for children in our communities. The bill strikes a sufficient balance between the rights of the individual and the safety concerns of society. We are in support of it.

• (1335)

The bill provides safeguards and limitations for the release of personal information regarding a person who has been pardoned. The bill ensures that information can only be requested by a prospective employer in relation to an employment application. In other words, it cannot be indiscriminately given out or requested from anyone. There is a clear protocol for the release of information about the individual concerned and serious penalties for wrongful disclosure of the information.

These measures adequately protect individuals from the misuse of personal information of the limited group of individuals we are talking about this afternoon. It is important, however, to recognize that when a pardon is granted it is recognition the offender has demonstrated real progress, restitution and rehabilitation and the powers the bill would bring into play are not exercised lightly.

The release of any information about an individual by the state must be undertaken with the greatest of discretion and caution, and all appropriate safeguards must be respected.

One improvement to the bill with regard to privacy concerns would be a provision for the notification of the individual that a request has been made for the disclosure of the individual's criminal record and pardon. This would give the individual the opportunity to withdraw an application for employment prior to the disclosure of the individual's personal information as opposed to being notified upon disclosure.

Private Members' Business

Overall the bill addresses a very serious concern for the safety of our children, communities and society as a whole. The bill could prevent future tragedies in our communities. If even one child can be spared it is worth pursuing.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak to Bill C-284, an act to amend the Criminal Records Act and the Canadian Human Rights Act (offences against children).

[Translation]

This bill deals with a very important topic, the need to protect our children against sexual abuse.

The government has already taken the necessary actions to allow organizations and individuals occupying positions of trust and authority with respect to children to work with community police forces to investigate known sexual offenders.

[English]

How have we done this? During the summer of 1994 officials from the ministries of the solicitor general, justice and health conducted national consultations on the issue of whether Canada should establish a registry of child sex offenders. Officials consulted with provincial and territorial officials, police agencies, volunteer agencies and non-governmental organizations.

While participants in these consultations did not support the establishment of such a registry, they did support the enhancement of the existing Canadian Police Information Centre database to provide more and better information to police and organizations working with their local police agencies to help screen out sex offenders from positions of trust or authority over children.

Participants supported other federal measures that would directly assist child service organizations in developing policies to screen out sex offenders. Accordingly in November 1994 the Solicitor General of Canada announced enhancements to the CPIC. These databanks now include data on all convicted sex offenders, prohibition orders and peace bonds relating to sex offenders, the age and the sex of the child victims of sexual abuse and fingerprint information on persons charged with high grade offences. There is a system in place at the moment.

Joint funding by the ministries of the solicitor general, justice and health was announced for a national education campaign to screen out sexual abusers. An integral part of the campaign was the development of the screening manual by the Canadian Association of Volunteer Bureaux and Centres, now known as Volunteer Canada. This manual includes a comprehensive national and

provincial-territorial analysis of the social, legislative and policy context for the screening.

• (1340)

[Translation]

The education campaign has resulted in the development of a series of fact sheets and a video entitled "Duty of Care", which were used to inform and educate the public, and made available in over 200 Canadian communities. I am proud of this campaign's huge success, and we recently learned that it would be extended for another two years.

Employers and community organizations should have a formal screening policy covering interviews, reference checks, individual risk evaluations, training and supervision.

The purpose of Bill C-284 is commendable. However, the bill adds to the confusion in providing for the screening of sexual offenders by checking criminal records even after a pardon has been granted. There is also the issue of records being destroyed. In fact, they are sealed and kept separate at the Canadian Police Information Centre. If a pardoned offender is subsequently convicted of a summary offence, pardon is automatically revoked.

In addition, for investigation purposes, identifying information on pardoned criminals is made available as soon as fingerprints are submitted, and this without reopening the entire criminal record.

[English]

The government has taken significant and important measures to better protect children from sexual offenders. Being a mother, I certainly want to make sure that is the case for my children and all Canadian children.

Senior criminal justice officials are currently reviewing these measures to determine if more can be done. It is very clear, however, that Bill C-284 does not do more to protect children. It sends the wrong message to parents and volunteer organizations that a criminal record check alone, including a check of pardoned records, will protect their children. That is not the case.

For that reason this government does not support this bill.

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak about Bill C-284 regarding amending the Criminal Records Act. Before I get into the nuts and bolts of the act I will give a little background information to the whole system of pardoning in not the entire history of civilization but since ancient times, which perhaps only the member from Surrey North might remember considering the colour of his hair. I think he is much more antiquated than I.

Private Members' Business

In ancient times apparently it was a monarch's privilege to distribute these pardons to anyone who had committed an atrocious act. I am thinking of King Zeus. He was a very compassionate person, much like Mr. Speaker sitting on the throne dispensing justice wisely and profoundly to all of us mere peons.

Then I rush ahead to merry old England, which was not merry old England to tell the truth, when King Henry VIII was the monarch. He was not so compassionate in his distribution of justice to those who disagreed with him or who had the misfortune of marrying him; almost as unfortunate as some person having the misfortune of marrying the member for Calgary Southeast. However that is food for thought for another time.

• (1345)

I go on to think about what kings we have in Canada who perhaps could distribute this justice. The only king I can think of in Canada is the King of Kensington. If anyone has been to Toronto's Kensington market on a Friday afternoon, I would think that the King of Kensington would most certainly be distributing justice and fairness and pardoning my sins if he could somehow prevent me from being at that market.

I would much sooner appear at the Calabogie market as you perhaps, Mr. Speaker, might indulge in doing on Saturday, knowing full well that you happen to be travelling up to the great riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke. The Calabogie flea market as you may or may not know, Mr. Speaker, as you very infrequently leave your humble abode on the beautiful shores of the Madawaska River, dispenses all sorts of goodies, the most common and famous of which would be the maple syrup. If you desire to go to that market, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that somehow we could arrange that for you, not by a chauffeured limousine but by a horse and buggy.

Let us rush on to the system of pardoning. When I speak about pardoning I am talking—

Mr. Mark Muise: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I may be mistaken but I was under the impression that we were debating Bill C-284. I have heard absolutely no reference to the bill in the last three and a half minutes.

The Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke was tying in pardons with the market in Calabogie. I think we are about to hear now how that relates.

Mr. Hec Clouthier: Mr. Speaker, I am rushing on. There was a lead up to Bill C-284.

We are talking about pardoning. I have to bring a subject up because we have had some people—and I hate to say this being their federal member of parliament—of disrepute who on occasion have gone through the pardoning system, or have attempted to go

through the pardoning system, or on occasion perhaps should have used or taken advantage of the system of pardoning as distributed by the solicitor general.

One person was a man in Stonecliffe, Ontario by the name of Wild Willie Buckshot. It is too bad that the hon. member from Souris is not here because as the story goes with this pardoning, he actually rode with the notorious outlaw Jesse James. This is a true story. He said that Jesse James fell off his horse while robbing a bank and he went back and picked up Jesse James and rescued him. For this very humane act he was charged under the Criminal Code with aiding and abetting a robbery. He believed that he should have received a pardon.

I am not sure whether or not he did get a pardon but the gist of the story is that Wild Willie Buckshot turned out to be a very respectable member of that community. As a matter of fact he became known as one of the premier lumbermen in that area. He happened to also have a chicken farm. I do not know how they both relate but it is just to show the system of pardoning.

We then had a former mayor of the city of Pembroke by the name of Angus A. Campbell who believed that he was wrongly done by because they put a bypass around the community of Petawawa. It went through his farm.

If the hon. member listens and pays strict attention he will see the end of where I am coming to in this pardoning system. I understand this is a private members' bill and that I am at a luxury here to go about this in a roundabout way. On occasion many of the members speaking have been rather abrupt with it, giving all the nuances of this bill. I am just taking a different cut on it.

When I speak about the former mayor of the city of Pembroke, what he did was very appropriate. He stood in the middle of Highway 17 with a shotgun and stopped all traffic on both sides of the king's highway. As a result of that there was a possibility that he would be charged. He wanted an outlet into his property because it was hurting his place of business.

• (1350)

Would that person be an offensive person to the community? I do not think he would be. I do not believe that he would. Perhaps the members opposite would think so. He became the vice-president of the Canadian Association of Mayors.

Then we had a lawyer called Maloney. Members may be interested in this. He was a criminal lawyer of note. He went into the court system. He had a person who had been charged. In his presentation before the judge he clearly indicated to the judge that the person had not lied since he was rocked in a cradle. As a result of that the judge dispensed justice in the appropriate manner. He pardoned his sins, if we want to look at it in that regard. How this

Private Members' Business

lawyer pulled this grandiose feat off was he rocked the person in a cradle in his chambers before he went into the court system.

I realize that my time is running out and I want to get to the real point. Apparently one in ten Canadians have a criminal record. That would lead me to believe that, and perhaps I should not extrapolate from this, but the loyal opposition has 60 members and perhaps six of them have a criminal record. If they have done something of disrepute and want to be pardoned for that, they can appeal to the solicitor general. I cannot see any problem in that if there is some justification to the pardoning process.

When we come to sexual offences concerning young children, the basis of my talk has been that we cannot take a broad brush and paint the entire society in a negative fashion because of things done in a repugnant manner by a small minority. I believe Bill C-284 is going to address the concerns of the people who can take advantage of the pardoning system in a fair and equitable manner.

Rest assured, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members opposite, that it will be the Liberal Party of Canada that will continue to look after and care for the benefits of all people irrespective of age, gender and nationality. Goodness gracious, we will even look after members of the Conservative Party if they so desire.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today on Bill C-284 and speak in support of my colleague.

My opening remarks were not going to concern what I have just heard across the floor of this House. I would be remiss if I did not comment on the speeches which were just related to us.

I look out as I have never done before in this House. I am looking right at the camera asking Canadians who are watching today to put down the iron for a few minutes, put down those books, put down whatever it is they are doing for a minute and listen to what is going on in this House.

We have had two speeches with a certain amount of humour in them on an issue which does not have any humour in it. This bill is about protecting our children and our future, the future of Canada.

To the member for Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, I would say that this great Liberal compassion, this great idea that the Liberals are going to stand up for everyone has turned out in my experience since coming to this House in September, to be in essence a falsehood.

• (1355)

There are two examples. We have been dealing with hepatitis C for some time. Where is the compassion? Where is the understanding? Where is the government taking care of our people, the people in need? I look at our military people, the junior ranks, not the senior ranks. Where oh where is the compassion and understand-

ing for them? I will speak to the cameras again. It is a sad commentary.

All we are asking with this bill is for support from all members of the House for one more tool to protect our children. We are not asking for the abuse of the rights of Canadian citizens. When criminals commit acts of violence, sexual abuse against children and so on, whether anybody likes it or not, the system is set up so that they do lose some of their rights.

The parliamentary secretary to the justice minister was going on about the fact that some organization did not want a registry. They felt that the screening manual that was developed would be sufficient or a step in the right direction and I have to agree very much.

Organizations have to use due diligence in determining who their employees are, whether or not they are capable of the job and whether or not they are a danger to the recipients of their service. In this case it is children and their mothers and fathers.

I say yes, I agree with that screening manual. I agree with all the education. But why would anyone be opposed to having one more tool, a vital tool? That tool would be the right to find out if someone has had a previous conviction record of sexual abuse against children. If in fact they had been pardoned, that record could be opened up as it pertains to their record of sexual abuse against children.

This bill is that simple. There should be no reason why members on all sides, the Liberals, the NDP, the Conservatives, the Bloc, cannot support this bill. It is a small step but it is a very important one.

We are not saying, as the parliamentary secretary tried to indicate, that we only believe this one item is what the whole world will rest on, that a check of the criminal record is sufficient to protect our children. It is not. However it definitely is one step in the right direction.

I would like to talk for just a minute about who commits these offences. Certainly the term pedophiles has been mentioned. Obviously that term is used for a reason because it has to do with sexual offences against children. I have heard different members, including members of my own party, talk about 31% of sex offenders released from prisons re-violate within three years and this kind of thing.

I spent 30 years in the police force and I certainly did not spend all my time working on child abuse cases. However for every time a criminal is caught for doing an act he or she has done—and let us not misunderstand the idea in that there are also female sex abusers of children—the fact is that an offender will normally commit many offences before he actually gets caught. A lot of offenders go through a good part of their lifetime never getting caught for the offences they commit.

Private Members' Business

In the case of using 31% of sex offenders released from federal correctional institutions reviolating, that is understated. When that person reviolates, he will only be charged for that one reviolation. He will not be charged with all the ones for which there is no evidence or insufficient evidence.

The problem we are looking at here is being understated by people who use statistics to try to say there are only a few cases and it is not so bad. We only have to look at the milk cartons and all the police files that show missing child after missing child. We know from the convictions of people who were caught for this that they commit multiple offences. It is not the kind of crime where they do it once. That is what is so serious about this.

• (1400)

I believe that whatever we can do as a government and as parliamentarians we should take that step. We can all support Bill C-284. It is right and there is no reason why we should not give our full support to it.

I plead today for the government which has a majority in the House and can control what goes on to at least have a free vote on this and let backbenchers say what they would like to see happen to this bill. I am sure a lot would support the bill.

I have come out strongly in favour of this bill. It is definitely right for my grandchild's protection. I ask everyone to support it.

Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the member turned this into partisan politics when this is private members' hour because Bill C-284 is very important. If he is seeking the support on this side of the House he should have spared us the shots against the government and the shots against the Liberals in suggesting that we have no compassion.

Indeed this is an important bill. On this side of the House we do have free votes in Private Members' Business. This is why we are here. This is why we hear different points of view.

I have to say to the member for Calgary Centre that I think it is a very good bill. He has introduced something that a chord that is of great concern to all of us. What is interesting to me is he actually touches on a much broader issue, privacy and criminality.

We have a situation now where we can make the parallel between what is proposed by Bill C-284, the release of certain criminal record information in relation to people who have received pardons, and the Young Offenders Act. Young offenders after being convicted have certain protections, certainly in family court.

This whole issue of whether when a person is convicted of a serious criminal offence they should be entitled under any circumstances to privacy I think is a broader issue that deserves a lot of future debate.

Normally I am uncomfortable with some of the anti-crime stances the Reform Party takes. Often they seem to be very extreme. In this instance the member for Calgary Centre is proposing something the government should pay very careful attention to.

In the last parliament the government proposed Bill C-55. That bill was related to the one we are talking about and the parliamentary secretary to solicitor general made reference to it in his speech. That bill addressed the problem of what to do about convicted and released sexual offenders to avoid them coming back to the environment in which they are tempted to act out another crime. That bill proposed electronic monitoring. It was to give judges the discretion to put electronic shackles on individuals without warrants, without charges even, so that when they came into the area of a playground or something like that a bell would go off via satellite and the police would come and pick them up.

If there is ever any question in this House that the debates we have on legislation can have an impact, the debates that Bill C-55 sparked and the criticism that came in this House as a result of the concept of putting electronic shackles on people before there had been any arrest or charge resulted in that bill being thrown out. In other words, in the last parliament a bill came forward from the justice department which in comparison to what has been proposed by the member for Calgary Centre was draconian. What the member for Calgary Centre proposes does have merit.

• (1405)

What the member is simply saying is that when a pardon is granted it should be a discretionary pardon in the sense that the solicitor general through the Criminal Records Act reserves the right to release the information of that record to certain groups and individuals who seek to know whether a person soliciting employment that involves responsibility with children has a previous conviction.

This is not unreasonable. This is actually much more reasonable than having some sort of device attached permanently to someone to prevent them from coming anywhere near children.

My problem is simply that I am not sure we need the legislation of Bill C-284 to accomplish the mission the member for Calgary Centre is setting out to do. I cannot pretend to be an expert on the Criminal Records Act but I have read all the previous speeches, including his, and it does seem the solicitor general already has latitude. I agree with this legislation in principle, but rather than using legislation to accomplish what he is trying to do we could probably do it by regulation.

Partisan politics aside, this is where private members' hour becomes very important. The member for Calgary Centre has raised an issue that does concern us. He suggests the direction the government may take and if we set aside partisan politics, if hon. members listened carefully to the speech of the parliamentary secretary for the justice department, they would have heard her say

Private Members' Business

the government is interested in this. The government is listening. The government does care about it.

I think the member for Calgary Centre has accomplished something very important. He is touching on an issue that is much broader, privacy and criminality.

I congratulate him on bringing this before the House and I think at the very least he has brought his message forward to all Liberals on this side and to the government. This is an area where a fix can and should be made.

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, I respect the opinions of all members in the House but it bothers me greatly when I see a member make a mockery almost of a serious and important piece of legislation. I say that for the record.

I am pleased to rise today in support of Bill C-284. I commend the work of the member for Calgary Centre in tabling such an important piece of legislation.

Bill C-284 is important in that its focus is one of the highest priority, the protection of our children from abuse.

Conservative estimates are that 1 in 3 girls is sexually abused before the age of 18 while 1 in 6 boys is sexually abused before the age of 16. Even more frightening is that most abused and neglected children reportedly never come to the attention of authorities. This is especially true in cases of sexually abused children since there may be no outward sign of physical, psychological or emotional harm. Furthermore, sexually abused children are reluctant to report these crimes. They feel intense shame, and secrecy is often the result.

For these and other reasons we must focus our attention to combat child abuse at the preventive level. It is a serious matter of public interest which Bill C-284, if passed, would help address.

As outlined by previous speakers, this bill amends two existing statutes, the Criminal Records Act and the Canadian Human Rights Act.

The amendments to the Criminal Records Act would allow for limited disclosure of the criminal record of a person pardoned of a conviction for sexual offence against a child. This disclosure would occur when the pardoned person applies for a position of trust over children. The information would be provided to only those individuals with responsibility for children who are considering such an application. Any inappropriate disclosure of information by these individuals would be subject to criminal sanctions.

• (1410)

Put simply, these changes would give organizations that deal with children an additional tool to scrutinize potential employees and volunteers before they are placed in positions of trust. Groups

such as Scouts Canada, the Girl Guides and minor sports teams would have access to information that is extremely relevant to the selection process.

For those who would object on the grounds of privacy rights for pardoned offenders, I suggest they examine the reality of sexual offenders. Among criminal offenders, those convicted of sexual offences have one of the highest rates of recidivism.

Our children are far too important to risk having repeat offenders enter into positions of authority and trust. We must give child centred and youth centred organizations the tools to prevent future tragedies of child sexual abuse.

It is a sad irony that we presently have a government that cracks down on law-abiding gun owners and leaves tens of thousands of hepatitis victims twisting in the wind yet nonetheless feels the rights of convicted child sex offenders should take precedence over child safety.

The second component of Bill C-284 amends the Canadian Human Rights Act that permits organizations to refuse to employ individuals in so-called child trust positions on the basis of persons having a pardoned sexual offence against a child.

This amendment is the next logical step in Bill C-284. Once an organization has access to relevant information it should be free to act on it without fear of reprisal.

I share the view of those who believe that rehabilitation is a laudable goal. I also believe that securing employment for offenders re-entering society is often critical to ensuring that they do not become repeat offenders. This in turn helps protect public safety.

We need to draw the line at allowing convicted sexual offenders, irrespective of whether they were pardoned, to secretly enter into positions of trust over children. Canadians need peace of mind that organizations to which they entrust their children have taken all the precautions necessary to protect their safety.

Bill C-284 gives these organizations another weapon to fight child abuse. This bill is a reasonable compromise between the rights of offenders and the rights of society, in particular our most important members of society.

On behalf of the Progressive Conservative caucus I urge all members to vote in favour of this legislation. Let us support our many volunteer driven organizations that deal with children. Let us support our families. Let us support the safety of our children.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to support my colleague for Calgary Centre on Bill C-284.

This bill is based on an earlier bill, Bill C-382, produced by my colleague from Fraser Valley. It died on the order paper at the close of the 35th parliament.

Private Members' Business

In October 1996 the member tabled a 26,000 name petition which called for the changes similar to those this bill proposes. I am very pleased to see it here again.

This bill would amend the Criminal Code to prohibit for life all those convicted of sex offences against children from holding positions of trust and responsibility regarding children. Surely we can all support that. Thus far I have heard some positive comments from Liberals. I am trusting they will support the bill to see it through to the end and actually become law.

The bill would enable those responsible for children to make fully informed decisions about who they hire. Bill C-284 will give parents with children in third party care the assurance that those responsible for looking after their children have not abused this position of authority in the past.

The bill proposes to allow for the limited disclosure of an individual's criminal record if the individual has been convicted of a sexual offence against a child and later applies for a position of trust with respect to children. Such a disclosure will include an individual's criminal record for a previous sexual offence against a child or children even if they had served their sentence and had later received a pardon which had been removed on notice of conviction from the individual's criminal record.

• (1415)

That is a very important aspect of the bill given that pardons have been fairly easy to obtain. Often those in the area of pedophilia are very difficult to cure and would not be subject to as much protection as those who have committed other kinds of offences under the Criminal Code. I emphasize this limited disclosure will only take effect when an individual applies for a position of trust with respect to a child or children.

Bill C-284 does not propose that sex offences against children can never be pardoned. The bill does not propose that if one makes a mistake such as this that it should be forever on one's record.

Rather, it proposes that if someone does sexually abuse children, that person could effectively be prevented from holding a position of authority with children again, as those responsible for children will be able to see that a job applicant has abused such a position in the past and thus they will be more judicious in their hiring practice.

Is this bill necessary? It sends a message that the protection of our children is paramount. We can look at some very high profile cases in this province in and around the London area. Others are ongoing as we speak like in Cornwall and places like that where tragic events have taken place. Crimes against children have impacted the lives of hundreds of people in the community. That is the focus of the bill. It would ensure those involved in this kind of activity will be censured in their activities when it comes to looking after children.

Bill C-284 is necessary to address the procedural deficiencies in the way pardons are treated. Currently when someone receives a pardon for a summary or indictable offence, no record is accessible by the public that there ever was a criminal conviction or that the pardon was ever granted. A pardon for a summary offence is issued three years after one completes one's sentence. One can apply to receive a pardon for an indictable offence five years after completing one's sentence.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but the time for the consideration of Private Members' Business has expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper. I am happy to advise the hon. member that when the debate on this bill is resumed, he will have five minutes in which to complete his remarks.

It being 2.30 p.m., for all intents and purposes, this House stands adjourned until Monday, May 25, 1998 at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Orders 28(2) and 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2.17 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

MR. BILL BLAIKIE

MS. MARLENE CATTERALL

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. PETER MACKAY

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
Brisson, 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 (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of 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.
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.
Discepolo, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil — Soulanges	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	Yukon	NDP

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
MacKay, Peter	Pictou — Antigonish — Guysborough	Nova Scotia	PC

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Nystrom, Hon. 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.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Kelowna	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Hon. Andy, Solicitor General of Canada	Fredericton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — Cochrane	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
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
St-Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Quebec	Lib.
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	Sherbrooke	Quebec	

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 (34)		
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.
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
Sekora, Lou	Port Moody—Coquitlam	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan—Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley	Ref.
White, Randy	Langley—Abbotsford	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg—Transcona	NDP
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.
Wasylcia-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.
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.
------------------	--------------------	------

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Byrne, Gerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte	Lib.
Doyle, Norman	St. John's East	PC
Mathews, 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 (103)		
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.
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
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, Hélène	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Assad, Mark	Gatineau	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, André	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, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle	Lib.
Bigras, Bernard	Rosemont	BQ
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia—Matane	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charbonneau, Yvon	Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies	Lib.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac—Mégantic	BQ
Coderre, Denis	Bourassa	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques	BQ
Dalphond—Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
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.
Discepolo, 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—Maisonnette	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.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
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.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois—Rivières	BQ
Saada, Jacques	Brossard—La Prairie	Lib.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Repentigny	BQ
St—Hilaire, Caroline	Longueuil	BQ
St—Jacques, Diane	Shefford	PC
St—Julien, Guy	Abitibi	Lib.
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
VACANCY	Sherbrooke	
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, Hon. 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

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of May 15th, 1998 — 1st Session, 36th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Guy St-Julien

Vice-Chairmen: John Finlay
Derrek Konrad

Claude Bachand
John Bryden
Gordon Earle
Ghislain Fournier

David Iftody
Nancy Karetak-Lindell
Gerald Keddy

Judi Longfield
Grant McNally
Lawrence O'Brien

Bernard Patry
Mike Scott
Bryon Wilfert

(16)

Associate Members

Cliff Breitkreuz
René Canuel
Bill Casey

Pierre de Savoye
Reed Elley

Maurice Godin
Rick Laliberte

John Maloney
Maurice Vellacott

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: Joe McGuire

Vice-Chairmen: Murray Calder
Jay Hill

Hélène Alarie
Leon Benoit
Paul Bonwick
Rick Borotsik

Gerry Byrne
Denis Coderre
Odina Desrochers

John Harvard
Jake Hoepfner
Larry McCormick

Dick Proctor
Paul Steckle
Rose-Marie Ur

(16)

Associate Members

Peter Adams
Garry Breitkreuz
Pierre Brien
Rick Casson

Michelle Dockrill
Howard Hilstrom
Allan Kerpan
Réjean Lefebvre

John Maloney
Lorne Nystrom
Denis Paradis
Gilles Perron

John Solomon
Greg Thompson
Myron Thompson

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: Clifford Lincoln

Vice-Chairmen: Jim Abbott
Mauril Bélanger

Paul Bonwick
Sarmite Bulte
John Godfrey
Joe Jordan

Wendy Lill
Dennis Mills
Mark Muise

Deepak Obhrai
Pat O'Brien
Jim Pankiw

Jacques Saada
Caroline St-Hilaire
Suzanne Tremblay

(16)

Associate Members

André Bachand
Claude Bachand
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik
Cliff Breitkreuz
Pierre Brien
Denis Coderre

Antoine Dubé
Maurice Dumas
Gordon Earle
Christiane Gagnon
Albina Guarnieri
Monique Guay
David Iftody

Rick Laliberte
Francine Lalonde
Eric Lowther
Peter G. MacKay
Inky Mark
Rey Pagtakhan
Louis Plamondon

George Proud
Carmen Provenzano
Nelson Riis
Benoît Sauvageau
John Solomon
Elsie Wayne
Bob Wood

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF SPORT IN CANADA

Chairman: Dennis Mills

Jim Abbott	Albina Guarnieri	Pat O'Brien	Nelson Riis	(9)
Denis Coderre	Peter G. MacKay	George Proud	Suzanne Tremblay	

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chairman: Stan Dromisky

Vice-Chairs: Raymonde Folco
John Reynolds

Jean Augustine	Louise Hardy	John McKay	Maria Minna	(16)
Sarmite Bulte	M. Sophia Leung	Grant McNally	Deepak Obhrai	
Norman Doyle	Steve Mahoney	Réal Ménard	Jacques Saada	
Jocelyne Girard-Bujold				

Associate Members

Claude Bachand	Libby Davies	Patrick Martin	Diane St-Jacques
Pierre Brien	Monique Guay	Benoît Sauvageau	Daniel Turp

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairmen: Bill Gilmour
Gar Knutson

Sarkis Assadourian	Aileen Carroll	Roger Gallaway	Karen Kraft Sloan	(16)
Gérard Asselin	Rick Casson	John Herron	Rick Laliberte	
Bernard Bigras	Yvon Charbonneau	Joe Jordan	David Pratt	
Chuck Cadman				

Associate Members

Peter Adams	John Duncan	Louise Hardy	Nelson Riis
Hélène Alarie	John Finlay	Clifford Lincoln	Benoît Sauvageau
Leon Benoit	Paul Forseth	John Maloney	Peter Stoffer
Pierre Brien	Maurice Godin	David Price	Stéphan Tremblay

FINANCE**Chairman:** Maurizio Bevilacqua**Vice-Chairs:** Monte Solberg
Paddy TorsneyMark Assad
Scott Brison
Roger Gallaway
Dick HarrisDavid Iftody
Yvan Loubier
Gilles PerronGary Pillitteri
Karen Redman
Nelson RiisGerry Ritz
Paul Szabo
Tony Valeri

(16)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Rob Anders
André Bachand
Sue Barnes
Carolyn Bennett
Rick Borotsik
Claudette Bradshaw
Pierre Brien
Jocelyne G. BujoldOdina Desrochers
Nick Discepola
Norman Doyle
Antoine Dubé
Raymonde Folco
Joe Fontana
John Herron
Dale Johnston
Jim JonesJason Kenney
Francine Lalonde
René Laurin
M. Sophia Leung
Peter MacKay
Steve Mahoney
Larry McCormick
Alexa McDonough
Bob MillsLynn Myers
Bob Nault
Lorne Nystrom
Pauline Picard
Charlie Power
Yves Rocheleau
Alex Shepherd
John Solomon**FISHERIES AND OCEANS****Chairman:** George Baker**Vice-Chairmen:** Charles Hubbard
Gary LunnYvan Bernier
John Duncan
Wayne Easter
Howard HilstromNancy Karetak-Lindell
Gar Knutson
M. Sophia LeungBill Matthews
Lawrence O'Brien
Carmen ProvenzanoYves Rocheleau
Paul Steckle
Peter Stoffer

(16)

Associate MembersGilles Bernier
René Canuel
Paul ForsethGhislain Fournier
Bill GilmourPhilip Mayfield
Svend RobinsonMike Scott
Angela Vautour**FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE****Chairman:** Bill Graham**Vice-Chairs:** Colleen Beaumier
Bob MillsSarkis Assadourian
Jean Augustine
André Bachand
John CannisMaud Debien
Raymonde Folco
Gurmant Grewal
Ted McWhinneyDenis Paradis
Charlie Penson
Julian Reed
Svend RobinsonBenoît Sauvageau
Bob Speller
Daniel Turp

(18)

Associate MembersClaude Bachand
Sue Barnes
Eugene Bellemare
Bill Blaikie
Paul Bonwick
Claudette Bradshaw
Sarmite BulteAileen Carroll
Monique Guay
Joe Jordan
Jason Kenney
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi
Richard MarceauKeith Martin
Paul Mercier
Bob Nault
Lorne Nystrom
Deepak Obhrai
Charlie Power
George ProudKaren Redman
Nelson Riis
Jacques Saada
John Solomon
Diane St-Jacques
Pierrette Venne
Bryon Wilfert

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Chair: Colleen Beaumier

Jean Augustine Paul Bonwick	Claudette Bradshaw Maud Debien	Raymonde Folco Keith Martin	Svend Robinson Diane St-Jacques	(9)
--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, TRADE DISPUTES AND INVESTMENT

Chairman: Bob Speller

André Bachand Bill Blaikie	Sarmite Bulte Raymonde Folco	Robert Nault Charlie Penson	Julian Reed Benoît Sauvageau	(9)
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----

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 Wasylcia-Leis	(16)
---	--	--	---	------

Associate Members

Pierre Brien Libby Davies Pierre de Savoye Michelle Dockrill	Antoine Dubé Christiane Gagnon Sharon Hayes John Herron	M. Sophia Leung Keith Martin Réal Ménard	Caroline St-Hilaire Paul Szabo Stéphan Tremblay
---	--	--	---

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND THE STATUS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

Chairman: Reg Alcock

Vice-Chairs: Bonnie Brown
Dale Johnston

Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders Carolyn Bennett Claudette Bradshaw	Brenda Chamberlain Paul Crête Libby Davies Nick Discepola	Jean Dubé Christiane Gagnon Albina Guarnieri Larry McCormick	Bob Nault Stéphan Tremblay Bryon Wilfert	(18)
---	--	---	--	------

Associate Members

Yvan Bernier Pierre Brien Jocelyne G. Bujold Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral Antoine Dubé	Reed Elley Yvon Godin Sharon Hayes Wendy Lill	Inky Mark Patrick Martin Réal Ménard Maria Minna	Lorne Nystrom Yves Rocheleau Diane St-Jacques Angela Vautour
---	--	---	---

INDUSTRY**Chair:** Susan Whelan**Vice-Chairmen:** Eugène Bellemare
Werner SchmidtChris Axworthy
Bonnie Brown
Antoine Dubé
Tony IannoMarlene Jennings
Jim Jones
Francine LalondeWalt Lastewka
Eric Lowther
Ian MurrayJim Pankiw
Janko Perić
Alex Shepherd

(16)

Associate MembersPeter Adams
Hélène Alarie
Carolyn Bennett
Bernard Bigras
Paul BonwickPierre Brien
Jocelyne G. Bujold
Sarmite Bulte
Chuck Cadman
Nick DiscepolaJean Dubé
Joe Fontana
Christiane Gagnon
Rahim Jaffer
Philip MayfieldRéal Ménard
Nelson Riis
Benoît Sauvageau
John Solomon
Peter Stoffer**JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS****Chair:** Shaughnessy Cohen**Vice-Chairmen:** Paul E. Forseth
John MaloneyEleni Bakopanos
Michel Bellehumeur
Garry Breitkreuz
Paul DeVillersNick Discepola
Sheila Finestone
Derek LeePeter MacKay
Peter Mancini
Richard MarceauJohn McKay
Jack Ramsay
Andrew Telegdi

(16)

Associate MembersCarolyn Bennett
Cliff Breitkreuz
Pierre Brien
Chuck Cadman
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral
Pierre de SavoyeChristiane Gagnon
Michel Guimond
Louise Hardy
Dick Harris
Sharon HayesHoward Hilstrom
Allan Kerpan
Keith Martin
Réal Ménard
Mark MuiseSvend Robinson
Caroline St-Hilaire
Diane St-Jacques
Myron Thompson
Stéphan Tremblay**LIAISON****Chairman:** Bill Graham**Vice-Chair:** Susan WhelanPeter Adams
Reg Alcock
George Baker
Robert Bertrand
Maurizio BevilacquaRay Bonin
Charles Caccia
Shaughnessy Cohen
Stan Dromisky
Sheila FinestoneDerek Lee
Clifford Lincoln
Gurbax Malhi
Joe McGuireBeth Phinney
Brent St. Denis
Guy St-Julien
John Williams

(20)

Associate Members

Stéphane Bergeron

Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

André Harvey

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET**Chairman :** Bill GrahamPeter Adams
George S. BakerMaurizio Bevilacqua
Madeleine Dalphond-GuiralAndré Harvey
Susan Whelan

John Williams

(8)

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS

Chairman: Robert Bertrand

Vice-Chairmen: Art Hanger
Bob Wood

Chris Axworthy
Leon Benoit
Hec Clouthier
Maurice Godin

Peter Goldring
Judi Longfield
Pat O'Brien

John O'Reilly
David Pratt
David Price

George Proud
John Richardson
Pierrette Venne

(16)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien
Denis Coderre
Monique Guay

Jim Hart
John Maloney
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

Réginald Bélair
Gilles Bernier
Jocelyne G. Bujold
Gerry Byrne

Roy Cullen
Pierre de Savoye
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
Michelle Dockrill
Ghislain Fournier
Bill Gilmour
Jim Jones

Gerald Keddy
Derrek Konrad
René Laurin
Réjean Lefebvre

Gilles Perron
Nelson Riis
Angela Vautour
Maurice Vellacott

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Chairman: Peter Adams

Vice-Chairs: Marlene Catterall
Chuck Strahl

George Baker
Stéphane Bergeron
Yvon Charbonneau
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

Ken Epp
Mac Harb
André Harvey

Bob Kilger
Rey Pagtakhan
Carolyn Parrish

John Richardson
John Solomon
Randy White

(16)

Associate Members

Michel Bellehumeur
Bill Blaikie
Don Boudria

Garry Breitkreuz
Michelle Dockrill
Norman Doyle

Jay Hill
René Laurin
Bill Matthews

Réal Ménard
Suzanne Tremblay

SUB-COMMITTEE ON MEMBERS' SERVICES

Chairman: Randy White

Garry Breitkreuz
Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral

André Harvey

Bob Kilger

John Solomon

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Chair: Carolyn Parrish

William Blaikie Yvon Charbonneau	Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral	Ken Epp	André Harvey	(6)
-------------------------------------	---------------------------	---------	--------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Chairman: Bob Kilger

Stéphane Bergeron Bill Blaikie	Don Boudria	André Harvey	Randy White	(6)
-----------------------------------	-------------	--------------	-------------	-----

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Chairman: John Williams

Vice-Chairmen: Ivan Grose
Andrew Telegdi

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

Associate Members

Roy Bailey Garry Breitreuz Scott Brison Jocelyne G. Bujold	Rick Casson Bev Desjarlais Michelle Dockrill Antoine Dubé	Michel Guimond Jim Jones Derrek Konrad Denis Paradis	Gilles Perron Alex Shepherd Peter Stoffer
---	--	---	---

TRANSPORT

Chairman: Raymond Bonin

Vice-Chairmen: Roy Cullen
Lee Morrison

Roy Bailey Murray Calder John Cannis Bill Casey	Bev Desjarlais Claude Drouin Joe Fontana	Michel Guimond Stan Keyes Inky Mark	Paul Mercier Carolyn Parrish Lou Sekora	(16)
--	--	---	---	------

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Yvan Bernier Rick Borotsik	Pierre Brien Paul Crête John Cummins	Ghislain Fournier Rick Laliberte John Maloney	Yves Rocheleau Elsie Wayne
---	--	---	-------------------------------

STANDING JOINT COMMITTEES LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Joint-Chairmen: Philippe D. Gigantès
Gurbax Malhi

Joint Vice-Chairman: Philip Mayfield

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Roch Bolduc
Eymard G. Corbin
Mabel M. DeWare

Richard J. Doyle
Jerahmiel S. Grafstein
Louis J. Robichaud

Marlene Catterall
Hec Clouthier
John Finlay
Deborah Grey
Howard Hilstrom
Jim Karygiannis
Raymond Lavigne

Wendy Lill
Paul Mercier
Louis Plamondon
David Price
Karen Redman
Jacques Saada
Brent St. Denis

(23)

Associate Members

Libby Davies

Maurice Dumas

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Joint Chairs: Sen. Rose–Marie Losier–Cool
Sheila Finestone

Joint 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

Eugène Bellemare
Claudette Bradshaw
Cliff Breitreuz
John Godfrey
Bob Kilger
Dan McTeague
Ted McWhinney

Val Meredith
Mark Muise
Denis Paradis
Louis Plamondon
Suzanne Tremblay
Angela Vautour

(25)

Associate Members

Pierre Brien

Lorne Nystrom

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS

Joint Chairs: Céline Hervieux–Payette
Derek Lee

Joint 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
Ghislain Lebel
Gary Lunn
Gurbax Malhi

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

(25)

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy
Michel Bellehumeur

Michel Guimond
Richard Marceau

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

CHILD CUSTODY AND ACCESS

Joint Chairs: Landon Pearson
Roger Gallaway

Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Erminie J. Cohen
Joan Cook
Anne C. Cools

Mabel M. DeWare
Duncan J. Jessiman
Lucie Pépin

Eleni Bakopanos
Carolyn Bennett
Robert Bertrand
Madeleine Dalphond–Guiral
Sheila Finestone
Paul E. Forseth
John Harvard
Nancy Karetak–Lindell

Judi Longfield
Eric Lowther
Gary Lunn
Peter Mancini
Denis Paradis
Caroline St–Hilaire
Diane St–Jacques

(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 (Economic Development Agency of Canada for the Regions of 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 Valeri	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, May 15, 1998

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-19. Third reading	7045
Mr. Rock	7045
Mrs. Chamberlain	7045
Mr. Johnston	7047
Mr. Johnston	7048
Mr. Konrad	7051

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Students

Mr. Proud	7053
-----------------	------

The Senate

Mr. Gilmour	7053
-------------------	------

National Police Week

Mr. Pagtakhan	7053
---------------------	------

International Day of Families

Mr. Laurin	7053
------------------	------

Speech and Hearing Awareness Month

Ms. Parrish	7054
-------------------	------

Occupational Safety and Health

Mrs. Chamberlain	7054
------------------------	------

Occupational Health and Safety

Mr. Johnston	7054
--------------------	------

North American Aerospace Defence Command

Mr. Richardson	7054
----------------------	------

The Family

Mr. Harb	7055
----------------	------

Young Offenders Act

Mr. Obhrai	7055
------------------	------

National Nursing Week

Ms. Brown	7055
-----------------	------

Banks

Mr. Nystrom	7055
-------------------	------

Sommet de la Francophonie

Mr. Bertrand	7056
--------------------	------

St. Francis Xavier University

Mr. MacKay	7056
------------------	------

Calgary Declaration

Mr. DeVillers	7056
---------------------	------

National Defence

Mr. Benoit	7056
------------------	------

Association canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences

Ms. Alarie	7057
------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hepatitis C

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7057
--------------------------	------

Mr. Rock	7057
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7057
Mr. Rock	7057
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	7057
Mr. Rock	7057
Mr. Strahl	7057
Mr. Strahl	7058
Mr. Strahl	7058
Mr. Rock	7058
Mrs. Tremblay	7058
Mr. Rock	7058
Mrs. Tremblay	7058
Mr. Rock	7058
Mr. Dumas	7058
Mr. Rock	7059
Mr. Dumas	7059
Mr. Rock	7059
Ms. McDonough	7059
Mr. Rock	7059
Ms. McDonough	7059
Mr. Rock	7059

Canada Customs

Mr. Price	7059
Mr. Dhaliwal	7059
Mr. Price	7059
Mr. Dhaliwal	7059

Hepatitis C

Mr. Hart	7060
Mr. Rock	7060
Mr. Hart	7060
Mr. Rock	7060

David Levine

Ms. Girard-Bujold	7060
Mr. Gray	7060
Ms. Girard-Bujold	7060
Mr. Boudria	7060

Hepatitis C

Mr. Vellacott	7061
Mr. Rock	7061
Mr. Vellacott	7061
Mr. Rock	7061

Immigration

Mr. Ménard	7061
Mr. Gray	7061
Mr. Ménard	7061
Mr. Gray	7061

Hepatitis C

Mr. Reynolds	7061
Mr. Rock	7061
Mr. Jaffer	7062
Mr. Rock	7062

Varenes Tokamak Project

Mr. Bergeron	7062
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland)	7062

The Environment

Mr. Caccia	7062
------------------	------

Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland)	7062
Hepatitis C	
Mr. Bailey	7062
Mr. Rock	7062
Mr. Hilstrom	7063
Mr. Gray	7063
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	7063
Mr. Rock	7063
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis	7063
Mr. Rock	7063
Job Creation	
Mr. Muise	7063
Mr. Peterson	7063
Mr. Muise	7063
Mr. Peterson	7064
Met Life	
Ms. Catterall	7064
Mr. Peterson	7064
Hepatitis C	
Mr. Obhrai	7064
Mr. Rock	7064
Indonesia	
Mrs. Debien	7064
Mr. Kilgour	7064
David Levine	
Mr. Proctor	7065
Mr. Gray	7065
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	
Mr. MacKay	7065
Mr. Massé	7065
The Family	
Mr. Szabo	7065
Ms. Blondin-Andrew	7065
Hepatitis C	
Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	7065
Mr. Rock	7065
Snow Geese	
Mr. Perron	7066
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland)	7066
Seniors Benefits	
Mr. Nystrom	7066
Mr. Peterson	7066

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Supplementary Estimates (A), 1998-99	
Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Adams	7066
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Adams	7066
Committees of the House	
National Defence	
Mr. Bertrand	7066
Justice and Human Rights	
Ms. Cohen	7067
Public Accounts	
Mr. Grose	7067

Criminal Code	
Bill C-406. Introduction and first reading	7067
Mr. Benoit	7067
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	7067

Supplementary Estimates (A) 1998-99

Reference to Standing Committees	
Mr. Massé	7067
Motion	7067
(Motion agreed to)	7068

Petitions

Abolition of Nuclear Weapons	
Mrs. Debien	7068

The Environment

Mr. Lowther	7068
-------------------	------

Adult Entertainment

Mr. Lowther	7068
-------------------	------

CRTC

Mr. Lowther	7068
-------------------	------

Taxation

Mr. Szabo	7068
-----------------	------

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Adams	7068
-----------------	------

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns

Mr. Adams	7071
Mr. MacKay	7071

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canada Labour Code

Bill C-19. Third Reading	7071
Mr. Rocheleau	7071
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	7077
Ms. Cohen	7078
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	7078
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	7079
Mr. Benoit	7080
Division on motion deferred	7080
Mr. Adams	7080

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Records Act

Bill C-284. Second reading	7080
Mr. Strahl	7080

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget Implementation Act, 1998

Bill C-36—Notice of Time Allocation Motion	
Mr. Boudria	7082

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Records Act

Bill C-284. Second reading	7082
Mr. Bailey	7083
Mr. Proctor	7083
Ms. Bakopanos	7084
Mr. Clouthier	7084
Mr. Muise	7085

Mr. Clouthier	7085
Mr. Hilstrom	7086
Mr. Bryden	7087

Mr. Muise	7088
Mr. Hanger	7088
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://wwwparl.gc.ca>

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

Additional copies may be obtained from 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 des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada – Édition, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9.