



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 116 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Friday, June 5, 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, June 5, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

—————  
*Prayers*  
—————

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

### CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION AND SAFETY BOARD ACT

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (for the President of the Queen's Privy Council and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs)** moved that Bill S-2, an act to amend the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to Bill S-2, which amends the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act and makes consequential amendments to another Act.

[*English*]

In 1989 parliament passed the CTAISB act and the act was proclaimed in March 1990. Following a review that was required by the statute and on the basis of the operating experience of the Transport Safety Board, the TSB, over the past eight years some legislative changes have been proposed to fine tune the TSB's already good legislation.

• (1005)

[*Translation*]

Many of the proposed changes are relatively minor, or are administrative in nature. It is also proposed to improve the Board's operating practices and its independence.

Thanks to the administrative changes proposed, a number of the definitions used in the act will be improved, application of the act as it applies to pipeline accidents and incidents will be clarified, and it will be made clearer that departments may continue to perform their duties while the Board is investigating an accident.

As well, the TSB will be more readily able to respond to provincial requests to carry out investigations for them, on a cost recovery basis.

[*English*]

There are several proposed changes to put increased emphasis on the identification of safety deficiencies through TSB investigations.

[*Translation*]

In order to encourage people to provide the TSB with information on safety, it is proposed that information provided to investigators, by witnesses for instance, be better protected. Civil proceedings may be taken against persons refusing to provide information to TSB investigators.

[*English*]

A proposal will provide protection to representations made to the board on its confidential draft reports by persons with a direct interest who are asked to review them. Such protection would be similar to that provided to witness statements.

[*Translation*]

The bill contains a number of provisions as well concerning on board recorders, equipment known as black boxes, which can be very useful in a complex investigation. The on board recordings, which are already protected, will include the video recordings of crew activities.

However, sounds heard in on board recordings that are not voice recordings, such as motor noise, will no longer be protected.

Currently, on board recordings cannot be used in criminal or disciplinary proceedings. One provision will apply the same privilege to the recordings to limit their use in civil proceedings.

[*English*]

The bill was considered in detail by the Senate and three amendments were made. The first was to provide assurance that there would be a minimum number of full time board members.

*Government Orders*

The second was to accommodate the orderly administration of judicial and other proceedings started before these amendments become law. We believe that both of those amendments improve the bill.

A third amendment was made to widen the meaning of on-board recordings. That amendment leads to some serious problems for the Department of Transport in its safety oversight role and we requested that it be defeated. It has the unintended effect of denying the employer and the regulator access to the information necessary to ensuring the quality and safety of some elements of air traffic service. Further, it makes it difficult to take remedial measures when procedures require amendments. I point out that the Canadian Air Traffic Control Association does not object to the removal of this amendment.

[Translation]

Bill S-2 would help improve Canada's already exceptional reputation in transport accident investigation. I ask all members of the House to give the bill speedy passage.

[English]

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill S-2, an act to amend the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act and to make consequential amendments to another act, the Canadian Labour Code.

• (1010)

This bill is a reprint of Bill C-86 which was introduced during the last parliament on March 6, 1997. It passed first reading, but it was never considered by the transportation committee of the House of Commons.

Before I speak to the bill I would like to say a few words about the process that is being followed.

I am on the transportation committee and this is the first time I have heard about this bill. Would it not make sense for the transportation committee of the House to see the bill before it is introduced for debate in the House of Commons? This is one good reason for the House not to accept bills originating in the Senate.

The transportation committee of the House of Commons is the scrutineer of all legislation pertaining to transportation matters in this country, not the Senate. At no time should the transportation committee be left out of the process.

We on this side of the House support this bill in principle, but we need an opportunity to clarify some technicalities in the bill, hopefully at the committee level. We agree that there is a need to modernize Canada's transportation safety investigation regulations to align them with the recommendations made in a 1994 review commission report on the Canadian Transportation Accident Inves-

tigation and Safety Board Act and the 1992 Moshansky commission report on the Dryden air accident.

One of the goals of the review was to uncover cost efficiencies as well as increase the flexibility of the board's operations. Included in its recommendations allowing for part time board members was that the ratio of the full and part time members would be left up to the governor in council. That makes a lot of sense. For example, should there be a large serious accident or even a series of serious accidents it may seem necessary to the governor in council to appoint five full time members. At other times a full time board would not be necessary.

Is it necessary to have three full time members all the time? Would it not make sense to leave it up to the government of the day to hire on need?

The good news is that this amendment, unusual as it may be, would not result in new programs and new expenditures. This is indeed unusual in most government bills.

The amendments to repeal the Transportation Safety Board's mandate to initiate and conduct special studies and special investigations on matters pertaining to safety in transportation puzzles me. This amendment appears to take away from the Transportation Safety Board the authority to be independent and to initiate investigations on its own.

This amendment would make the Transportation Safety Board very reliant on directions from government on what it can and cannot investigate.

Bill S-2 will also place a greater emphasis on the identification of safety deficiencies in the transportation sector. It will prohibit other federal departments, except the Department of National Defence, from investigating a transportation occurrence for the purpose of making findings as to its causes and contributing factors. An investigation for any other purpose is sanctioned.

Bill S-2 will strengthen the distinction between safety investigations and court disciplinary proceedings. It will also provide for greater protection of information provided to the Transportation Safety Board. It will prohibit the use of on-board recordings in legal proceedings and will generally relieve investigators from the obligation to appear as witnesses in any such proceedings.

• (1015)

The Reform Party supports the bill. It is critical to the process that the bill originated in the Senate and should pass through the transport committee of the House of Commons.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today to Bill S-2. For the

*Government Orders*

benefit of those watching, this bill was originally introduced by the government on March 6, 1997 as Bill C-86 but died on the order paper when the last federal election was called on April 26, 1997.

I would first off like to say that our party, the Bloc Québécois, will support the bill. I give the government the option of proceeding to second and third reading this morning to permit the bill to be passed quickly before the summer recess.

Even though elements of the bill are of interest to our party, there is a procedure not often used in the House, which is sometimes a problem, but which is permitted, namely, the introduction of bills directly in the Senate. This is why this bill is known as Bill S-2. So, exceptionally, the government decided, with the co-operation of the Leader of the Government in the Senate, to introduce this bill in the Senate first, rather than in the House first.

Like most Quebeckers, we in the Bloc Québécois are totally opposed to the institution that is the Senate. We deplore the fact that, showing a degree of contempt for democracy, the government chose to introduce the bill before unelected parliamentarians. Bear in mind that this archaic institution from another era is made up of 104 individuals appointed by the government of the day, who are currently almost equally divided into two groups: a Liberal majority and a Conservative official opposition.

To us, as a party, it is absolutely indecent for such a bill to be initiated by unelected senators. The government should have followed the usual procedure and introduced the bill here, in the House of Commons, the house of the people, where we represent democracy as it was clearly expressed in the June 2, 1997 general election. Whether we get along or not, or have differences of opinion about Canada's or Quebec's place on the international scene, we are all democratically elected members of parliament.

There is no ambiguity about the political colour of the 44 members of the Bloc Québécois: we are sovereignists. We have said so before, during and every day we have a chance to do so in this House since the election. We consider ourselves democrats, to the same extent as our colleagues from the four other parties represented in the House. This concludes the aside I wanted to make regarding the unusual procedure used.

I hope the government will not make it a habit. We work hard in this place. We have a number of bills to examine. Unfortunately, it is rumoured that we will adjourn soon, earlier than scheduled on the parliamentary calendar, because our legislative agenda is so light. I see the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration laughing across the way. But it is true, there is not much to work on. We are prepared to work hard, night and day and on weekends if necessary, but we need a legislative agenda to work on. I believe members of this House have shown that they can be serious and work hard. There is no need to have bills introduced directly in the Senate.

• (1020)

I go back to the fact that the Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act was passed in 1989 and proclaimed in 1990. That legislation provided for a review mechanism. The board that conducted the review tabled its report in 1994, and the bill before us reflects these recommendations, those of the Moshansky commission of inquiry, and also takes into account various consultations.

I want to deal with three specific issues: the board's independence, the role given to the provinces in this bill, and the members of the board.

First, the bill does strengthen the board's independence, and our party is very pleased with that. The board will deal at arms' length with the minister. Its independence is also encouraged by promoting non coercive methods to gain the co-operation of witnesses and to better protect the confidential nature of the information provided by witnesses, and by providing greater protection in legal proceedings, following statements made by witnesses.

The object of the board is to advance transportation safety by conducting independent investigations, identifying safety deficiencies, making recommendations and reporting publicly on investigations. These responsibilities are stated in clause 7 of Bill S-2. The idea is not necessarily to find guilty parties. Rather, it is to find out what happened, why and what conditions led to the accident.

The board must play an inquisitive but not necessarily accusatory role to find out what happened. It must find out the facts to understand the incident and, of course, to write reports, which is the important element in clause 7. This will help to define prevention measures, so that such incidents do not recur. The issue is transportation safety, it is about saving human lives.

When we use a means of transportation in Canada or in Quebec, we expect the company to be serious, reasonable and professional. Since we naturally trust it, it could be tempted to try to stretch increasingly limited financial resources a little further by trying to keep costs down—by cutting a few corners, as my mother would say, not bothering with every little detail—to the detriment of safety.

The government therefore has the important legislative and regulatory role of ensuring that Canadians and Quebeckers have an efficient, effective and, above all, safe transportation system.

No matter how many regulations are in place, accidents are still going to happen. But they must be well documented; we must look into them, make reports and recommendations so that, when these accidents occur, we really know what went wrong. And I hope that that will not be the end of it, that these recommendations will not

*Government Orders*

gather dust on library shelves and never be consulted again. It has to have a certain documentary value if prevention is to be served.

• (1025)

The board's purpose is not to cast blame. Right now, the board can press charges against individuals refusing to testify. The issue is one of being compelled to testify. In future, it will be possible to make an application to the Superior Court or the Federal Court in order to require an individual to disclose information or be found in contempt. Our party is pleased with this procedure. It is faster, less costly and more effective.

We in the Bloc Québécois are not narrow-minded. We are not in the opposition for the sole purpose of criticizing and complaining. When the government gets something right, we say so. That is a sign of political maturity.

However, when it is wrong, I hope we have the right to say so, and I hope the government does not think it is perfect. For instance, in clause 19, paragraph 15.1, the government is proposing a faster, less expensive and more efficient process, that we support, because we think it is a good thing.

On the independence issue, the bill confirms the exclusive jurisdiction of the board over investigating the causes of a transportation occurrence. That is stipulated in clause 14.4. The wording is also changed to show that the board is not an administrative or quasi-judicial tribunal.

I do not remember the exact wording and I do not have the time to start looking for it in the bill, but we wanted to decriminalize the whole process as it concerns the witnesses. If memory serves, we no longer talk about briefs and witnesses, but about people giving testimony.

That might sound like a technicality, but still it decriminalizes the whole process and it indicates that the main purpose of the board is to investigate the facts and to come up with recommendations to once again improve safety.

With this bill, the government wanted to eliminate the quasi-judicial aspect of the proceedings of the board. We support this move.

My second remark concerns the role of the provinces. Since we are still in a heavily centralized federal system, it is unfortunate that the Canadian pact should provide for a strong central government and provinces that are nearly powerless. This is one problem. And, partly because of that, Quebec looks forward to the day when it has full power and does not have to come begging to the federal government all the time.

This is the system we have to live with for the time being, and our party being a democratic party has said that it would keep looking for ways to improve the Canadian federal system from within.

The provinces will now be allowed to ask the board to investigate accidents in transportation areas that are under their own jurisdiction. Paragraph 15.1 provides that provinces can use the board.

I think that this provision could be interesting under the new approach being used with railways in Canada and especially in Quebec, where we have a number of railway lines. The process is underway. This procedure could be used in the case of so-called short line railroads. The board will be empowered to investigate accidents in transportation areas under provincial jurisdiction. The fact is that short line railroads are entirely under provincial jurisdiction when they are not involved in interprovincial operations.

• (1030)

Of course, the costs of the investigation must then be recovered from the provinces. Our party does hope the board will be reasonable in assessing the costs to the provinces. I hope it will not try to pass on to them the cost of the three inch thick carpeting which I am sure covers the floor in the board's offices. If, however, the costs incurred during the course of an investigation on a means of transportation under provincial jurisdiction are reasonable, I do not foresee any problem.

This bill encourages co-operation between the board's investigators and provincial coroners as opposed to peace officers.

My third and last point, before I conclude, deals with board members. The bill provides for the appointment of part time members and a full board of no more than five members. We acknowledge that this is bound to make the board more cost efficient.

However, this is another case of bouquets and brickbats. We must raise an issue that the government really fails to understand or refuses to accept. When the Liberals were in the opposition, under the Conservatives, they took issue with the many partisan appointments made by Prime Minister Mulroney, as can be seen in *Hansard* for the years 1984 to 1993, at which point the Liberals came to power. When they formed the opposition, the Liberals kept on lambasting Prime Minister Mulroney and his Tory government for their partisan appointments.

In 1993, the Liberals were voted in, but the practice was maintained. Today, it is alive and well. Our party would have hoped that with Bill S-2 the government would have shown an openness and transparency it has not shown since 1993. We would have liked to see an open appointment process under which board's members would be chosen for their skills and expertise, and not for being a member of the Liberal Party of Canada or a candidate in a general election.

The Bloc Québécois is well aware of how the government rewarded the Liberal candidates who ran against us unsuccessfully in the Quebec City area. I remember a lady by the name of Margo Brousseau, who ran in 1993 for the Liberal Party in Louis-Hébert. Shortly after her defeat to my former colleague, Philippe Paré,

*Government Orders*

Mrs. Brousseau was appointed to the board of directors of the port of Quebec City.

We know also that in the last election Jacques Portelance, a councillor in the municipality of Charlesbourg, was defeated by my colleague from Charlesbourg. A few months ago, he was appointed to the board of directors of the port of Quebec City. I have nothing against Mr. Portelance. And my colleague from Argenteuil—Papi-neau is telling me that Stéphane Hébert was also a Liberal candidate who was rewarded by the government.

The government should have used this bill to say “Enough is enough”, as Reform members like to say. It should have taken the opportunity to provide for transparency in the appointment process. But no, the partisan appointment process lives on.

• (1035)

Everyone will find some benefit in my last comment on the issue. The Liberals are continuing what the Conservatives were doing and now, with the Conservatives in opposition, the few Conservative members we see in this House, because they are often missing in action, starting with their former leader—

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

**Mr. Michel Guimond:** These few Conservative members wax indignant, criticizing the government’s partisan appointments, even though they did the exact same thing during their eight or nine years in office.

This confirms what we in the Bloc said to Quebeckers in the last election campaign in 1993: “The Liberals and the Conservatives are exactly the same, except that they throw the ball at each other”. When one party is in office, the other complains and vice versa.

We in the Bloc Quebecois are of one mind in this regard: Since we field candidates only in Quebec, we know that we were elected to represent Quebec’s interests. What we ask for is a transparent process. We have no one to reward for contributing to our election fund. We want the government to appoint the most able people, regardless of gender, origin or academic background.

In conclusion, this bill makes various small administrative changes resulting from the experiences of the last few years. We think it is normal to make such administrative changes and, as I mentioned earlier, we believe the board plays an important and essential role.

It is a good thing that there will be more emphasis on the identification of safety violations. It is a good thing that the board will use collaboration and rely on information provided in all frankness and confidence to improve its investigative method.

We are happy that, through this bill, the board will confirm that it is determined to identify circumstances surrounding the loss of lives in order to promote security, and not to determine responsibility.

I think it is a clarification that needs to be made. The issue is not to know who is responsible, but to try to understand what happened, especially if lives were lost, and to make sure that it does not happen again.

A country’s transportation system depends essentially on the degree of confidence. People will prefer one means of transportation over another if they are confident, if they think safety rules are observed and if they believe they are in an environment that is safe and sound for themselves and their families.

It is clear that problems will arise if people in Quebec and in Canada lose confidence in one means of transportation or another. We have an example of that right now. Air traffic controllers are presently negotiating with Nav Canada. I do not want to sound alarmist, but I hope that the safety of air passengers is not threatened by these negotiations. We know there are pressure tactics, we know there are obstacles.

Nav Canada—and this was confirmed by the Auditor General of Canada, Mr. Desautels—was literally given the air traffic control system in Canada. I think it would be in Nav Canada’s best interest to sit down at the bargaining table with its employees, the air traffic controllers, and to find a way to settle this collective agreement. It is crucial to the safety of Canada’s air transport system as well as to the confidence we have in this system.

• (1040)

I repeat what I said at the beginning of my speech: We support Bill S-2 and our party will co-operate with the government should it decide to proceed with second and third reading of this bill this morning so it can be passed before the summer recess.

[*English*]

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, back in 1989 the Conservative government originally introduced the safety board act and we opposed it. It was fundamentally flawed then and it is fundamentally flawed now.

The bill before us is to amend the act but does nothing to address the deficiencies in the Transportation Safety Board. The main idea underlying this act is supportable in principle. In 1989 this act brought a number of federal bodies responsible for investigating transportation safety under the same roof.

If the Conservative government had wanted to, it could have streamlined these operations, increased efficiency and saved money for the taxpayers without sacrificing public. Instead this act created a seriously deficient Transportation Safety Board, a board

*Government Orders*

that was and still is unable to fulfil its mandate to safeguard the lives of Canadians.

Last year there were 2,159 train, marine, air and pipeline accidents reported in Canada. This is just the number of reported accidents and does not include any that went unreported. These accidents resulted in 127 deaths. Yet the safety board's nationwide investigative staff only consists of 135 people. These 135 people, field investigators, supervisors, laboratory personnel, forensic investigators have to cover all the accidents that occur in Canada. No wonder the safety board is plagued with a backlog.

In its annual report the board states its intention to reduce the amount of time it spends on each case so that it can reduce its backlog. Think about that. They are going to spend less time on each case so they can cut down the backlog. An investigation into an accident is not something that can be rushed. It is a matter of public safety and warrants a complete and thorough investigation, not a rush job.

The government has left the Transportation Safety Board understaffed and underfunded so much that the dedicated public servants who work there have little choice but to cope as they are doing. It should not be this way. This organization is supposed to advance transportation safety in Canada. It is what Canadians rely on to protect them and their environment from accidents on the rails and waterways and in the the skies and the pipelines of this country.

Canadians rely on the Transportation Safety Board but its resources are spread too thin. It was a good idea to streamline safety investigations under one roof, but for it to work we have to give the board the resources it needs to fulfil such a broad mandate. By nickeling and diming the Transportation Safety Board the government is putting the health and safety of Canadians at risk.

This is not something we can afford to cut corners on, but that is just what is happening. Apparently the government would rather save money than lives.

Fortunately the original act included a clause requiring a review of the Transportation Safety Board. This review was completed in 1994. By then we had a new government. The Liberals had replaced the Conservatives.

The Liberals have had a chance to fix the problems with the Transportation Safety Board to make a meaningful investment in transportation safety but they have chosen not to. They are just as indifferent to the health and safety of Canadians as their Conservative predecessors.

Instead the Liberals have given us the bill before us today, Bill S-2. Not only does this bill not deal with the deficiencies of the Transportation Safety Board, it actually makes them worse.

At present the board consists of four members. One of the amendments that the Liberals are proposing would allow them to turn some of these appointments from full time into part time positions. We are led to believe that this is a good thing because they will be able to spread themselves a lot further. I am sceptical. I am concerned that the board will have even fewer working hours to deal with the many important issues it is mandated to investigate. This is a big step in the wrong direction.

There are a few good amendments in this bill, but on the whole it makes a bad act even worse. One of the good amendments which I will touch on briefly is the extension of the privacy protections for those who give information to board investigators.

As an experienced labour activist I know the kind of pressure and intimidation employers are capable of using against workers. If employees have information that is of use to the safety board but may be damaging to their employer, they must be free to give this information.

• (1045)

However, they might not co-operate with investigators if they are afraid for their jobs and families. Thus it is vitally important that testimony given to the safety investigators be held in the strictest of confidence. This is necessary so that witnesses can be candid with investigators without fear of retribution.

The extension of confidentiality in the investigative process is a good amendment. It gives workers the freedom to co-operate with safety board investigators and protects them. It is surprising to see such an amendment in a Senate bill. That place is hardly an institution known for protecting workers. It has historically played the role of advocate for the privileged few. Not that the privileged few have ever needed this protection with the Liberal and the Conservatives in power.

Even John A. Macdonald acknowledged the other house's role as a defender of the privileged when he said a larger qualification should be necessary for membership of the upper house in order to represent the principle of property. The rights of the minority must be protected and the rich are always fewer in number than the poor.

This amendment protecting workers is quite out of character for that other house. In the context of the rest of the bill this one amendment is an anomaly. The amendments to this bill that I most strongly object to are the ones that reduce the independence and public accountability of the board. These are much more in character for that unelected and unaccountable institution.

Like the auditor general, this transportation safety board is expected to be independent of political and outside influences. That is the whole point. It is supposed to provide an independent neutral perspective on safety issues in Canada. Everyone acknowledges this. Yet the safety board act includes a ridiculous provision



*Government Orders*

allowing ministers and other interested parties to review draft copies of the board's annual report and submit comments on it.

This is a glaring contradiction. What this does is allow parties with vested interests in the board's reports to attempt to influence these reports to their advantage. Even if the board members try their best to be neutral they will be undoubtedly influenced to some degree by these outside submissions. This is especially true in the case of submissions by ministers since the board members are appointed by the government. Thus the safety board is not independent like it should be. It is subject to undue political influence.

Comprising the board's independence and neutrality in this way is scandalous. It risks the health and safety of Canadians for the sake of politics. The safety board must be free of outside influences so it can focus exclusively on public safety.

Not only does this bill before us today not resolve the board's independence problem, it makes the problem's magnitude much worse. At least now when private interests comment to the board about the draft reports these comments are not secret. At least the public has a chance to scrutinize these comments and see how the board is being influenced.

The bill would make these submissions secret. Why is this? Why do the Liberals in the Senate not want the public to know what people are saying to the transportation safety board? It looks like they do not want Canadians to know what is going on at the board. They are covering it with a shroud of secrecy. It is bad enough that the current act allows private interests to influence the safety board. Now the Liberals are trying to hide this from the Canadian people. It is deceptive. It is patronizing. It is anti-democratic. It shows how out of touch the Liberals are with ordinary Canadians.

I am forced to wonder what the Liberals are trying to hide. If these private submissions they are trying to hide were not unduly influencing the safety board there would be no reason to hide them. By placing this shroud over the safety board they are shattering the illusion of independence.

Canadians expect the transportation safety board to be looking out for them so that when they travel for business or for pleasure they can feel safe. That is why they need a safety board that is independent, neutral and adequately funded. It must be adequately funded so it has the resources to properly carry out its mandate. It must be independent so it can focus on public safety without undue political or private influences diverting it from its purpose. To deny the board these essential necessities does a great disservice to Canadians.

As I indicated, there are beneficial aspects of the bill. We will be in a corner today weighing the benefits being enacted before the summer or delaying the bill with the hope of trying to convince the Liberals of the changes in the fall. It is apparent they have a majority and I am not convinced that delaying the bill will result in any changes but just a stalling of the inevitable.

• (1050)

**Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give my views on Bill S-2.

We have been provided with a book on this bill which we have reviewed as best we could. We have contacted as many people as we could, including officials of the transportation safety board to find out their views on it. As far as we could tell there seemed to be consensus for the passing of this bill.

However, the government wants to move it through the system and avoid the transport committee. It will require unanimous consent on that. I am going to withhold my consent on that because this is the second major transportation bill to go through the government. As members of the transportation committee we have been denied access to witnesses.

In the case of Bill C-9, a much more profound bill with more impact, I moved a motion to have witnesses heard but I was overruled by the committee so we never heard witnesses opposed to Bill C-9. There is the same effort with Bill S-2 to avoid allowing witnesses to make presentations. We are only allowed to hear the people in support of the bill while we are not allowed to hear the people opposed to it.

When Bill C-9 went to Senate after we passed it in the House, the senators had witnesses in their senate committee, and many people opposed it. We were denied access to those presentations. I feel very strongly that we were sent here to serve the people. We were put on the transport committee to help make decisions and proper amendments. If we are not allowed to hear both sides of the story but are only allowed to hear the government side, we are not equipped or able to make intelligent decisions. I will be opposing unanimous consent on this.

I am really sorry with Bill C-9 that I did not push harder for witnesses to be heard. I did make the motion and I was overruled but I feel now that I should have done more. I am not going to make that mistake again. I want to hear both sides of the story, not just one.

In that effort we contacted officials of the transportation safety board. They are supportive of this bill. We asked them several months ago and then asked them again yesterday. They feel there are some positive changes here which they want to see go ahead. However, we have not heard the other side of the story from the people affected, and a lot of people will be affected by this bill.

Another reason to send it to committee and to call witnesses is that the government strangely enough moved an amendment in the bill that was passed but it now wants to withdraw that amendment. I do not have a satisfactory explanation of what that was all about. Why did the government move the amendment in the first place? Who was affected by it? I think air traffic controllers, perhaps pilots and a lot of people would be affected by that amendment. Now the government wants the amendment withdrawn with no

*Government Orders*

explanation, no hearings and no witnesses. That is another reason to make this bill go to committee and to hear all sides of the story.

If it is a good bill it will pass committee. I pledge my total support to see that it goes through as quickly as possible but I do want it to go to committee. If we allow this bill to go through without first going through committee and hearing witnesses, it will be the second transport bill this happens to. It will be the same as Bill C-9 where we were not allowed to hear from witnesses.

Bill C-9 was a much more profound bill with more impact. A lot of people were against it and we were not allowed to hear from any of them. The only people we heard from are those we reached out to and contacted ourselves. We did not have an open committee or testimony from people who were affected. That same thing will happen with Bill S-2 if we allow it go through via the speedy process which is going through the House without going to committee. We will be voting against unanimous approval to expedite this bill through the system.

• (1055)

[Translation]

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Deputy Speaker:** All those in favour 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.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare the motion carried on division. The bill is therefore referred to the Standing Committee on Transport.

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

[English]

**PENSION BENEFITS STANDARDS ACT, 1985**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill S-3, an act to amend the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 and the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The member in whose name the motions on the notice paper stand is not here to move them. Therefore I will proceed to put the question on the report stage of this bill.

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais:** Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity to speak on Bill S-3.

**The Deputy Speaker:** I am sorry, there is nothing to speak on at the moment. We are on report stage. There are amendments proposed that cannot be put to the House because no one is here to move them. I intend to put the question on concurrence at report stage, which is not a debatable motion.

**Hon. John Manley (for the Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.)** moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**An hon. member:** On division.

(Motion agreed to)

**Mr. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not sure exactly what happened but it was our intention to move and to speak to amendments at report stage. That did not happen and you moved very quickly to concurrence.

The member for Churchill was intending to speak to the motion for concurrence. Things are moving ahead very rapidly and without the full consent of the House.

**The Deputy Speaker:** There is not a matter of consent. The motion for concurrence is not a debatable motion. I was required by the rules to put the motion to the House. I did so. The motion is put and carried.

The question is when will the bill be read the third time. Since it can be read now, if that is the desire of the House, we will deal with it now. The hon. member for Churchill will have an opportunity to speak on the bill at third reading.

When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Hon. John Manley (for the Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.)** moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

*S. O. 31*

**The Deputy Speaker:** We are now on debate at third reading, but it being 10.58 a.m., the first speaker can wait until after question period.

nothing to reform the Senate. Shame on the Liberals for allowing the Senate to continue its downward slide.

\* \* \*

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

### CANCER

**Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I remind the House that Sunday, June 7 is national cancer survivors day in Canada.

As my colleagues may be aware, one in three Canadians will be diagnosed this year. Sometimes it seems like that rate is even higher in P.E.I. I have too often seen the intense suffering cancer inflicts on its victims but today, thanks to improved detection methods, more available information and enhanced methods of treatment, more than half of all people with cancer will survive the disease.

The Canadian Cancer Society is planning activities to elevate the importance and profile of this day throughout Canada. I encourage everyone to celebrate life, honour our survivors and recognize the important role of others in the lives of survivors.

I commend the Canadian Cancer Society for its continuing work in helping combat cancer and raise public awareness of this devastating disease.

\* \* \*

### THE SENATE

**Mr. Gurmant Grewal (Surrey Central, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Senate is not accountable because senators are not elected.

• (1100)

Eighty-four percent of British Columbians want elected senators. Provincial representation in the Senate is unequal and we know that the Senate is not effective.

The other day the Prime Minister said that the Senate abides by its own rules and manages itself. The Prime Minister only knows who to appoint to the Senate and then he forgets how to manage them. He said he would reform the Senate, but he is not doing that.

We need to change the Senate. Otherwise its downward slide will continue. The Prime Minister is letting the Senate continue its downward slide. Shame on the Prime Minister for talking the talk, but not walking the walk. Shame on the government for doing

### THE OTTAWA RIVER

**Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for thousands of years the Ottawa River was the primary transportation route to the Canadian interior. Long before the arrival of the white man, our aboriginal people understood its importance. In fact, the Algonquins controlled the river for many years and exacted tolls from those using it. It is likely that Etienne Brûlé was the first European to travel the river in 1610, followed by Samuel de Champlain in 1613.

Today a group of individuals no less visionary than our aboriginal peoples and the early explorers is seeking to open up the Ottawa River to navigation from Lake Temiskaming to the St. Lawrence. Two phases which open the upper reaches of the river have already been completed by the Ottawa River Navigable Waterway Corporation. The final phase between the Chaudière Falls and Lac Deschênes is the only stretch of the river that remains to be opened.

There is tremendous potential for jobs and economic development along the Ottawa River. I would like to urge the federal government to work with this non-profit corporation to initiate a feasibility study to determine the economic costs and benefits of constructing a bypass system or a lock system to permit the navigation of small craft on the Ottawa River.

\* \* \*

### BROOKLIN SPRING FAIR

**Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Brooklin Spring Fair, initiated in 1911 and held the first weekend in June, holds very special significance for the historic village of Brooklin in my riding.

Traditional events that are held over four days form the backbone of the fair. On Thursday exhibits are placed in the arena to be judged in the home craft section. Main events include a children's pony show, opening ceremonies and the ambassador of the fair competition. Friday unleashes the excitement of the midway for children's day, followed by the roar of the truck and tractor pull. Saturday features a parade, horse shows, livestock competitions and an action packed demolition derby. The final day of the fair incorporates the sheep show, car show and harness horse racing.

The remarkable success and longevity of the Brooklin Spring Fair can be attributed to the effort and dedication of many individuals. The variety of the events displayed at the fair ensures a bright future for one of Canada's oldest fairs.

*S. O. 31*

### CANADIANNURSES

**Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians have a great deal to offer the world. Just look at the Canadian Nurses Association and the excellent work it is doing in developing countries.

Following CIDA's mandate to strengthen civil society organizations and satisfy basic needs, Canadian nurses have provided assistance to 25 developing countries over the past 15 years. Projects range from promoting the professional development of nurses to encouraging nurses to take a leadership role in the primary health care of the community.

I would like to congratulate Jane MacDonald, a health educator from the Centretown Community Health Centre, for her work in Ecuador. As well, I would like to congratulate Janet Mann and Anne-Marie Lanctôt for their dedication to strengthening the role of nurses in Ethiopia.

I join with my colleagues to thank every Canadian who has volunteered their time and expertise in helping those in need around the world. Congratulations on a job well done.

\* \* \*

### DELGAMUUKW

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of Canada's Delgamuukw decision will have a long lasting and far-reaching impact on British Columbia.

Section 13 of the British Columbia terms of union laid out that the federal government was responsible for "The charge of Indians". In 1924 the federal government, through an order in council, stated that the province had successfully completed all the requirements under this section.

One constitutional expert goes to the very heart of Delgamuukw by saying "This court decision goes to the very question of B.C.'s sovereignty and the right of its government to conduct its public affairs". With the provincial government's hands tied and the federal government's unwillingness to take responsibility, combined with the Supreme Court of Canada's activist approach, a solution does not appear to be close at hand.

British Columbians must insist that the federal government accept its legal responsibility and the cost of reaching a permanent solution with all B.C. aboriginal people and, if necessary, offer a legislated solution to the legal mess that the Supreme Court has thrown us into.

• (1105)

### NUNAVUT

**Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today's article in the *Globe and Mail* highlights the dire situation in Nunavut. All the statistics are true. We do have uncommonly high rates of substance abuse, high rates of unemployment and, yes, high rates of suicide.

However, on Tuesday this House voted with a resounding majority to take the first steps to rectify these problems. Bill C-39 is part of a new beginning in Nunavut. It is going to be part of the solution. The answer lies with the people of Nunavut who will form their new government and begin to reshape their lives.

What we have before us is an opportunity, an opportunity we can be optimistic or pessimistic about. I choose to be optimistic.

We are asking fellow Canadians to give us a chance to get to the batter's mound and not strike us out before we even get there.

\* \* \*

### COLONEL F. G. NOSEWORTHY

**Mr. Gerry Byrne (Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House this morning to congratulate a native of Corner Brook, Newfoundland, a very honourable and noteworthy individual, Colonel F. G. Noseworthy, who is a member of my riding of Humber—St. Barbe—Baie Verte.

Mr. Noseworthy received the Order of Military Merit at an investiture ceremony that was presided over by Governor General Roméo LeBlanc on May 29, 1998.

The Order of Military Merit was created over 35 years ago to recognize meritorious service and devotion to duty by members of the Canadian forces. Mr. Noseworthy has been with the military engineering branch of the Canadian forces for over 29 years. It is my pleasure to congratulate him on such a great accomplishment.

Mr. Noseworthy was cited for his hard work. He excelled as a staff planner at both national and international levels, including as chief of staff of the 12 nation European community monitoring mission.

His competence and professionalism have not only been noted, they have now been recognized by such a prestigious award. Congratulations to Mr. Noseworthy.

\* \* \*

### CRTC

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the CRTC continues to make decisions which go against the will of Canadians.

The most recent ruling of the CRTC calls for an increase in Canadian content on Canada's radio stations, despite the fact that both the Canadian people and the radio industry oppose any such changes. Poll after poll indicates that Canadians are happy with 20% to 25% Canadian content on radio.

What did the CRTC decide to do? It raised the level to 35%, despite the fact that broadcasters are already having a hard time finding Canadian programming.

I had the opportunity to question the chair of the CRTC on this issue. Her answers were vague and hidden behind cultural objectives that the Liberals want to force upon the Canadian people.

The bottom line is that Canadians are masters of their own homes and are quite capable of making their own decisions. Therefore, I call upon the CRTC to reconsider its decision.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### COMMUNITY ACCESS PROGRAM

**Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 1, I was pleased to represent the hon. Minister of Industry at the opening of "L'@venue", a pilot project of the community access program in an urban setting, in Montreal.

There were more than 150 people in attendance, including representatives from the media, municipal, provincial and federal governments, as well as key partners from the private sector, like Videotron and the Bank of Montreal.

I talked about the role of the federal government in the development of the information highway, through the community access program.

This pilot project is important, not only because it allows the community to profit from the socio-economic advantages of the knowledge-based economy, but also because disadvantaged young Montrealers will be able to acquire profitable skills and experience, and thereby improve their future job opportunities.

I would like to congratulate all the partners in this important project and to offer my best wishes of success to all CAP sites in Canada.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### THE ENVIRONMENT

**Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there is a long and sad history of environmental neglect in the north. For 67 years the Dene people of Daline have suffered and died because of radioactive contamination on their traditional lands and they need help now.

*S. O. 31*

The Marwell tar pit in Whitehorse has been leaking toxic wastes into the environment for over 50 years. A man was even trapped and died there.

The federal government collects money for land reclamation and reforestation, yet no money goes back.

• (1110)

It takes 200 to 700 years to grow a tree in the north. The government approved the cut of over 200,000 hectares and only 4,000 have been replanted, and that is because of the efforts of students in the north.

There are abandoned military sites all over the north and if the departments of defence, Indian and northern affairs and the environment value the people and the land of the north this would never have happened. At the very least it would have been cleaned up.

If the Minister of Finance is serious about the environment there is ample opportunity to prove it.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### HUMAN RIGHTS

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, EGALE, a group promoting equality for gays, lesbians and bisexuals, is undertaking a survey on the condition of homosexuals among over 40,000 Canadians.

No one can dispute that lesbians, gays and bisexuals live unique experiences and share particular problems. This survey is the first systematic attempt to collect scientific data that should give us a better knowledge of these communities across the country.

Through this survey, participants are being asked to take action for equality, tolerance, openmindedness and mutual respect.

To conduct the survey, EGALE obtained the co-operation of the Department of Justice and the Canadian Human Rights Commission and two of its prominent analysts, Stephen Samis and Sandra Goundry.

I wish them well and at the same time I invite Canadians to contribute to the success of this operation.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS

**Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 50th anniversaries of both the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the founding of the State of Israel I would like to thank the government House leader and the House leaders of all parties for taking a principled stand on the issue of the holocaust denial.

Yesterday all parties in the House of Commons took this important stance against Mr. Ernst Zundel. He is an active and

*Oral Questions*

vicious anti-Semite, as well as one of the world's largest publishers of anti-Semitic and neo-Nazi publications.

In denying him admittance to the precincts of the House of Commons this House's unanimous decision has paid respect to those who perished in acts too horrible to describe, as well as to those who are living witnesses to the atrocities of the holocaust.

We must continue to counter this hateful, repugnant revision of history and remember the inhumanity of the holocaust. Mr. Zundel and his kind do not reflect Canada, its people or its values.

\* \* \*

**NORTHERN IRELAND**

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, on good Friday, May 22 of this year, the people of both Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland voted overwhelmingly in support of a peace accord.

We in this House should salute this spirit of compromise. It clearly prevailed in the hearts and minds of the people of Northern Ireland, be they Protestant or Catholic. They managed to set aside centuries of bloody conflict and endeavoured to reconcile their differences through the fine art of compromise.

Once referred to as a "terrible beauty", Northern Ireland is now well poised to take its rightful place in the international community, free from the sectarian hatred and division that has so pervaded the past 30 years of trouble.

We in this House, regardless of political affiliation, should follow this lesson of historic agreement: that the politics of division and exclusion is destructive and that the politics of reconciliation is the most effective means to building bridges across divided communities.

Indeed, examples of what the Irish poet Yeats termed the "indomitable Irishry" can be found in the contributions of Irish immigrants to Canada like Samuel McFall of Carrickfergus and Damian Curley of Galway.

Let us hope and pray that the honourable compromise reached in Northern Ireland holds true and that peace "comes dropping" quickly and remains victorious.

\* \* \*

**THE REFORM PARTY**

**Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians will savour the irony of the Reform Party's efforts to form an alliance with the only federal political party that seeks to separate Quebec from the rest of Canada, and this coming from the party that attempted to make it a point of honour to defend the Canadian flag in the House of Commons.

Canadians deplore the politically motivated efforts at rapprochement initiated by the Reform Party. This rapprochement will fool no one. Canadians will see it for what it is, a disguised attempt by Reform to increase its political base outside of western Canada.

[*Translation*]

Similarly, Canadians will not be fooled by the purely political manoeuvres of the Parti Quebecois and the Bloc Quebecois in .

These parties know very well that they cannot hope to sell the idea of a separate Quebec without promising political and economic partnership with the rest of Canada.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for Brampton West—Mississauga admonished me, my party and the premier of Ontario for our concern for the safety and human rights of Canadians.

• (1115)

We have misgivings regarding the granting of refugee status to Canada of eight individuals, including a hijacker, currently held in an Israeli jail.

What the member and chair of the subcommittee on human rights neglected to tell the House is that these eight pillars of virtue have been turned down by every other country where they have sought refugee status. What she neglected to tell us is that these eight have been termed a national security risk to the state of Israel.

Charity begins at home and so do human rights and the right to feel safe. Do these eight inspire in anyone a feeling of safety and security for Canadians?

Yesterday I reflected on a picture in my office of Nelson Mandela and me. I will be writing Mr. Mandela a letter of apology in the event that he hears that the member for Brampton West—Mississauga compared him to the group of eight in an Israeli jail. I hope the member will apologize personally to the premier of Ontario for her remarks.

---

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[*English*]

**GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS**

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the government admitted that it fudged the procurement rules by awarding a half billion dollar contract to Frontec Corporation without allowing Frontec's competitors to bid.

*Oral Questions*

When this was revealed the government's response was it froze the deal with Frontec Corporation. The official opposition has been asking about the \$2.85 billion sole source contract to Bombardier.

When will the Minister of Public Works and Government Services freeze that contract as well in favour of an open bidding process?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I quote the deputy leader of the Reform Party, the member for Edmonton North, who said in the House on May 6, 1996: "On May 2 I attended a supper in Grand Centre, Alberta to welcome a NATO delegation. They are studying the possibility of awarding a 20 year contract to Canada as NATO's flight training location. The other bidder is Texas and we are convinced that our program could beat it out by a country mile". Maybe the member should speak to the deputy leader.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Reformers believe that Canadian companies can bid in an open competitive process and win those bids. This government just awarded the largest service contract in Canadian history, a \$2.85 billion contract to Bombardier. Here are the facts.

NATO was flexible on the time lines. The tendering process was ignored and the 15 day guidelines for publishing of sole source contracts were nixed by this cabinet. Will the Minister of Public Works and Government Services shut down the Bombardier contract just like he did Frontec? Why the double standard?

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member as usual is confused on the facts. The contract with Frontec expires March 31, 2000. Therefore I think there is some time before we make that decision to renew that contract and we will take the necessary steps to make sure that every firm has the possibility to make its representation and proposal.

On NATO training, Frontec said the political side is that we kept the Reform Party informed on this for three and a half years.

**Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is obvious it is the minister who is confused on this issue. Reformers have been asking for information from the government for seven months now.

Canadians want an open, transparent and competitive bidding process. The Liberal government is maintaining a non-competitive bidding process. The government is risking the loss of Canadian businesses.

Canadian taxpayers might have to put up with this but foreign governments do not. Will the Minister of Public Works and Government Services freeze the Bombardier contract and allow, like Canadians want, open, transparent and competitive bidding?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there was a press release, a public announcement made in 1996 that the government in light of the Bombardier consortium proposal was going to NATO to ask it to give Canada the right to train NATO pilots. It was public in 1996 and yet no other companies came forward in spite of the public information.

Speaking of public information, the deputy leader of the Reform Party knew all about this in 1996 and she liked the deal. If it was good then, it is good now.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION**

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

Yesterday there was an unprecedented and bizarre decision. The supreme court overturned a refugee board decision and ruled that a convicted drug dealer cannot be denied a refugee hearing. A dissenting judge said this individual jeopardized the lives, health and welfare of many Canadians.

• (1120 )

Does the immigration minister agree with this ruling and if not, what is she going to do about it?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, members must understand that we are talking about a Supreme Court ruling. I hope that the member opposite is not asking me to flout the law of Canada.

That said, the ruling is a very recent one. We are analyzing its impact, but there are other avenues available to us in the Immigration Act that would also allow us to take action, and that is what we are examining.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, a decision of this magnitude has repercussions around the world and undoubtedly leaves every criminal with intent to use Canada as a safe haven with a notion that we are very easy to access.

Will the minister of immigration amend legislation immediately so that this bad decision for Canada can be overturned? Even two of the judges say it is a terrible decision for Canada. When will the minister take action so this drug dealer can be kicked out of Canada like he should be?

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I hope the member is not recommending that we not follow the rule of law in this country. We will respect the rule of law in the legislation that we have.

*Oral Questions*

We have other tools in the Immigration Act right now. I am thinking about the certificate for danger of the public. When we tabled that legislation some years ago the Reform Party voted against that. We will take our responsibility here.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

If I correctly understood what the minister was saying about his EI reform, unemployed workers should be thanking him, because 60% of them are no longer eligible, and young people should be ecstatic because they are all paying premiums, but three-quarters of them are not receiving benefits.

If the minister's reform is as great as he would have us believe, how does he explain that hundreds of people are demonstrating against it in front of his Montreal office as we speak?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the EI reform was absolutely essential. The EI system we had in Canada had not changed in 25 years and did not serve the public's interests well. It had to be modernized and adapted to contemporary reality.

I know that the Bloc Québécois members love passive measures and anything to do with the past. They are always pushing passive income support, when what people are calling for is a dynamic labour market and help entering it.

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister has carried out his reform so well that, according to the figures, there are now 1.3 million unemployed workers in Canada.

If his reform is so wonderful, how does he ignore the fact that it has meant that 750,000 unemployed workers are not eligible for any benefits? We are not complete imbeciles.

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what the member has failed to point out is that the number of jobs in Canada has jumped by 1.2 million since October 1993 because of a healthy economy, because we have put our fiscal house back in order, because we now have active measures to help workers back into the job market, because of 30,000 such jobs, and because of the transitional jobs fund in regions where unemployment was too high.

**TRANSITIONAL JOBS FUND**

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Quebec National Assembly, the premiers of Ontario, Alberta, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the central labour bodies as well as groups of employers are unanimous: employment insurance is not managed responsibly.

What else will it take to make the minister see the light and make the necessary changes?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary I think that if there is a government in this country that has acted responsibly over the past decades it is the one led by the current Prime Minister.

• (1125)

Our government is acting responsibly by making difficult and courageous decisions, when necessary, in order to help people break out of the cycle of dependency the Bloc Québécois wants to keep them in.

I can assure you that we are doing them a service by making available to them tools far more useful than a cheque every two weeks, which is what they would be condemned to live on for years to come.

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the minister forgot to mention that active measures are not his responsibility. In most cases, they are now the provinces' responsibility.

What he is responsible for is employment insurance and the transitional jobs fund. And he has failed on both counts.

How can the minister talk about helping workers with the transitional jobs fund when, besides the fact that the fund has run dry, this measly \$300 million over three years represents 40 times less than what he has cut from the unemployed alone?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the funds in the transitional jobs fund will be spent over the coming months, up until March 31, 1999, as we have committed to do.

I welcome this opportunity the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques has given me to say that, at the heart of the employment insurance reform, there is the new Canada-Quebec agreement, a historic agreement on manpower.

It is part of this reform that will see \$2.7 billion transferred to the Quebec government so it can implement active measures for



*Oral Questions*

unemployed workers and welfare recipients in Quebec, who will then have a better chance of re-entering the workforce.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**LABOUR**

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, just as the offshore petroleum boom in Atlantic Canada is taking off, the federal government snatches away long awaited and long promised jobs for Canadian workers. Thousands of experienced Canadians are more than ready to take up the challenge of seismic offshore work but the government is once again prepared to put the demands of foreign vessel owners for cheap labour ahead of Canadian interest.

What does this government have against Canadian workers?

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have nothing against Canadian workers. On the contrary, our government is working to find them jobs.

That said, we have changed nothing in the immigration legislation or regulations. A question has arisen just recently in Nova Scotia about the interpretation of the policy or practice in use there. We are now looking at the overall picture.

We are going to do everything necessary to see that Canadians have work.

[*English*]

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, that does not sound like standing up for Canadian workers to me.

For decades federal and provincial governments have dangled the promise of offshore jobs over the heads of unemployed Atlantic Canadians. Now the government is fudging and fidgeting around about interpretations that may do those Canadian workers out of those jobs.

Again, is the minister prepared to stand up for Canadian workers?

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I stand up for Canadian workers. I also stand up to respect the legislation in this country.

Perhaps the member does not know but the practice was quite different in Newfoundland. That is why we had that problem. A private company challenged the department to go to court because the practices were different in two provinces.

It is the role of the federal government to have a national policy. That is why we will revise it.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES**

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans slammed the door on Nova Scotia fisheries workers by not granting a single tonne of the 28,000 northern shrimp quota to any of the four Nova Scotia community proposals. According to scientific advice from DFO, the minister is free to allocate an additional 7,000 tonnes of shrimp quota.

In light of his decision to completely ignore Nova Scotian needs, will the minister consider granting the remaining shrimp quota to the four Nova Scotia proposals?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is simply ill informed. The quota allocation dealt with two sets of components of the fleet. On the first dealing with the seventeen major license holders, two and a half of the licenses are held by Nova Scotian companies.

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago we heard the minister say that fish come first. He should remember that people in communities come first, communities like Canso, Mulgrave, Lismore and Arichat. Their future depends on a reasonable share of the scientifically viable shrimp quotas.

● (1130)

The quota increase would allow for an allotment to these Nova Scotia proposals. Will the minister have the courage to come to Nova Scotia and explain to these individuals involved why his shrimp quotas have been denied to their communities?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the ignorance of the member displayed in the preamble of his first question extends into his second. He simply does not understand or he is not willing to admit that a substantial portion of that shrimp quota is going to Nova Scotia companies.

With respect to the second aspect of his remarks that fish come first, I simply ask him, can we have fishermen if we do not have fish? The answer is no. Can we have fishing communities if we do not have fish? The answer is no. I suggest it is time he and his party started to recognize the importance of conservation in making sure we have that fish resource.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of immigration.

*Oral Questions*

As an immigrant to this country I know that coming to this country is a privilege that should not be given out lightly. Law-abiding immigrants and genuine refugees are welcome but today's supreme court ruling is an open invitation to criminals to come to our country. Can the minister not see that it is wrong to let drug dealers into our country? The minister can change this decision. She does not have to study it. Will the minister personally intervene to kick out this convicted dealer, yes or no?

[Translation]

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have already replied to that question, but I will do so again.

The Supreme Court handed down its ruling yesterday, and we are looking at the impact.

That having been said, I cannot discuss the situation of the individual concerned in detail, but there are other avenues open to us under the legislation for intervening and ensuring that this kind of individual is never allowed to stay in Canada.

[English]

**Mr. Deepak Ohrai (Calgary East, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, who makes the laws in this country, parliament or the supreme court? This is another decision in which the supreme court is reading into the law. You have the authority. You have the right to do it. You have the law to do it. Are drug dealers going to take precedence over genuine refugees? When will you intervene and kick—

**The Deputy Speaker:** Order. The hon. member will address his remarks to the Chair and not to the minister. The hon. Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is always a problem with the Reform Party. As an immigration matter there are very complex issues here. We have to think twice before making decisions when it affects the lives of individuals. It is clear that we will look at it very closely. We have other tools in the legislation for acting in that case.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ATLANTIC GROUND FISH STRATEGY**

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Yesterday, the minister stated that he is preparing to make public the measures to assist fishers after the expiry of TAGS. He also said "we are working in partnership with the provinces in an effort to address the situation".

What answer does the minister have for Minister Beaton Tulk of Newfoundland, who last Wednesday stated that the federal government had gone there to announce its intentions, not to consult him? Is this what the minister means by partnership?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, I can say that we did not make an offer or a proposal. The people we sent out went precisely to consult the governments of the Atlantic provinces, and to see whether certain of the Government of Canada's ideas were in line with theirs.

We are aware that the same solution may not be right for every community or every province. That is why we are working in conjunction with the provinces.

**Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, B.Q.):** Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland appears to be dissatisfied with what the minister is preparing to announce. That is a bad sign.

Given the real needs of the fishery workers, what does the minister have to reply to Newfoundland Premier Brian Tobin, who is calling for between \$800 million and \$1 billion to cover the four elements I spoke of yesterday?

• (1135)

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I too have seen what Premier Tobin is calling for. All I can say at this time is that dialogue produces results.

Dialogue will certainly lead us to see how we can best serve the people in our communities, in a post-TAGS context.

For the time being, I will not comment on a totally arbitrary figure thrown out without any indication as to whether it is for all provinces or just Newfoundland.

\* \* \*

[English]

**HEPATITIS C**

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today after years of waiting, hundreds of victims of government health care policy will finally receive compensation. Unfortunately though I am not talking about victims of poisoned blood. I am referring to victims of forced sterilization in Alberta. They are being compensated. Alberta initially refused to compensate these individuals but they swallowed their pride and decided to deal with the issue.

Why will the health minister not follow Alberta's example, admit he was wrong and compensate all hepatitis C victims?

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member will recall of course that the first compensation package that was announced some couple of

*Oral Questions*

months ago had as signatories all of the provincial premiers as well as the territorial ministers and all ministers of health.

As I indicated in this House before, on a matter of such seriousness the only thing that is workable of course is a consensus position, which involves all authorities throughout the country. It was such a position that was presented to all victims. I think it received the accord and agreement of everyone. Now we are in a position where all of those same players are once again at a table—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for Calgary—Nose Hill.

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta showed leadership on the sterilization issue. All we have seen from Ottawa's health minister is buck passing and excuses as we have just heard.

If the health minister really was leadership material, you would think he would be looking for ways to make hepatitis C compensation happen, not ways to make consensus fail.

What single thing has the health minister done to show real caring and concern for pre-1986 victims?

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it might be helpful to trace back in history to only a year ago to recognize that none of the provinces or the territories, in fact nobody was interested in compensation.

If leadership means bringing people to the table when they did not want to consider any such issues, well then that is leadership. The minister brought his colleagues from across the country together to the table. They fashioned out a compensation package, one that is agreed upon even by members of the opposition parties. We have before us at least the workings of a method of dealing with the most tragic issue in this country's health history.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### MAPLE SYRUP INDUSTRY

**Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

During the ice storm, the minister announced a special \$40 million fund to hire workers. The fund, managed by Human Resources Development Canada, had no priorities and operated on a first come, first served basis.

Since this program continues to be managed by HRDC and has not been transferred to the Government of Quebec, will the minister keep his promises to maple syrup producers?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am stunned to hear the Bloc Québécois criticizing us now for looking after people who were in the middle of the ice storm crisis. We had three months to run this program—from January to April—and we are being criticized for taking the “first come, first served” approach.

When a crisis occurs, you generally try to deal with the most urgent matter, that of helping people. I can assure you that our fellow citizens were very happy to have the Government of Canada—as represented by the Canadian army, my colleague responsible for Canada's economic development and the Department of Human Resources Development—help them, compared with what other governments did.

**Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, 600 maple syrup producers are threatened because of his inaction. Needs are desperate.

Does the minister not understand that he must change his position and give HRDC new resources to ensure the survival of the industry?

• (1140)

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have already done a lot to help maple syrup producers. We are aware of certain difficulties.

It is well known that many of these measures are now the responsibility of the Government of Quebec. The measures we took to help the producers during the storm were the ones taken over by the Government of Quebec on April 1.

We spent the money we had set aside for this and, if we can do more as a government, we will, because we always want to help our fellow Canadians.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### IMMIGRATION

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, we asked the minister of immigration for a straight answer on a simple question about whether or not she believes a convicted drug dealer should be allowed to stay in Canada and seek refugee status and she gives us a haughty little lecture about the rule of law.

Let me tell her about the rule of law. This parliament is sovereign and it can exercise its sovereign power to amend the legislation to ensure that convicted drug dealers like this get kicked out of the country like they should be.

Will this minister act or not?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister did not say that she condoned the conduct of this

*Oral Questions*

convicted individual. She was merely pointing to the fact that in our system, parliament makes laws but they are interpreted by the courts.

As I see in a press report, and I have not reviewed the ruling, all the supreme court said was that this individual should get a hearing. It did not say he should be allowed in the country. I understand from the press report that it specifically pointed to the other measures that the minister mentioned that could be used to deny this person permanent status in this country.

Why does the Reform Party not pay attention to the facts on this matter instead of making these wrongful insinuations?

**Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the supreme court has ruled that this person has a right to a hearing when he is a convicted drug dealer who is a threat to this country and its citizens.

When will this government stand up for Canadians instead of the rights of drug dealers by amending the legislation?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the legislation in question was a product of the work of government. The minister said she was going to review the law to see what other amendments are necessary. She is not even going to wait for that. She is going to see what other parts of the existing laws should be used.

The Reform Party is totally out to lunch when it says that this government is standing up for drug dealers. It is not doing that at all.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

In the riding of Manicouagan, not only do we have to deal with a shortage of steady jobs and a large number of unemployed, but the minister has decided to eliminate all specialized resources in employment insurance for the middle and lower North Shore.

How can the minister justify abandoning the unemployed of the middle and lower North Shore, when his new reform is creating an increasing number of problems for these people? Will the minister answer my question, yes or no?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that, as far as I can tell, the reform is good for Canadians. Employees in our offices across the country are now familiar with the new legislation and

they do a very good job of serving their fellow citizens whenever they call upon them.

I can even see an improvement in the services provided, since the management of active measures was more difficult at the beginning. I can assure you that I have not yet heard any criticism from the North Shore to the effect that the quality of service has diminished, quite the contrary.

\* \* \*

[English]

**BOATING SAFETY**

**Mr. Gar Knutson (Elgin—Middlesex—London, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, every year in Canada 200 lives are lost and 6,000 non-fatal accidents occur while recreational boating.

Can the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans please tell us what he and his department are doing to increase the safety of the boating public on Canada's waterways?

**Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has very correctly pointed out, this is a serious question with respect to loss of life and also the injury of individuals, many of whom are children.

In addition to the measures with respect to flotation devices, measures with respect to speed restrictions and safety equipment, at the start of Safe Boating Week which begins tomorrow, I will be making further announcements to enhance boating safety in one of the most popular recreational activities that Canadians have.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION**

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is a convicted drug dealer selling \$10 million worth of drugs. What about our children?

Why will this government not just simply throw this drug dealer out of the country?

• (1145)

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the Reform Party is looking for questions this morning. They do not know what to ask.

This is the fourth question on the same subject. We answered very clearly on that. We said that we have other tools in the legislation to deal with that case.

Yesterday we had a decision by the supreme court concerning an interpretation of the refugee convention of the United Nations. This is not a simple matter. It is an important one. We will look at it and will act on it if we have to do so. In the meantime we can act on that individual.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in fact this is a very simple matter. I am shocked that this minister is laughing about an issue as important as this one.

We have a convicted drug dealer. Why will the minister and the government not just throw that drug dealer out of the country?

**Hon. Lucienne Robillard (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the impact of the decision that we received yesterday. It only says that individual should have a hearing in front of the refugee board.

We have other tools in the legislation to prevent individuals from going to the refugee board. This was in Bill C-44 voted on in the Chamber, but the Reform Party voted against it.

\* \* \*

**CANADA CUSTOMS AND REVENUE AGENCY**

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of national revenue. Yesterday the government brought in legislation to create the Canada customs and revenue agency. If there ever were a bureaucratic blunder looking for self-justification, it is this proposal.

Is the minister of national revenue prepared to reconsider this matter, given the fact that the provinces have not agreed and that a lot of the initial justifications for this agency simply have not manifested themselves?

Why is the government proceeding at this time against all the advice to the contrary that it has received?

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member. He is quite wrong. In fact with five provinces including British Columbia we have working groups to look at areas where we can work in co-operation.

It does not take a rocket scientist to understand that there is only one taxpayer. If we in the country can get to having a single tax administration we would all be better off. With one stop shopping, a single window administration, we will be better off as Canadians.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the origin of this agency had to do with the government's intention to harmonize the GST and to envision this supertax agency that would reach down and do all the taxing for all levels of government. A working group does not make a provincial agreement to participate in these agencies and the government is being premature in proceeding with this matter.

Instead of proceeding without the original justification, why does the minister not scrap the agency and the GST while he is at it and he will have no justification whatsoever for proceeding with this agency?

**Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that we already do a lot of work for the provinces. In fact we collect 50% for certain provinces and up to 87% of their taxes. We have a very good established relationship.

The agency will create an opportunity to even advance that for provincial participation. Is the hon. member against provincial participation? The provinces have been asking for it.

This agency will include the provinces. That is good for Canada and that is good for the provinces. It will provide a better service and simplify tax administration. I know the hon. member will support it when he reads the document.

\* \* \*

**HEPATITIS C**

**Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

I have a letter from the hon. Russell MacLellan, premier of the province of Nova Scotia, a former parliamentary secretary. In this letter he says "The provincial, territorial and federal ministers of health have met on hepatitis C and an agreement has now been reached for individuals who were infected between January 1984 and 1990". Previously we were told that the window was only 1986 to 1990. Premier MacLellan is now saying 1984.

Will the minister confirm this expanded window and tell us when hepatitis C victims will be notified?

• (1150)

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member is probably referring to some of the proposals that were put on the table at the earlier part of the week in Edmonton in the two day session when all submissions were being presented to the working group.

I suspect that the member upon close reading of that letter will find that some of these suggestions may have had greater weight than others. I am going to wait, as we will wait, for the working group to give us a definitive response.

**Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC):** Mr. Speaker, no matter how many times I read this letter it says the same thing. It says "An agreement has been reached for individuals with hepatitis C who were infected between January 1984 and 1990". It says an agreement between the provincial, territorial and federal ministers.

Somebody is wrong here. Either the premier of the province of Nova Scotia or the hon. member. Will he tell us which one is wrong?

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thought it was pretty clear. Even if he wants to reread that letter over and over again, I gave an indication that a series of options was presented.

Obviously there was agreement on some and less agreement on others. The working group will take all those things into consideration, evaluate them, weigh them, cost them and give the appropriate governments an indication of which ones should receive priority.

If the process is working, as the letter suggests it is, then he should wait until all that work is done and get a definitive response.

\* \* \*

**GUN CONTROL**

**Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, today it is reported that the government will be confiscating firearms from law-abiding citizens and gun dealers without compensation.

Could the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice tell us whether the government will be confiscating firearms?

**Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for her question. The government unlike the Reform and the Conservative parties opposite is committed to gun control for public safety. We are committed to ensure that children do not shoot children.

We are also committed at the same time to the respect of law-abiding Canadian gun owners. Therefore the minister, after she met with a user group, put together a special amnesty to respond to the concerns of dealers raised by the executive director of the Canadian Police Association.

There will be an amnesty for law-abiding Canadian citizens.

\* \* \*

**VICLAS**

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it has been a number of weeks since I first asked the solicitor general about the violent crime linkage analysis system or ViCLAS that the RCMP computer system used for tracking serial killers and sex offenders.

Senior police officials say that it is only a matter of time before a preventable rape or murder occurs because there are thousands of crimes missing from the computer databank.

Just what is the solicitor general doing to ensure that this valuable investigative tool gets all the resources required to keep it running?

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member realizes and has admitted that ViCLAS is an instrumental tool in helping to solve crime.

As a matter of fact the real problem with ViCLAS is not the system itself but that the data which have to be entered is the responsibility of individual provinces.

To that end the solicitor general is reviewing, especially with the province of British Columbia, ways that we can co-operate with the various provinces. That is where the bottleneck seems to be.

I am led to believe also that the province of British Columbia has already hired four extra data entry clerks to catch up with the volume.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

In view of his reply to my earlier question, how can the minister explain that it is the postman travelling from village to village in the middle and lower North Shore who is the employment insurance expert? How can he explain that?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration said earlier, Bloc members probably do not have many questions this morning, because they keep coming back to the same ones.

If the hon. member has a specific question regarding the very useful role of the postman and what an employee of Canada Post can do, I am very pleased to see that the postman is helpful to people.

However, if the hon. member has a more specific question on how my department is run, he can come to see me and we will do our very best to provide good services to North Shore residents.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PAY EQUITY**

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, recent court cases affecting women workers at Bell Canada have cast into doubt the likelihood that these women will have their rights recognized under the federal pay equity legislation which has been on the books for 20 years.

● (1155)

If the government is committed, if the President of the Treasury Board is as committed as he says he is to equality for women, will

*Oral Questions*

the minister stand up today for the principle of pay equity and intervene in the Bell Canada case to ensure that 20,000 Canadian women have their concerns addressed in the appropriate tribunal to reach a fair and just settlement?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have stood for the equality of equal pay for work of equal value for a long while. In particular the government passed a law in 1978 that talked about equality.

We have offered \$1.3 billion to help women achieve equality. I ask the member to try to put some pressure on the unions so that in the end the unions will agree to give that money to women who fully deserve it.

\* \* \*

**VETERANS AFFAIRS**

**Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC):** Mr. Speaker, Sue Riordon has been fighting to have her husband's pension benefits increased in light of the fact that doctors have said that he is 90% to 100% disabled. Her husband, Terry, suffers from gulf war syndrome.

It seems coincidental that since she testified at the SCNDVA hearings in Halifax that their claim has been denied. This is yet another example of how the government is ignoring its veterans.

Will the Minister of Veterans Affairs explain why he is ignoring the doctors' recommendations by refusing to provide Terry with a full military pension?

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows that the government, along with many other governments, in fact all governments, does not recognize that there is such an illness as gulf war syndrome.

I want to tell the hon. member that this country provides veterans of World War I, World War II, Korean war and retired members of the Canadian forces and the RCMP with the best possible benefits of any other country in the world. I am proud to stand by that.

\* \* \*

**CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA**

**Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general recently announced that Correctional Service Canada would hire 1,000 new correctional officers for penitentiaries across the country. He has also said he believes that we already incarcerate too many people in Canada.

How does the minister or his parliamentary secretary reconcile the desire to put fewer offenders in jail with their hiring of 1,000 new correctional officers?

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hiring of 1,000 new correctional officers is not at all inconsistent with the desire to reduce the prison population. On the contrary, it is good news for corrections. It is consistent with our goal to have effective corrections.

Correctional officers do not simply perform guard duty. They participate in programming, case management, risk assessment and provide proactive intervention measures.

In summary, they will reduce the individual caseloads of officers resulting in more effective corrections and will bring stability to some of the institutions.

\* \* \*

**ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

**Mr. Derrek Konrad (Prince Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in his final report the access to information commissioner slammed the government's system-wide chronic problem of non-compliance with the act.

To underscore the problem he included this quote in his report to characterize the government's attitude: "Never write if you can speak; never speak if you can nod; never nod if you can wink".

When will the government stop winking at the law and start complying with access to information requests?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the report in question also praised the Privy Council Office for eliminating the delay in handling access to information requests.

I point out that Canada is still one of only fifteen countries in the world to have access to information legislation. We are taking the lead; we are not lagging behind.

We are certainly willing to review the act to see what improvements can be made. We are taking the access commissioner's report seriously, but we have to look at the good things he says as well as the other parts of the report.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**SUDAN**

**Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Sudan is currently experiencing a terrible famine. CIDA, whose priority is to attend to people's basic needs, is not yet involved in Sudan.

Can the minister tell us why, between 1993 and 1997, CIDA cut one-third of its official development assistance funding to the 48 poorest countries in the world and what his government intends to do to help Sudan?

*Government Orders*

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government was indeed forced, at one time, to cut the Canadian International Cooperation Agency's budgets, but the hon. member opposite is no doubt aware of the fact that, in the last budget tabled by the Minister of Finance, these cuts were cancelled.

• (1200)

Of course, when the country's finances will permit it, this government clearly intends to do all it can to provide assistance to those in need around the world, including the Sudanese.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**EMPLOYMENT**

**Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, since the closure of the Anvil Range mine in Faro, Yukon the unemployment rate has risen to over 17%. There is a Faro mine reclamation trust fund set up and this fund was meant for clean up.

Will the minister replace the tough luck, too bad message that has been sent to the Yukon and use the money to help support jobs for the town of Faro, the First Nations of Ross River and in fact for people of the Yukon territory?

**Mr. Gerry Byrne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the decision to close mines based on the availability of natural resources is always a very difficult one which faces many communities throughout Canada.

However, in this situation the local people themselves are working together for solutions. I would like to work with the hon. member and, quite frankly, I would take the opportunity right after question period to sit down with her to review the issue and get more details.

\* \* \*

**REPORT OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL**

**The Deputy Speaker:** I have the honour to lay upon the table the report of the Auditor General of Canada on the requirement to report specified foreign property under section 233.3 of the Income Tax Act.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(e), this document is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[*Translation*]

**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 no less than 40 petitions.

\* \* \*

**QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER**

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

[*English*]

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, for eight months Question No. 21 has been languishing on the Order Paper. It takes nine months from conception to delivery.

When will the government give birth to the answer to Question No. 21?

**Mr. Peter Adams:** Mr. Speaker, I know the member has been concerned regarding Question No. 21.

As he may have noticed, I presented the responses to no less than 40 petitions today and we have over 1,000 petitions to deal with. We have completed well over 80% of the responses to petitions. We are at 70% or 75% in other responses.

The problem with Question No. 21, as he knows, is that it involves inquiries to be made in every department of the government. I want to assure him that we are very close to the end of this particular marathon.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Shall the questions stand?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[*English*]

**PENSION BENEFITS STANDARDS ACT, 1985**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-3, an act to amend the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 and the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Act, be read the third time and passed.

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill S-3 today at third reading.



*Government Orders*

This bill is a well considered and concrete example of how we are dealing federally with our regulated private pension plans. We are updating the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985, or the PBSA as it is often called.

• (1205)

These reforms are long overdue. This legislation governs the private pensions plans in the sectors that are subject to federal jurisdiction, including banking, interprovincial transportation and telecommunications. These plans are administered by the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, or OSFI.

Of Canada's 16,000 pension plans about 1,100 are covered by the PBSA. They represent approximately \$45 billion or 10% of the entire asset value of all private pension plans in Canada.

With the number of seniors in Canada growing so rapidly I assure the House that sound, secure pensions are and continue to be a priority of this government. Our colleagues know that over the past two years we have embarked on a dramatic reform of the public component of our national pension system, including changes long overdue in the Canada pension plan. If we had not made these changes, in 20 years there would have been real problems and we would not have the type of secure retirement that Canadians deserve.

The PBSA has not been materially revised since it came into force in 1987. This is in contrast to the financial institutions legislation where the supervisory and credential systems were significantly strengthened, first in 1992, then in 1995 and again in 1997. There is no question that the PBSA needs to be updated.

While most federally regulated pension plans are fully funded, some pension plans have come under financial pressure as a result of demographic and economic factors. These include an aging workforce. They can also come about from corporate downsizing. Those are two factors which make pension funding relatively more expensive for employers.

In this environment there have been solvency concerns regarding some plans, while others have wound up without sufficient assets to pay all of the benefits that were promised. In these situations the employer, whether a single employer or an industry group, experienced economic difficulties.

Many pension plans made substantial improvements to pension benefits in the 1980s with the expectation that employers would always be able to fund them. This also added to the challenges. In some cases insufficient contributions were made to fund these improvements. As these problems emerged it became clear that the current credential and supervisory framework is not always equipped to deal with problem plans. The range of powers and regulatory components needed were just not there. Bill S-3 is our

effort to meet these challenges. Under this legislation the federal government and the superintendent of OSFI will have the necessary powers and tools to work with plans that are experiencing problems.

The measures in Bill S-3 flow from a series of basic principles outlined in our July 1996 white paper. These principles are that private pension plans be supervised for the benefit of members, retirees and other beneficiaries, that the pension regulatory and supervisory framework should contain the incentives and safeguards necessary to reduce the possibility that pension promises might not be met, and to provide for early intervention and resolution of pension plans that are experiencing difficulty.

Outside supervision cannot and will not be expected to guarantee that pension promises will always be met, nor can it be a substitute for good governance of plans by administrators. After all, these plans are governed by the trustees who are appointed by the workers and by the companies themselves. Regulation and supervision must be cost effective. Regulatory framework for pension plans should not impose undue costs on existing plans or unduly inhibit the creation of new plans.

Members of private pension plans should receive adequate and timely information from the administrator concerning the precise financial condition of the plan that person is under. There must be appropriate accountability and transparency in the supervisory process itself.

• (1210)

The measures in this bill are as a result of a very broad consultation process. In drafting this legislation the comments received on the initial proposals that were contained in the white paper were considered and the appropriate amendments were made. Provincial ministers responsible for the supervision of provincial pension plans were also invited to comment and there was ongoing consultation among pension supervisors to the CAPSA.

I should mention, too, that other proposals in the white paper which have not been addressed in this legislation will be introduced later through regulation. Areas such as additional disclosure requirements and funding rules are already dealt with through regulations and this approach will continue.

In other cases, such as planned governance and investments, the government believes that it is more appropriate to develop best practices. We recognize that the size and other attributes of individual pension plans will affect government structures, government practices and investment strategies.

Considerable additional consultation will take place prior to the implementation of these regulations and guidelines.

*Government Orders*

At this time, on behalf of the government, I would like to thank the Senate, the many industry participants and other stakeholders who provided such constructive and insightful co-operation and advice in bringing this legislation forward and in working with us in such a constructive way to deal with the precise problems that we faced to fashion legislation which is more responsive to the concerns that all of us have, which is to maintain secure and dignified retirements for our pensioners.

I have highlighted the important issues dealt with in this legislation. All of us believe that the stability of Canada's private pension regime will be enhanced for the benefit of its plan members. We are confident of that. I certainly encourage all colleagues in this House to give speedy passage to this bill and I thank them for the co-operative approaches which they have taken in working with us, with pensioners and with the regulators to provide better legislation for Canada's pension community.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the privilege to stand in the House of Commons, Canada's highest court, we hope. We hope that it would take precedence over the Supreme Court of Canada.

We also have a responsibility in standing here. Today I represent not only the people of Canada, not only the people of my riding, but also I represent, hopefully, the interests of pensioners or potential pensioners in private plans around the country.

I would like to give a statement that will put you at ease, Mr. Speaker. That is, I am not going to use more than about 30 seconds to talk about the Senate today.

People out in the real world who are listening to this debate are probably not too aware of the fact that bills which initiate in the House of Commons begin with the letter *C*. This one happens to begin with the letter *S*, which means it started in the Senate. Of course we have reasons to believe that there are some untoward government motivations to quickly pass it in the Senate and then bring it here.

We believe very strongly in the Reform Party that that is backwards. Bills of this importance should definitely be initiated by the elected members of our parliamentary system and not by those who are appointed by political patronage connections.

This bill is called S-3. That means it started in the Senate. With that comment about the Senate, I am going to get on to some of the things which are particularly interesting to us.

I want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of all of the Liberals who are pushing this legislation through and certainly the attention of Canadians to a very important aspect of Bill S-3.

• (1215)

The parliamentary secretary has already outlined some of the reasons for this bill. I have to admit there are many things in this bill we think are commendable and should be proceeded with. However, there are also some extremely odious components. As a member of the official opposition it is my duty and responsibility to draw those to everyone's attention.

Section 9.(2) in the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 is fraught with a bit of a problem. It states that if an actuarial report filed under this section indicates that there is a surplus in a private pension fund, in other words if there is more money in the fund than what is needed to meet the obligations under a fixed benefit plan, that surplus may be refunded to the employer.

Section 9.(2) gives some conditions as to when, where and under what conditions the employer can get the money back. One of them is that the superintendent must consent to the refund. I will come back to this in a few seconds.

It also states that an employer has a claim to the surplus or part of it after being notified of the employer's proposal for a refund of that surplus or part of it if at least two-thirds of the persons in the different categories consent to it. If only 50% consent to it then the superintendent will appoint an arbitrator and will judge the matter.

Does that not raise a red flag? I know Liberals love red. There is a member across right now dressed in red and I think it looks great. We are familiar with the infamous red book. So red and Liberal sort of go together. In this case, however, I hope they see red. Red is also a warning. In traffic it means we need to stop. It is a warning for danger. Whenever there is extreme danger the colour red is used.

This is what I want to talk about. It so happens that section 9.(2) could directly impact on the personal holdings of the Minister of Finance. For at least a decade there has been a controversy about actuarial surpluses in private employer-employee pension plans, a situation that rarely occurred before the mid-1980s. Is the employer entitled to a surplus or are the workers?

This issue was brought to a head in 1986 when Conrad Black's Dominion stores took \$63 million from three employee pension plans and were subsequently forced by Ontario's supreme court to return the funds. At that time a moratorium was put on all surpluses regulated by the province of Ontario and although this has been relaxed somewhat, provincial rules for the division of surpluses are still very stringent.

There are a number of questions that need to be answered about the minister's involvement in this legislation before the Reform Party can approve it and certainly before the Liberals should be passing this.

*Government Orders*

The Minister of Finance acquired Canada Steamship Lines in 1981. The Pension Fund Society of Canada Steamship Lines based on Montreal has had one of these defined benefit pension plans for its employees since 1940. The last actuarial evaluation of the plan on which we have information was done in December 1995 by A. Foster Higgins & Co. However, according to the Pension Fund Society's newsletters we know that the plan's assets have enjoyed spectacular growth in recent years, for example 21% in 1995, 20% in 1996 and 17% in 1997.

The society's obligation to the beneficiaries was \$84 million in 1997. However, net assets in the plan were \$252 million and the total surplus was valued \$142 million in that year.

• (1220)

Under the present rules of the superintendent of financial institutions the employer, in this case the minister, is eligible to claim \$118 million in surplus from this pension fund. He would probably not get all of it because he would have to strike a deal to give a part of it to pensioners in order to persuade at least 50% of them to agree to give him the surplus.

No contributions have been made to the plan by the employer since December 31, 1984 and by employees since December 31, 1991. There were 823 beneficiaries in 1996, after 25 had passed away in that year, which included 127 active employees.

The plan is committed to indexing benefits to 80% of inflation. Beneficiaries received an increase of 2% in 1996, representing 90% of inflation.

It is very timely for the Minister of Finance that the act be passed now. It was first introduced by the Minister of Industry in the House in March, 1997, then in the Senate by Senator Alisdair Graham last fall with a few minor changes. Under the bill if two-thirds of beneficiaries vote to release the surplus funds the employer can have them provided also that the superintendent of financial institutions agrees. If less than two-thirds but more than half agree, the matter must go to binding arbitration. The arbitrator is chosen by the superintendent if the parties cannot agree on a choice.

This information begs a number of important questions. The official opposition must receive adequate answers to them before approving this legislation.

Is the minister in a general conflict of interest when a bill from which he might benefit so significantly is passed under his general authority, a bill that receives all necessary support and impetus from his office? We have searched for an answer to this important question for some time. We spoke to ethics counsellor Howard Wilson January 30 about the minister's involvement with this legislation and he answered that the Canada Steamship Line's pension fund is incorporated under the Pension Fund Societies Act

under the auspices of the Department of Industry and will not therefore be directly affected by the Pension Benefit Standards Act.

The ethics counsellor confirmed to us that the surplus in CSL's plan is about \$140 million. However, we have obtained the 1996 financial statements for Canada Steamship Lines Pension Fund Society and a number of newsletters from the society. The newsletters comment often on the passage of the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 as if it will be directly relevant to the surplus in their plan. The financial statements from 1996 actually state that the plan is registered under the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 and the registration number is 55006.

We have also consulted with the Department of Industry and it has found a registration for the pension fund under the Pension Fund Societies Act. It is registered under both, while the ethics counsellor is under the impression that it is registered under one act only.

We would like an answer to our second question. Is Mr. Martin's pension plan still registered under the—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member knows he cannot refer to members of this House by name. I know he would not want to make that mistake.

**Mr. Ken Epp:** I know that, Mr. Speaker. I apologize. The notes have his name and I guess I was not paying close attention to what I was reading.

Is the pension plan still registered under the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985? If it is, it means that the Canada Steamship Lines pension fund will be directly affected by this legislation. Does this put the minister in conflict of interest? That is a very important question that needs an answer.

The third question the Reform Party would like to have answered is a more important one. Why did the ethics counsellor have incorrect information about the registration of this pension fund. Who told him that the pension fund was not registered under the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985 currently before this House but only under the Pension Fund Societies Act? How did the misinformation come to him? Did it make its way from the minister's office? Was it an honest mistake or does it represent an attempt to mislead the ethics counsellor into thinking that the minister would not be directly affected by the act now before this House and cause the ethics counsellor to defend the minister when perhaps he should be warning him? We have made an access to information request to Mr. Wilson's office on this issue but we were refused any information he has on his file. We appealed this decision to the information commissioner but we think it is strange that all information would be denied us in a way directly contrary to the spirit of the conflict of interest and post-employment code for public office holders approved by the Liberal government in June 1994.

*Government Orders*

• (1225)

Allow me to read clause 3.2 of the code: "Public office holders have an obligation to perform their official duties and arrange their private affairs in a manner that will bear the closest public scrutiny, an obligation that is not fully discharged by simply acting within the law".

It appears that the ethics counsellor does not want the public to have any insight into this matter, much less the closest public scrutiny the code requires.

We regard this as a serious issue and we encourage the ethics counsellor to lay before the public the documents that will bear the level of public scrutiny required in the code.

Continuing with what the ethics counsellor told us, he then said that the minister has doubly distanced himself from the passage of the bill because he left all ministerial work concerning the bill to the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions. Combined with the suggestion that the bill would not impact the CSL Pension Fund Society, this was a kind of double indemnity against conflict of interest in the ethics counsellor's eyes.

However, I would remind the House that the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions is not an independent minister. The present secretary of state was appointed by cabinet proclamation pursuant to section 11 of the Ministries and Ministers of State Act which was first passed by the Trudeau government in 1970. Section 11 of that act tells us that the duty of the minister is to assist any minister or ministers as having responsibility for any department and states that the secretary of state will make use of the services and facilities of the department.

A copy of the proclamation notice from the June 25, 1997 *Gazette* states that the present secretary of state was appointed pursuant to section 11 and it details the duties to assist the Minister of Finance in carrying out his responsibilities.

The secretary of state clearly takes his direction from the Minister of Finance and his job is to follow his orders. This looks like a suspiciously close relationship and it gives rise to the follow question. Since the minister's pension fund will be directly affected by this act and since the minister guiding it through the legislative process cannot rightly be called independent, is the Minister of Finance therefore in a conflict of interest?

We are suspicious about the secretary of state's independence for a particular reason. As I stated earlier, the Minister of Industry first introduced this bill into the House a year ago. This gives rise to yet another question. Presumably the Minister of Industry first introduced Bill S-3 because he bears responsibility for the Pension Fund Societies Act, an act that is separate from the Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985. Why did the Minister of Industry then not reintroduce this act in this parliament? Why was it

transferred from the Minister of Industry to the secretary of state, a junior minister under the direct control and supervision of the Minister of Finance?

We become even more suspicious when we note that in section 9 of the act now in question the rules for granting a surplus to an employer are considerably relaxed. There is no division formula in the present act. There is no vote required in the present regulations. We are not opposed to entrenching a formula in legislation, but in practice in the pension fund industry most companies hold a vote and receive the agreement of up to 100% of pensioners.

There are some examples. Last July active and retired employees of Jenisys Engineered Products voted 95% to divide a surplus. In December 1997 Unisys employees voted 99% in favour of a division of a pension fund surplus.

Since July 1990 regulation 10 of the Ontario pension benefits act has stipulated that for ongoing plans a plan sponsor must obtain 100% agreement of all members. Later that was changed to 90%, which is the current requirement.

• (1230)

Ontario's legislation may be restrictive but the idea that there would be a vote requiring the approval of just two-thirds of employees, and if between one-half and two-thirds of employees voted for the change it would go to an arbitrator who would make a final decision is an innovation in the industry. Only the provinces of B.C. and Quebec allow for mandatory arbitration.

This act will make the surplus much more accessible to the minister. The present role of the superintendent under the Pension Benefits Standards Act is to ensure the funded status of the plan that it remain solvent if any surplus is given. His role is not to hand out surpluses to employers or employees; the courts decide who gets any surplus.

The amendments to the Pension Benefits Standards Act in Bill S-3 actually broaden the role of the superintendent in that he must appoint an arbitrator if 50% of employees agree, a role he did not have before. The superintendent's office tells us that in the situation of an ongoing pension plan, like the minister's, it is very unlikely that the employer would get anything under the present act. The employer might try to approach employees for their agreement, but even if there is a vote the superintendent will still require that the courts give their blessing to any distribution.

If a plan is terminating, that is winding up, the superintendent makes a strictly legal decision based on the plan documents. If the plan itself is silent on who gets the surplus, it again ends up in the courts. In the minister's case where his company's plan is ongoing, the case would normally have gone to the courts. This act removes the issue from the courts and politicizes it to the point where only half the employees have to agree before the matter goes to an

*Government Orders*

arbitrator. And get this: the arbitrator is appointed by the superintendent who in turn is appointed by the Minister of Finance.

This bill is so different from the norm that it begs two further obvious questions. The present superintendent, John Palmer, was himself appointed by the minister in September 1994. He presumably hopes to be reappointed when the superintendent's seven year term expires in 2001. The superintendent is therefore dependent on the minister, but the minister in turn depends on the superintendent to appoint an arbitrator to get the surplus. Is this not in itself a conflict of interest?

The seventh question is, at any point during which the legislation was being developed, did the minister have input into the make-up of the new surplus division formula? Could he have brought his considerable authority to bear with the intent of relaxing the legislative requirements necessary for an employer to have access to his own pension fund assets?

Our next concern is that the Superintendent of Financial Institutions regulates about 1,100 private pension plans. The Minister of Finance will argue that he is just one employer among many and that he will be treated like every other employer by this legislation. We would respond by quoting from the 1996 annual report of the superintendent released in March, in the section entitled "Surplus Refunds":

In general, surplus must exceed the greater of 25% of the liabilities of the plan or 2 times the contribution of the employer to the normal cost of the plan, in order to qualify for a refund. Very few plans in surplus have levels of surplus above these thresholds.

If there were many other pensions plans governed by the Superintendent of Financial Institutions which are in the same surplus situation, this particular circumstance might not be so important. But should this act pass, the Canadian Steamship Lines Pension Fund Society has a surplus that could be made available to the minister of approximately \$50 million. To me, this is not small change and it would accrue to an individual rather than a corporation.

An eighth question, part of which we asked through access to information, is how many other plans are regulated by the Superintendent of Financial Institutions with surpluses available to the employer in the neighbourhood of \$50 million? If there are such companies, is the employer an individual such as the minister or a corporation in which no one has individual benefits? Is the minister claiming to treat himself as any other employer when he really belongs in a category all by himself? Will he receive a personal benefit from this legislation greater by far than almost all other employers in Canada?

This question was answered in part by an access to information request of April 1 which detailed for us all actuarial surpluses over \$10 million that the Superintendent of Financial Institutions oversees.

• (1235 )

Just 44 of the 1,100 plans that the superintendent oversees have surpluses over \$10 million and only five of them have surpluses larger than \$110 million. This means that the minister's pension fund surplus is one of the top five in the country.

This act will provide a benefit for him that only four other companies in the nation can beat. Those companies may not be individuals but corporations. We cannot know for sure, but in all likelihood the minister is the individual in Canada who will benefit the most from the passage of this legislation.

For all intents and purposes the minister is really in a unique situation rather than just one more employer among many.

Finally, we would like to receive the minister's personal assurance that he has kept out of the issue. We note that the president of the pension fund society of Canada Steamship Lines is Mr. Gordon Black, long time employee of CSL. Mr. Black is also listed on the board of directors of Canada Steamship Lines.

So that we might be assured that the minister is not consulting improperly with the president of the pension fund society who will look after the interests of the company in the surplus distribution process, we would like the minister to answer this question: has the minister spoken to or met with Mr. Black for any reason since January 1, 1997, just before the legislation was first tabled? If so, when? What was the subject of the meeting or meetings?

It is the job of the official opposition to conduct careful inquiries into these matters in order to ensure that no minister abuses a position of trust by passing legislation that would augment his or her private fortune.

We are not accusing the minister of wrongdoing. We are simply doing our job by asking questions. We are asking for full and complete disclosure on the part of the ethics counsellor and the minister himself so that the people of Canada can be fully satisfied as to the integrity of the Government of Canada.

This government ran on a platform of openness and accountability. Yet we have had such bizarre situations that the code of conduct for ministers has been kept secret from us. The prime minister alludes to it but never ever has presented a copy of it.

Here we have now a situation where there is a lot of question as to the propriety of this government actually passing this legislation.

At the beginning of my speech I said that the Liberals are associated with the colour red. I have raised a bunch of questions. They are red flag questions and they are questions that demand answers. These are questions that must be answered before this government proceeds to ram this legislation through, having all its

*Government Orders*

members stand up in concert at the pull of their strings to vote in favour of this.

I urge the Liberal members who want to build or create for the first time this reputation of integrity that is so important for the Canadian people. They want to trust their government. I urge them to vote against this legislation. Why not let this be the first bill that this government actually loses? It comes from the Senate. There is no implication of anything like confidence in the government or anything on this. Let us defeat this one because of these unanswered questions.

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I will take a little time to go over the bill since we have not had the opportunity to discuss it fully as a result of the process that has been taken.

Bill S-3 was passed by the Senate on November 20, 1997. The legislation governs private pension plans set up for employees working in businesses under federal jurisdiction, including banking and interprovincial transportation and telecommunications. The pensions of parliamentarians and those of federal public servants are not covered by this legislation.

What is Bill S-3 intended to do? It would introduce to the Pension Benefits Standards Act the same philosophy that governs the changes to the legislation governing federally chartered financial institutions in Canada.

• (1240)

The overall intention of the bill is to set clear ground rules for housekeeping, to codify the rules on how to handle the controversial issue of the treatment of surplus assets in a pension plan, to restore better balance between the employer and those who benefit from the plan, to enhance the ability of the minister to enter into agreements with provinces to apply and enforce the provinces' pension legislation. There is a mandate for the administrator of the fund to invest the assets of the fund in a manner that a reasonable and prudent person would apply in respect of a portfolio.

Why are we opposed to this? All of these are good intentions and the roads to hell are paved with good intentions.

There are three major reasons we oppose Bill S-3. It entrenches regulations which unnecessarily bypass parliament. S-3 promotes an obsession with surplus withdrawal rather than a focus on ways to improve the existing pension system. S-3 emanates from the Senate and is part of a sloppy process that abandons the role of parliament.

First, the regulations which unnecessarily bypass parliament. Section 10.1(2)(b) of Bill S-3 allows for the imposition of rigid arbitrary rules without consultation, truly a Henry VIII clause. There is no evidence that such arbitrary carte blanche is needed.

The provision confers tremendous powers to unaccountable bureaucrats.

Section 10.1(2)(b) stipulates that there shall be no improvements in pension plans if the solvency ratio of the plan falls below a specified level. The solvency ratio is defined by regulations. We have a major problem with this concept.

According to the testimony of an Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions official before the Senate banking committee, the prescribed level would initially be set at 105%. This would have had a very serious impact on the take home pay of plan members and on the ability of trustees to improve benefits.

It is our understanding that following a discussion with the Canadian Labour Congress and the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions, the OSFI now intends to use a less stringent ratio. Section 10.1(2)(b) allows OSFI to do this through order in council without having to go back to parliament. There is no guarantee that an unaccountable bureaucrat at some point will not impose a harmful solvency ratio at some time in the future.

What happens if a stringent solvency ratio is imposed? A too stringent solvency test such as the 105% ratio threatens to stop the development of any new benefit programs in a pension plan and even discourages improvements to existing defined benefit plans. It will be virtually impossible for some private plans to become more attractive because this may cause short term fluctuations in their solvency ratio. If similar rules were to apply to the purchase of homes, very few consumers could purchase a home unless they could use existing liquid assets to fully purchase the home or fully pay for any home improvements.

If these rules had been in place 30 years ago, it is hardly exaggerating to say that we would have had no defined plan in Canada. Every time an employer based plan improved benefits, it had to incur a temporary solvency deficiency, which was paid up later.

At a time when the federal government is encouraging privately funded fully defined benefit plans, a 105% solvency ratio will also discourage employers to set up new plans. The Canadian Institute of Actuaries concurs. We are also concerned that the solvency test becomes in principle a model for pension legislation, which the provinces will adopt.

Why a shotgun approach when the OSFI has ample powers to place restrictions on poorly funded plans or on plans deemed at risk?

OSFI may be looking for the easy way out; a lot of arbitrary authority but not enough staff for a fine tuned regulation. Hence, it is much easier for the OSFI to end its examination function and strap all defined private pension plans into a solvency ratio straitjacket, even if it freezes initiative and may end up killing

*Government Orders*

certain plans. At the very least, it shows a lack of understanding of the historical *modus operandi* of private pension plans.

We are uncertain as to which problem this government is trying to resolve.

• (1245)

There is no solvency crisis in the private pension system. Since the Pension Benefits Standards Act came into force in 1987, 392 plans terminated. The assets were wound up and distributed. Of these only nine terminated in less than fully funded status. In most of the nine the loss of benefits to the members was minimal and the plans had very small membership. In one plan only the members received less than 95% of the pension benefits credit. In that case the members received approximately 80%. The source for that figure is the Public Benefits Standards Act annual report.

It is inappropriate to undermine the ability of all plans to enhance pension benefits and become more attractive because of the exaggerated importance given by the OSFI to short term market fluctuations. It is the view that prescribing any solvency ratio test for plan investment is probably not the right approach to making sure plans do not terminate in an underfunded situation.

Bill S-3 already gives OSFI wide reaching powers to force poorly funded plans to take whatever action is necessary to bring assets and liabilities in line. There is no need for a Henry VIII clause that removes parliament from the equation.

The current five year funding solvency constraint in the PBSA is already sufficient to limit a situation in which contributions and plan assets could fall short of termination liabilities. The five year funding framework also provides ample guarantee that termination liabilities are funded over a short period. OSFI is taking a major policy position without any broad discussion. Even the U.S. has much more relaxed rules.

The government should instead make the plan sponsor liable for all the unfunded liabilities should the plan be terminated. In the province of Ontario, for instance, an employer that terminates a plan has to make up for the unfunded liability and not just be on schedule with amortization payments as is currently the case at the federal level.

This creates a self-regulatory incentive for the employer to follow the prudent per cent approach in making improvements to the plan. The system works well. Why not pursue this avenue at the federal level?

The Canadian Labour Congress has said that it may be more important for OSFI to take action against individuals who have acted imprudently than to try to create a general rule governing plan improvements.

An obsession with the surplus withdrawals rather than a focus on ways to improve the existing pension system is our second concern. Bill S-3 proposes a mechanism for employees and employers to take the surplus out of a private pension plan rather than offer incentives to improve pension plans.

The Liberal assault on the Canada pension plan, old age security and its gutting of universality on the backs of the working poor are followed by this assault on the middle class, the main beneficiary of the private pension system. This lack of legislated incentive to make things better is a hallmark of a mediocre management vision of the public interest. It condemns an increasing number of workers and retirees to poverty.

Bill S-3 should impose an outright ban on the removal of surpluses from ongoing plans and require the consent of plan members to remove surpluses in plans being wound up. It is especially annoying to see the feeble position of the government on the surplus issue when it is proposing nothing in regard to inflation protection.

There is today an urgent need for public policy to strengthen our public and private retirement systems. While CN and VIA Rail retirees have seen their pensions lose value because of poor inflation protection, the CN and VIA Rail pension plans are approaching a surplus or are in a surplus position. Rather than focusing on surplus refund, would it not be better instead to focus on ways to enhance the CN and VIA Rail pension plans?

The government has failed to move away from its obsession with short term bureaucratic efficiency. It should endeavour to work with employers and provinces to improve pension plans rather than focus on ways to take the money out.

Bill S-3 emanates from the Senate and is part of a sloppy process which undermines the role of parliament.

• (1250)

It is worth taking some time to talk seriously about the one sided and dysfunctional legislative process that bills like Bill S-3 are symptomatic of. We saw it earlier this morning and we are seeing it again.

Canadians want to believe in the House of Commons. They want to believe that what goes on here is a process steeped in trust, openness and mutual respect. They want a process that allows all voices to be heard, a process that is respectful of not only the will of the majority but the rights of the minority, and a process that is conducted in good faith, recognizing that there are people whose voices are too often excluded from the most critical legislative stages.

I could not help but listen to the minister speak on this matter and indicate that he had heard from the Senate and from industry. Nowhere did he mention that the House of Commons had a chance

*Government Orders*

to be heard from. Nowhere did he mention that Canadians as individuals had a chance to be heard from.

The problem is that the government has made us all so captive to the process that there is no quarter for those indispensable principles of democracy. We give up on democracy to deal with mountains of legislation. While the government is sure to say it is a legitimate function of the Senate to deal with such a bill, I would hasten to say that there is no legitimacy in having an unelected body drafting bills that would affect the pensions of thousands of workers.

The government has no legislative vision. It is so obsessed with pushing forward bill after bill that it loses sight of the delicate interrelations that exist between one program and the next. We saw this with the changes to CPP.

The New Democratic Party kept calling on the government to table the changes to old age security as well. We can hardly change one without knowing what is going to happen to the other. Yet the government failed to act. Five months later while seniors fret about their security the government is still tinkering with the old age security.

There is a lack of consultation. Instead of inviting Canadians to share their voices with us the government marginalizes people by consulting with polling firms rather than with Canadians. Bill S-3 may have gone to the Senate banking committee but I would be overly charitable if I were to call that consultation.

Only two groups appeared before the committee. More shocking than that, the government wants us to accept fundamental changes to these pensions in the absence of broad based consultation. Even though this bill affects only 10% of total pensions in Canada it introduces to the private sector a paradigm that may threaten other plans including those run by the provinces. Would a government that believed in consultation not have sought out the voices of the people?

Members on the opposite side of the House are very comfortable with their slim majority. Canadians see them forcing through legislation. They see them stopping legitimate debate in the House and making major policy statements for the cameras rather than for their colleagues. This sort of arrogance and disrespect for parliament is a symptom for bad legislation such as Bill S-3.

In conclusion, I was honoured to stand today on behalf of the member for Qu'Appelle who is our critic and who is in Sault Ste. Marie listening to what Canadians have to say about bank mergers. The government has refused to allow parliament to do its job and called for an all party parliamentary committee to review the merger. On behalf of that member I present his words.

**Mr. Mark Muisse (West Nova, PC):** Mr. Speaker, Bill S-3 proposes to update the Pension Benefits Standards Act, a law through which the federal government supervises private pension plans.

Canada's system of retirement income has three pillars. The first pillar is the basic old age security paid to all seniors together with the various supplements paid to low income seniors. The old age security benefit has come under considerable scrutiny lately as Canadians await the finance minister's overhaul of the program.

As recently as last month the finance minister attempted to push through reforms to the program in Bill C-36. Bill C-36 proposed changes to the guaranteed income supplement that 1.5 million low income seniors receive. The changes increased the clawback on benefits to seniors who work part time for extra money. The PC Party proposed amendments at report stage of that bill to protect seniors who would see more of the supplement taken away from them.

The bill also proposed to change how the supplement was calculated thereby costing each senior a further cut of approximately \$6 a year. PC Party amendments to protect seniors from these cuts were defeated by the Liberal government. However the finance minister has now agreed to propose further legislation to rescind these changes.

• (1255)

In a press release of May 25 the minister admitted that these changes had unforeseen adverse effects on seniors benefits. If it had not been for our party which brought the government's attention to these cuts, the proposed changes would have passed.

Retirement savings experts are already telling middle income Canadians over the age of 50 to be wary of savings in RRSPs because what they save now will most likely be eaten up in higher taxes later. This creates a directive disincentive for Canadians to do what is right and to save for their own future and their retirement.

The second pillar consists of employment based Canada and Quebec pension plans. Under the government's reform to this pillar Canadians will have to pay more to get less.

The third pillar includes retirement savings such as RRSPs and employer pension plans. The government has moved to restrict access to RRSPs by freezing contribution limits and forcing seniors to mature their RRSPs two years earlier. The legislation deals with other parts of the third pillar such as employer pension plans. Most employer pension plans are governed by provincial law, but 500,000 Canadians belong to the 1,000 plans that fall under federal law.



*Private Members' Business*

Ten years ago the Progressive Conservative government overhauled the Pension Benefits Standards Act, the law which governs those plans. Significant changes were made to the minimum standards that plans must meet in areas ranging from survivor benefits to information disclosure. The bill before us updates that act.

The goals of the bill are to improve the way that the plans are governed, to improve Ottawa's ability to step in when plan administrators do not appear to be following sound financial practices to set up rules for the withdrawal of pension surpluses. It will also allow Ottawa to enter into supervisory agreements with provincial regulators through the Canadian Association of Pension Supervisory Authorities.

Unlike other recent changes to our system of retirement savings the only parts of the bill to generate even minor controversy are the provisions that pertain to the withdrawal of pension surpluses. Pension fund managers are concerned that the surplus and the wind-up provisions in the bill are weighed heavily against employers. However the bill is not particularly controversial. There has been some controversy over the introduction of some government bills in the Senate, a practice which has fallen into disuse in recent years.

Without getting into debate on Senate reform, if bills are to be introduced in the Senate, Bill S-3 is especially the kind of bill on which the Senate can do solid work before sending it on to the House of Commons. This is particularly the case given the combination of the technical nature of the bill, the expertise of those on the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce in area of corporate governance and the non-partisan spirit of co-operation with which members of this committee approach such legislation.

To not optimize the collective skills, wisdom and experience of these senators is an affront to Canadian taxpayers. We have a Senate and the senators on this committee have demonstrated prowess, ability and expertise in these areas.

I remind my colleagues that to not optimize this expertise would be denying Canadian taxpayers another level of deliberation on this type of important legislation. It is an approach that we could use here from time to time when we look at legislation, especially legislation affecting areas of corporate governance where there is a significant amount of institutional knowledge in the Senate.

The Senate banking committee has made six substantive amendments as a result of the testimony it heard from officials and from outside witnesses. The Senate amendments further clarify the rules to be followed when an employer wants to withdraw from the pension surplus. It struck a provision that would have given the Superintendent of Financial Institutions the ability to decide if a particular allocation of a surplus was fair as the issue of fairness should be left to employees and employers to be settled, not public servants.

It also improved the process for allocating a surplus in cases where a company goes bankrupt or winds down. It is very

important that we protect individuals when a company is faced with the types of dramatic downsizing and corporate readjustments that have occurred over the past several years. The legislation will help improve that process.

Those amendments were developed by opposition and government members in the Senate working in the spirit of co-operation with the officials. A spirit of co-operation might be something we should try to duplicate in the House periodically when we are working on legislation as important as this.

• (1300)

At the end of this process financial officials conceded that the bill had been improved by the contribution of the Senate.

The PC party prides itself on working constructively to improve legislation that enters this House and the Senate which is why we proposed the amendments we did to this bill and Bill C-36.

I urge all parties to study bills affecting Canadian seniors with the same scrutiny in order to improve legislation and to protect our seniors.

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been consultations among the parties. The critic for the Bloc is unable to be with us today. He or she will be able to speak when the debate resumes, along with anyone else.

I think you will find agreement to adjourn this debate and that the House see the clock as 1.30 p.m. and proceed to Private Members' Business.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Translation*]

**The Deputy Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

### PORT-CARTIER PENITENTIARY

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier (Manicouagan, BQ)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should institute a public inquiry on the administration of the maximum-security penitentiary at Port-Cartier.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I speak to you today on a matter that has, unfortunately, taken a long time to reach the attention of this House.

*Private Members' Business*

Six months ago, I moved a motion calling for a public inquiry into events that were occurring at the Port-Cartier detention centre, which is a maximum security facility and therefore under the jurisdiction of this government.

Six months have passed since then, and the motion has just resurfaced today. This motion calling for a public inquiry is, in my opinion, self-evident.

The public inquiry called for would cast light on the past events, which forced the guards to work under intense stress for some days. I have met with management, the unions and the workers in the detention centre on two occasions since the incidents, and they have told me directly that everything possible would be done to try to find solutions to the problem experienced. Today, all committees that were struck have presented reports and, fortunately, the tension appears to have dissipated somewhat.

It is, however, most fortunate that management decided to take the bull by the horns. Judging by the length of time it took for my request to be responded to, it is a good thing no lives were at risk. If that had been the case, I trust that the government would have reacted more promptly. This long delay between the events and the consideration of this motion makes me wonder, however.

• (1305)

When the motion was moved the Port-Cartier penitentiary, a maximum security institution, was facing a crisis. The guards, men and women, had worked long periods in a highly charged atmosphere. They and all the personnel in the institution know necessarily that everyone aware of it when the inmates are up to something.

This very tense situation could have ended in violence. The inmates threatened the corrections officers and their families as well. The corrections officers know when they start working in these institutions that they can expect rough talk from the inmates at times.

Nevertheless, patience has its limits, and when insults and threats are directed at those dear to us it really hurts. A number of corrections officers at the time were obliged to take days off to distance themselves from the unhealthy atmosphere in the institution.

I am not sure any member of this House would agree to work in such circumstances and be treated the way guards often are in detention centres. There are always ups and downs in these institutions. The situation varies from one to another, depending on the type of inmate.

When I made the motion in September, calling for a public inquiry into the events at the Port-Cartier detention centre, the situation was critical. There had been threats to the life of certain guards, and some inmates had been violent.

It took six months for the matter to be brought before the House. Six months in which, fortunately, the situation improved, it appears. Six months in which the management of the institution worked with all departments, including the union and workers to find solutions.

But do we have to wait for the situation to arise again before we intervene? Could we not take appropriate measures now to make sure that all security guards, regardless of where they work, can do their work safely without putting their health or even their life in danger?

There are workers in these institutions who have nervous breakdowns, anxiety attacks and all kinds of physical problems related to stress. Guards know all these problems. It is quite understandable. Corrections officers in maximum security institutions, like the one in Port-Cartier for example, have to deal everyday with hardened criminals who are serving a life sentence in most cases.

The inmate population in institutions like the Port-Cartier and Donnacona penitentiaries, for example, is very similar. However, Port-Cartier will also receive inmates facing serious accusations or those who need protection from other inmates.

Let us not kid ourselves, these are tough guys who fear nothing, especially not a guard who is asking them to go back to their cell because it is late. These inmates are dangerous and violent when they are alone. Imagine having to face them as a group.

Violence does not stop when the door of the cell is closed. It often goes on inside in many different forms. That is exactly why penitentiaries have the infamous hole, which is feared by all inmates, the place where an inmate will be kept alone for a certain period of time, where he will have to eat and sleep alone with very few opportunities to get out.

• (1310)

An inmate is not sent to the hole because he decided to give flowers to his cellmate. The hole is used for rebels or for those who need to be protected against violence from other inmates.

Violence in penitentiaries is a reality, and immediate action must be taken when a difficult situation is reported. We must not wait for guards to lose their lives before we react. Otherwise, why would we put criminals behind bars if guards are to become the victims of their violence? If guards are killed on duty, I think it means that there is surely something wrong with the system.

In any event, I think the judicial system as a whole needs to be scrutinized, reviewed and adjusted where appropriate. Many inmates who are behind bars in 1998 have done time before. They served a first sentence and were released on good behaviour two thirds of the way through their sentence. In many cases, former

inmates quickly fell back into their old criminal habits and offended again.

If an individual of any age mercilessly takes away someone else's freedom or life, or significantly reduces their quality of life, and if the justice system finds him guilty beyond any reasonable doubt, it should also deny him all privileges, at least the freedom he has taken away from innocent victims.

I fully understand that one is innocent until proven guilty. I agree this is a very important concept. However, I am not clear about how specific the evidence to the contrary must be. Must one have witnessed the crime in order to be able to give proof or will rational analysis be sufficient?

When the spouse of a woman whose child was found dead is acquitted and, to boot, part of the deposition is dismissed, I have grave concerns. Does it have to be one or the other? In granting parole to an individual who has taken the life of a child, is any consideration whatsoever given for instance to the full impact of his action?

If, at the time of sentencing, the judge decided he should serve 25 years, why then does he serve only about half his sentence? Why should an inmate be released earlier than his sentence calls for, when his victims may have to live with the consequences of his violent actions for the rest of their lives?

When it is not the victims themselves who have to live with the memory, it is their relatives and friends who must live every day without the presence of a loved one. While their lives will forever be changed, the murderer may be set free after 10 or 12 years.

I find it absurd and I have not yet talked about how the trial is conducted. When it takes a whole year to produce a report, it is only normal to forget some elements and to end up producing a document that is not as clear as if it would have been, had it been written in the days following the events.

Similarly, when a case takes months before going to trial, because it keeps being postponed or adjourned, the same thing occurs. In some cases, it took years before some people finally got their day in court. All the while, the victim and his or her close ones were constantly reliving the tragedy.

Finally, the trial takes place and a verdict is rendered. Imagine the pain of the members of a family following an acquittal, or even when a jail sentence is imposed, since they know full well that the offender will not serve out his full sentence.

• (1315)

Is it the whole judicial system that needs to be reviewed? One thing is certain: we must review the rules governing parole for serious offenders who, once released, committed the same crimes again. While it is true that, in many cases, time spent behind bars is

beneficial and can be a form of therapy, it is not the case for every inmate.

Going back to the motion before us, the atmosphere that prevails in certain penal institutions is so bad that an inmate cannot be rehabilitated. If verbal, psychological and even physical violence is as prevalent inside the institution as it is outside, how can we expect to rehabilitate these people?

If it is the case, we must do so before other innocent victims fall prey to a criminal.

**Mr. Nick Discepola (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to have the opportunity to discuss an issue which, as the hon. member for Manicouagan pointed out, was raised in the House on October 22, 1997.

The hon. member expressed concern about management of the maximum security penitentiary at Port-Cartier, Quebec, and asked the government to institute a public inquiry.

[English]

On August 28, 1997 staff from the day shift at Port-Cartier institution in the Quebec region refused to relieve the night staff from their posts, citing dangerous working conditions. Later that morning staff invoked Part II of the Canada Labour Code.

[Translation]

During the evening, Labour Canada issued an interim ruling ordering evening shift employees to perform their duties. It also asked employees to put in writing their reasons for invoking part II of the Canada Labour Code. Labour Canada officials were at the Port-Cartier institution on the morning of August 29 to conduct their inquiry.

I should also point out that, on August 30, the situation at the institution had gone back to normal. On September 2, at the end of its independent inquiry, Labour Canada issued its final ruling, confirming that the immediate safety of the staff was not at risk.

[English]

It should also be known that Labour Canada is an independent body which addresses the health and safety concerns of all employees involved in any federal work within the legislative authority of parliament. As I have just stated, it acted very promptly.

[Translation]

The principle of prevention is integrated into the Canada Labour Code, which gives a number of basic rights to workers in the federal administration, so as to ensure their safety in the workplace.

There have been instances where the employees availed themselves of their right to refuse to work, and where the inquiry conducted by Labour Canada concluded that their health and safety were not at risk, or that the danger was hypothetical rather

*Private Members' Business*

than actual. Such was the case regarding the events of August 29, 1997.

[English]

Since the right to refuse to work can often result in an immediate lockdown, which in turn results in increased tension within the inmate population, it is extremely important that this right be used for resolving genuine safety and health concerns.

[Translation]

On October 23 during Oral Question Period our hon. colleague, the member for Manicouagan, asked the Solicitor General why he refused to order a public inquiry. As my colleague knows very well, the solicitor general answered the question a number of times. He explained his reasons, once again, in a letter to the member for Charlesbourg October 2.

The solicitor general said it was not necessary at that point to call a public inquiry, because Labour Canada had already investigated employees' concerns.

[English]

It is also worthwhile to mention that the hon. member for Manicouagan submitted an application for access to information at the Correctional Service of Canada on September 9 to view and hear the recordings of the events that occurred at Port-Cartier institution on August 28.

• (1320)

[Translation]

On December 16 the member visited Port-Cartier to view and listen to the recordings. He watched the video cassettes first and decided not to listen to the audio cassettes.

He did not raise any specific problem. He did, however, indicate to the director of the institution that he had met a number of employees, that things seemed to be going well and that progress had been made since August. In the light of these observations, the Solicitor General of Canada and the Commissioner of Correctional Services Canada considered the matter closed.

I thank my hon. colleague for expressing his concerns on the matter.

**Mr. Ghislain Fournier:** Mr. Speaker, it is true that, in Port-Cartier, relations are much improved between management, employees

and the union. It is also true, however, that this motion is six months old and that the events it refers to took place six months ago.

What I like about this motion is that it allows us to discuss the judicial system as a whole, a system that I question. Canadians pay high taxes. Fathers with working children like myself are still paying school taxes, and I am happy to do so because we have a responsibility to pay for the education of our children and grandchildren. It is our civic duty.

While we have a responsibility to pay taxes, a reasonable quality of life and a safe environment must be provided for our children and our families. It is the government's responsibility to protect society.

When I see the justice system releasing inmates before they have served their full sentence, when I see that it takes years for cases to get to trial and then they are dropped for lack of a case, I tell myself that we are not fulfilling our mandate of protecting society.

The notion is promoted, and the public, whose tax bill is high, is told "You pay your taxes to have a good quality of life; we are looking after the public, those who are ill, children, seniors, the disabled, the mentally ill, and hoodlums as well".

But they must be looked after in such a way that our society can again live in freedom, that people are not afraid to go out at night. I therefore call on the government to overhaul the entire justice system. When it does that, it will be serving decent folk.

In my riding I have seen people whose lives were changed by crimes, such as a child or woman who has been raped. These people will be marked forever. We cannot ignore these problems. The system must be reformed and our society protected.

I call on the government to examine the justice system, which is now in need of reform.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Since no more members wish to speak and the motion was not selected as a votable item, the hour provided for consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the item is dropped from the order paper.

[English]

It being 1.23 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 1.23 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
<b>ALBERTA (26)</b>		
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.
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA (34)</b>		
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
<b>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)</b>		
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Children and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
Karetak—Lindell, Nancy	Nunavut	Lib.
<b>NOVA SCOTIA (11)</b>		
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
<b>ONTARIO (103)</b>		
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—Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Terrebonne—Blainville	BQ
Normand, Hon. Gilbert, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food) (Fisheries and Oceans)	Bellechasse—Etchemins—Montmagny—L'Islet	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome—Missisquoi	Lib.

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	
<b>SASKATCHEWAN (14)</b>		
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.
<b>YUKON (1)</b>		
Hardy, Louise	Yukon	NDP

## LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of June 5th, 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 Breitzkreuz  
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 Breitzkreuz  
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 Breitzkreuz  
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





## FINANCE

<b>Chairman:</b>	Maurizio Bevilacqua	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Monte Solberg Paddy Torsney	
Mark Assad Scott Brison Roger Gallaway Dick Harris	David Iftody Yvan Loubier Gilles Perron	Gary Pillitteri Karen Redman Nelson Riis	Gerry Ritz Paul Szabo Tony Valeri	(16)

### Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Rob Anders André Bachand Sue Barnes Carolyn Bennett Rick Borotsik Claudette Bradshaw Pierre Brien Jocelyne G. Bujold	Odina Desrochers Nick Discepola Norman Doyle Antoine Dubé Raymonde Folco Joe Fontana John Herron Dale Johnston Jim Jones	Jason Kenney Francine Lalonde René Laurin M. Sophia Leung Peter MacKay Steve Mahoney Larry McCormick Alexa McDonough Bob Mills	Lynn Myers Bob Nault Lorne Nystrom Pauline Picard Charlie Power Yves Rocheleau Alex Shepherd John Solomon
---	--	--	--

---

## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

<b>Chairman:</b>	George Baker	<b>Vice-Chairmen:</b>	Charles Hubbard Gary Lunn	
Yvan Bernier John Duncan Wayne Easter Howard Hilstrom	Nancy Karetak–Lindell Gar Knutson M. Sophia Leung	Bill Matthews Lawrence O'Brien Carmen Provenzano	Yves Rocheleau Paul Steckle Peter Stoffer	(16)

### Associate Members

Gilles Bernier René Canuel Paul Forseth	Ghislain Fournier Bill Gilmour	Philip Mayfield Svend Robinson	Mike Scott Angela Vautour
---	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------

---

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

<b>Chairman:</b>	Bill Graham	<b>Vice-Chairs:</b>	Colleen Beaumier Bob Mills	
Sarkis Assadourian Jean Augustine André Bachand John Cannis	Maud Debien Raymonde Folco Gurmant Grewal Ted McWhinney	Denis Paradis Charlie Penson Julian Reed Svend Robinson	Benoît Sauvageau Bob Speller Daniel Turp	(18)

### Associate Members

Claude Bachand Sue Barnes Eugene Bellemare Bill Blaikie Paul Bonwick Claudette Bradshaw Sarmite Bulte	Aileen Carroll Monique Guay Joe Jordan Jason Kenney Gary Lunn Gurbax Malhi Richard Marceau	Keith Martin Paul Mercier Bob Nault Lorne Nystrom Deepak Obhrai Charlie Power George Proud	Karen Redman Nelson Riis Jacques Saada John Solomon 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 Members**Peter 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 Breitreuz  
Paul DeVillersNick Discepola  
Sheila Finestone  
Derek LeePeter MacKay  
Peter Mancini  
Richard MarceauJohn McKay  
Jack Ramsay  
Andrew Telegdi

(16)

**Associate Members**Carolyn Bennett  
Cliff Breitreuz  
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                      Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral                      Ken Epp                      André Harvey                      (6)  
Yvon Charbonneau

---

### SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

**Chairman:** Bob Kilger

Stéphane Bergeron                      Don Boudria                      André Harvey                      Randy White                      (6)  
Bill Blaikie

---

### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

**Chairman:** John Williams

**Vice-Chairmen:** Ivan Grose  
Andrew Telegdi

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

#### Associate Members

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

---

### TRANSPORT

**Chairman:** Raymond Bonin

**Vice-Chairmen:** Roy Cullen  
Lee Morrison

Roy Bailey                      Bev Desjarlais                      Michel Guimond                      Paul Mercier                      (16)  
Murray Calder                      Claude Drouin                      Stan Keyes                      Carolyn Parrish  
John Cannis                      Joe Fontana                      Inky Mark                      Lou Sekora  
Bill Casey

#### Associate Members

Chris Axworthy                      Pierre Brien                      Ghislain Fournier                      Yves Rocheleau  
Yvan Bernier                      Paul Crête                      Rick Laliberte                      Elsie Wayne  
Rick Borotsik                      John Cummins                      John Maloney

---

## 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 Breitzkreuz  
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, June 5, 1998

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Canadian Transportation Accident Investigation and Safety Board Act

Bill S-2. Second reading .....	7635
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7635
Mr. DeVillers .....	7635
Mr. Mark .....	7636
Mr. Guimond .....	7636
Mr. Guimond .....	7639
Ms. Desjarlais .....	7639
Mr. Casey .....	7641
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a committee) .....	7642

### Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985

Bill S-3. Report stage .....	7642
Ms. Desjarlais .....	7642
Motion for concurrence .....	7642
Mr. Manley .....	7642
(Motion agreed to) .....	7642
Mr. Blaikie .....	7642
Third reading .....	7642
Mr. Manley .....	7642

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Cancer

Mr. Proud .....	7643
-----------------	------

### The Senate

Mr. Grewal .....	7643
------------------	------

### The Ottawa River

Mr. Pratt .....	7643
-----------------	------

### Brooklin Spring Fair

Mrs. Longfield .....	7643
----------------------	------

### Canadian Nurses

Mr. Harb .....	7644
----------------	------

### Delgamuukw

Mr. Mayfield .....	7644
--------------------	------

### Nunavut

Mrs. Karetak-Lindell .....	7644
----------------------------	------

### Colonel F. G. Noseworthy

Mr. Byrne .....	7644
-----------------	------

### CRTC

Mr. Obhrai .....	7644
------------------	------

### Community Access Program

Mr. Patry .....	7645
-----------------	------

### The Environment

Ms. Hardy .....	7645
-----------------	------

### Human Rights

Mr. Ménard .....	7645
------------------	------

### House of Commons

Mrs. Finestone .....	7645
----------------------	------

### Northern Ireland

Mr. MacKay .....	7646
------------------	------

### The Reform Party

Mr. DeVillers .....	7646
---------------------	------

### Human Rights

Mr. Reynolds .....	7646
--------------------	------

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Government Contracts

Mr. Hart .....	7646
Mr. Gagliano .....	7647
Mr. Hart .....	7647
Mr. Gagliano .....	7647
Mr. Hart .....	7647
Mr. Gray .....	7647

### Immigration

Mr. Reynolds .....	7647
Ms. Robillard .....	7647
Mr. Reynolds .....	7647
Ms. Robillard .....	7647

### Employment Insurance

Mrs. Tremblay .....	7648
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7648
Mrs. Tremblay .....	7648
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7648

### Transitional Jobs Fund

Mr. Crête .....	7648
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7648
Mr. Crête .....	7648
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7648

### Labour

Ms. McDonough .....	7649
Ms. Robillard .....	7649
Ms. McDonough .....	7649
Ms. Robillard .....	7649

### Fisheries

Mr. MacKay .....	7649
Mr. Anderson .....	7649
Mr. MacKay .....	7649
Mr. Anderson .....	7649

### Immigration

Mr. Obhrai .....	7649
Ms. Robillard .....	7650
Mr. Obhrai .....	7650
Ms. Robillard .....	7650

### Atlantic Groundfish Strategy

Mr. Bernier .....	7650
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7650
Mr. Bernier .....	7650
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7650

### Hepatitis C

Ms. Ablonczy .....	7650
Mr. Volpe .....	7650
Mrs. Ablonczy .....	7651

Mr. Volpe .....	7651
<b>Maple Syrup Industry</b>	
Ms. Alarie .....	7651
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7651
Ms. Alarie .....	7651
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7651
<b>Immigration</b>	
Mr. Kenney .....	7651
Mr. Gray .....	7651
Mr. Kenney .....	7652
Mr. Gray .....	7652
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Mr. Fournier .....	7652
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7652
<b>Boating Safety</b>	
Mr. Knutson .....	7652
Mr. Anderson .....	7652
<b>Immigration</b>	
Mr. Benoit .....	7652
Ms. Robillard .....	7652
Mr. Benoit .....	7653
Ms. Robillard .....	7653
<b>Canada Customs and Revenue Agency</b>	
Mr. Blaikie .....	7653
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	7653
Mr. Blaikie .....	7653
Mr. Dhaliwal .....	7653
<b>Hepatitis C</b>	
Mr. Casey .....	7653
Mr. Volpe .....	7653
Mr. Casey .....	7653
Mr. Volpe .....	7654
<b>Gun Control</b>	
Ms. Torsney .....	7654
Ms. Bakopanos .....	7654
<b>ViCLAS</b>	
Mr. Cadman .....	7654
Mr. Discepola .....	7654
<b>Employment Insurance</b>	
Mr. Fournier .....	7654
Mr. Pettigrew .....	7654
<b>Pay Equity</b>	
Ms. Desjarlais .....	7654

Mr. Massé .....	7655
<b>Veterans Affairs</b>	
Mr. Muiise .....	7655
Mr. Mifflin .....	7655
<b>Correctional Service Canada</b>	
Mr. Bélanger .....	7655
Mr. Discepola .....	7655
<b>Access to Information</b>	
Mr. Konrad .....	7655
Mr. Gray .....	7655
<b>Sudan</b>	
Mrs. Guay .....	7655
Mr. Boudria .....	7656
<b>Employment</b>	
Ms. Hardy .....	7656
Mr. Byrne .....	7656
<b>Report of the Auditor General</b>	
The Deputy Speaker .....	7656

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	7656
<b>Questions on the Order Paper</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	7656
Mr. MacKay .....	7656

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

<b>Pension Benefits Standards Act, 1985</b>	
Bill S-3. Third reading .....	7656
Mr. Peterson .....	7656
Mr. Epp .....	7658
Mr. Epp .....	7659
Ms. Desjarlais .....	7662
Mr. Muiise .....	7664
Mr. Adams .....	7665

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

<b>Port-Cartier Penitentiary</b>	
Mr. Fournier .....	7665
Motion .....	7665
Mr. Discepola .....	7667
Mr. Fournier .....	7668
<b>Appendix</b>	

**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.**