



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

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

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Thursday, October 8, 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

Thursday, October 8, 1998

The House met at 10 a.m.

\_\_\_\_\_

*Prayers*

\_\_\_\_\_

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

### ANNUAL REPORT OF CHIEF OF DEFENCE STAFF ON STATE OF CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the annual report of the Chief of the Defence Staff on the state of the Canadian Armed Forces.

\* \* \*

### 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 four petitions.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

### REPORTS OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND OSFI

**Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 15th and 16th reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

These reports deal with the aging population and information for parliament's understanding of choices regarding the aging population, as well as the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions regarding insurance and pensions.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, the committee requests the government to table comprehensive responses to these reports.

\* \* \*

### FOREIGN PUBLISHERS ADVERTISING SERVICES ACT

**Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-55, an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers.

She said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to present for first reading an act respecting advertising services supplied by foreign periodical publishers.

[*Translation*]

This bill concerns advertising services provided by foreign periodical publishers.

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

\* \* \*

• (1005)

[*English*]

### CANADA ENDANGERED SPECIES PROTECTION ACT

**Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-441, an act respecting the protection of wildlife species in Canada from extirpation or extinction.

He said: Mr. Speaker, if this bill becomes law it will protect all endangered species and their habitat in Canada, regardless of where they live, including aquatic species and migratory birds. It will identify species at risk and the factors that threaten them and their habitat.

This bill will require the Minister of the Environment to prepare a recovery plan. It will make it an offence to harm, disturb or kill endangered species or their habitat. This bill will give appropriate powers to designated persons to conduct inspections and enforce the law. It will allow citizens to bring investigations of suspected threats to an endangered specie or its habitat.

This bill would apply to provincial as well as federal lands unless a province decides to pass mirror legislation.

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

*Routine Proceedings***COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE**

## FISHERIES AND OCEANS

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.)** moved that the first report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans presented on Monday, March 23, 1998, be concurred in.

**Mr. Bill Matthews (Burin—St. George's, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I very much want to take part in this debate this morning to speak to the east coast fisheries report that was presented to parliament on March 23.

It was quite an undertaking for members of the committee to go about Atlantic Canada and parts of Quebec to hold 15 public meetings in the presence of thousands of people from the fishing industry.

I recall very well the large numbers of people at places like Tors Cove, Burgeo and Îles-de-la-Madeleine who came for hours to pass on their views and their observations to the members of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans.

The report the committee submitted to parliament reflects the feelings, the sentiments and the desires of people in those provinces, and the changes that should take place in DFO policy particularly. It was quite an undertaking, an undertaking that has not been undertaken by any other standing committee of parliament to my recollection.

The report received quite a bit of attention, as everyone knows. But the recommendations of the report were those desires, wishes and recommendations that came from the public hearings that were held in the various provinces we visited. We held 15 meetings and listened to thousands of people involved in the fishing industry. Fishermen, fish plant workers, trawlermen, retired trawlermen and people who had held top management positions with fish processing companies came before the committee to give their views.

One of the contentious issues was the state of our fish stocks, particularly our cod stocks, the effect of foreign overfishing and what foreign overfishing has done to the fish stocks over the years. Everyone recognizes that foreign overfishing has declined, but it has mainly declined because it is not financially viable for foreign countries to come so far from home to catch diminished amounts of cod and diminished amounts of flounder. The main reason they are not coming over to catch the fish is because it is not financially viable to do so.

• (1010)

I see the parliamentary secretary shaking his head. He is probably shaking his head in disbelief. He is shaking his head in disbelief or he is shaking his head at the truth. I am not quite sure.

**Mr. Lynn Myers:** Get your facts straight.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** The hon. member would not know a fact about the fishery if he fell on it.

There is still foreign fishing going on and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans a number of times, in appearing before the standing committee, has said that if there are Canadian interests which still want fish to be caught by foreigners he will make that fish available to them.

I want to go on record this morning as saying that I know of at least two Canadian enterprises which at present have submissions before DFO looking for fish that is now being caught by foreigners.

Since I am on the topic of foreign fishing I cannot bypass the opportunity to comment for a few moments on the recent NAFO meetings in Lisbon, Portugal.

In those Lisbon, Portugal meetings, for the first time since 1949, for the first time since Newfoundland joined Confederation, the co-ordinates of the fishing zones on the nose and the tail of the Grand Banks and the Flemish Cap have been altered.

It is the first time since 1949 that we see a change in area 3M which we always refer to as the nose of the Grand Banks. There has been a change which will allow foreigners to catch shrimp on the nose of the Grand Banks for the first time since 1949.

For members who do not know, the nose and tail of the Grand Banks are considered nursery areas. It is where juvenile fish grow. It has great feeding potential. Fish grow very well there. We try to protect the nose and the tail of the banks for that reason.

What has Canada done? Just a few short weeks ago in Lisbon it agreed to alter fishing zone 3M to allow foreigners to catch shrimp in the nursery area. It is the first time. It is now an area known as 3MA.

**An hon. member:** Wrong again.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** I say to the hon. member that I am not wrong again and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has indicated that the governments of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia have supported this move. That is still debatable.

It is very widely debated in Newfoundland whether or not the government of Newfoundland agreed.

**Mr. Wayne Easter:** We are dealing with facts, not fiction.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** We are dealing with fish, I say to the parliamentary secretary; something which he did not know a lot about a year ago. He knew a lot about spuds, but he did not know a lot about fish. He still knows more about potatoes than he knows about fish.

This is a very disturbing situation for a number of reasons. The foreigners will not be content in five, six or ten years just to catch shrimp on the nose of the Grand Banks because then they will claim historic attachment and they will want to catch cod and flounder and so on.

*Routine Proceedings*

If we were to listen to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, and top management at DFO, they would lead us to believe that Spain and Portugal are not overfishing, that they are not catching cod on the nose and tail and the Flemish Cap of the Grand Banks.

I want to inform the House that right now, as I speak, Portugal and Spain have huge amounts of headed flatfish, American plaice, yellowtail flounder and gray sole for sale in frozen form in their warehouses. Where did they get this frozen flatfish? There is only one place they could have gotten it: from fishing on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and Labrador.

They got the flatfish as a bycatch for cod. How much cod did they take to have these huge amounts of flatfish, American plaice, yellowtail flounder and gray sole for sale? Yet the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and his top management people will try to convince Atlantic Canadians particularly that they have Spain and Portugal under control. What malarkey.

It is just as bad out there today as it was 10 years ago. The Government of Canada has made it worse by now allowing the same people to catch shrimp on the nose of the Grand Banks.

• (1015)

The parliamentary secretary shakes his head. He shakes his head a lot these days. He shakes his head about the problems with the fishery and he shakes his head about some of the problems his own colleagues are experiencing. He shakes, shakes and shakes his head.

**Mr. Lynn Myers:** About misinformation.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** The hon. member keeps shouting “misinformation”. The government is good at trying to turn the truth into misinformation. The hon. member cannot deny the obvious. The hon. member would not know, but since the NAFO meetings in Lisbon there has been a huge outcry about the shrimp situation on the nose of the Grand Banks. A lot of people have their you know what in the wringer over this situation. It is a very serious situation in Newfoundland and Labrador and Atlantic Canada. We suffer most when foreigners fish on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and Labrador; not central Canada or western Canada but Atlantic Canada.

Another recommendation in our report dealt with the early retirement post-TAGS program. The committee in its wisdom, after listening to those thousands and thousands of people affected, recommended that if the government came forward with an early retirement program it should develop a formula consisting of age plus attachment to the industry.

We recommended that. Everyone that came to our meetings recommended that. However, once again the minister of HRDC in particular did not accept the recommendation. I am sad to say that

because thousands of people with 30, 32, 34 and 35 years of attachment to the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada have fallen through the cracks of the early retirement program.

I do not want to see anyone with anything taken away. We can look at someone 55 years of age with 10 years of attachment to the industry who will receive early retirement benefits. Then we can look at a person 54 years of age with 35 years of attachment to the industry who will not receive any early retirement benefits. There is an obvious unfairness and injustice.

Why the government did not accept that recommendation I will never understand. I have consistently said that there was not a need for the government to allocate any more than the \$730 million it allocated to the program. There could have been a redirection inside the fund to take care of this problem.

I suggested very strongly to the minister of HRDC and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in written form and verbally that they should have redirected the \$100 million allocated to ACOA for community regional development. They could have redirected some of that money to early retirement and taken care of those people with 30 to 35 years of attachment to the industry.

There is a very serious situation unfolding in Atlantic Canada today. I know about the riding of Burin—St. Georges which I represent. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have always in large numbers gone away to look for work. They have always gone to Ontario, British Columbia or Alberta. It has been part of our life. However, in the rural communities of Burin—St. Georges and rural communities of other ridings that make up our province the out-migration is frightening. It is very difficult in most of our communities to find anyone under 45 years of age. Most of them are 50 years of age plus. Most of them are retired people or the few who hold government jobs.

That is what is happening in Newfoundland and Labrador and in a lot of communities in Atlantic Canada today. It is as a direct result of what has happened to our fishing industry, what has happened to our fish resource, our fish stocks.

Our report recommended a change in DFO policy and attitude so that as our stocks regenerate and rebuild there would at least be a future for Atlantic Canadians in the fishing industry. All we got in response from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans was that he cast the report aside. He tried to downplay the report. He did not take the recommendations of the committee very seriously.

• (1020)

I am very disappointed by that because as all members of the House know the majority of members of the standing committee like all other committees are government members. There were nine of them. Nine of them participated in the writing of the report. Nine of them supported the recommendations of the report. Nine

*Routine Proceedings*

of sixteen government members wrote and supported the recommendations.

What did the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans do? He just threw it aside and said "hogwash, bunk". The biggest problem in the fishing industry on the east and west coasts today is that the people in the industry do not have confidence in the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans because of that kind of attitude. At least the minister could have taken the report and very seriously reviewed and considered it. He could have at least responded to it in a meaningful way, which he refused to do.

The report from the committee generated a lot of attention in Atlantic Canada. There were 15 public meetings. Thousands of people appeared before the committee. They expected something to follow from the report and from the recommendations. All they got was more arrogance and more nose-thumbing from the Minister of Fisheries and Ocean, which is not acceptable.

We have some very serious problems in Atlantic Canada with the unemployed and the out-migration. There are some positive signs in some of our fishing zones, particularly in our southern zones, that our fish stocks are regenerating. In the province of Newfoundland and Labrador that I represent this year we had a commercial cod fishery with a total allowable catch which increased from 20,000 metric tons to 30,000 metric tons.

Fishermen I grew up with and worked with in the fishing industry when I was working my way through university tell me that there is more fish in the southern zones today than they have seen for the last 15 year. They have no reason to mislead me. I am one of them. I grew up with them. I am concerned about them. They tell me there are good signs of fish in the southern zones.

With the northeast coast northern cod stocks the signs are not so great, but within the last few weeks I was pleased to hear scientists say that there is at least some small sign of some regeneration in the northern cod stocks.

Our committee did not only hear about cod. We heard about red fish, turbot, lobster and scallops. You name it, we heard about it. The shellfish industry particularly is still a very solid industry. There are some very good earnings. Fishermen are doing very well. There is still a very good fishing industry in Atlantic Canada in other species.

I want to allude to the NAFO meetings and the observer coverage on foreign vessels.

**Mr. Wayne Easter:** It is 100%.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** The parliamentary secretary is as proud as the minister to talk about the 100% observer coverage. Observers come from the European Community. Observers are hired by the European Community. They are not Canadian observers. They are Spanish and Portuguese. In fact they are mostly British observers

who are paid by the owners of the vessels they observe on. So what?

We have 100% observers but the price we have to pay is the giving away of shrimp on the nose of the Grand Banks to have observer coverage for another two years when it will be reviewed again. We may not have 100% observer coverage after two years. The foreigners may reject it in two years. That is what I am told. I am not saying it is correct. I am told that in two years it is up for review. The parliamentary secretary will have an occasion to respond to my remarks. If I am wrong he can set the record straight.

**Mr. Wayne Easter:** It will take me all day.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** No, it will not. It will not take the parliamentary secretary very long to deal with it because he knows what I am saying is correct. He knows full well.

How could the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans be so delighted with 100% observer coverage on foreign vessels by foreigners who are paid by foreigners? We do not get to see the observer reports. They can tell us what they like.

• (1025)

**Mr. Wayne Easter:** They were offered to you in camera.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** I refuse to accept the observer reports in camera. If I saw them the first thing I would do is get in trouble because once I read them I would tell people what were in them. I would rather not see them, because if I see the observer reports I want to talk about them. I do not want to see them for my information. I want to tell Atlantic Canadians and all other Canadians what is in them.

They are the people who deserve to know. Satisfying my curiosity is not good enough. I represent 158 communities in Newfoundland and Labrador. These people want to know what is in the observer reports. What is the point of my looking at the reports in camera and not being able to tell them about it without getting myself in trouble?

Why the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans did not give us the reports so that we could look at them, say what we wanted about them and make public what is in them, is a matter of real debate.

It is the government's way of covering it up. It wants to cover it up and pretend that it is rosy. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans beats his chest about 100% observer coverage. So what? It is like having Jesse James looking after the bank. It is like paying Jesse James to be security at a bank. Jesse would argue that he did not steal any money. The foreigners tell us that they did not violate any of our NAFO regulations and we believe them.

There is a situation nine miles off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador where the French are still catching salmon. The commercial salmon fishery of St. Pierre and Miquelon has increased while our fishermen have been bought out. The French bought our fishing nets and set them nine miles offshore. The salmon fishing has



*Routine Proceedings*

increased. The French tell the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans that they are not catching very many salmon, and the minister believes them. Yet the French do not have one salmon river that contributes to the resource. All they do is take out.

These are the kinds of situations that we get from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, from the parliamentary secretary and from others over there who are big wigs in government. They try to bamboozle the public. They try to give a false impression but the people are seeing through it.

I finish by saying that I was very pleased to be a part of the east coast report, to have participated in the committee, to listen to Atlantic Canadians, and to express their desires and wishes to the government. However, I am sorry to say the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans did not take the report very seriously.

**Mr. Wayne Easter (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I too was very pleased to be part of the Standing Committee of Fisheries and Oceans. Its 15 meetings in Atlantic Canada and Newfoundland were excellent. We had good discussions and listened loud and clear to what fishermen had to say.

I will admit that we had very good co-operation by all members of the committee in a non-partisan sense and came up with an excellent report. Not all is as bad as the member for Burin—St. George's paints it in terms of the minister's response. There was an excellent response to a number of points.

Although the member wants to raise a lot of false flags in the foreign fishing issue, the minister clarified the concerns on foreign fishing. I would like to make some points relative to what the member said about foreign fishing to try to correct the record.

The catches from quotas allocated to foreign fleets in Canadian waters have dropped to less than 2,000 tonnes in recent years. They are down from an average of 350,000 tonnes in the late 1970s and 1980s. The member is shaking his head; he knows that. We still have foreign fishing within our 200 mile zone. A question needs to be asked. Why?

• (1030)

The fact is that this foreign fishing is under bilateral fisheries agreements with those countries that abide by our conservation objectives inside and outside 200 miles. That is an important point. Inside and outside 200 miles.

These foreign allocations do not deprive Canadian fishermen who still leave large portions of their quotas in the water every year. Some of the foreign vessels in two special Atlantic fisheries

are chartered by Canadian quota holders. These foreign charters provide jobs for Canadian plant workers and new markets for Canadian companies. It is important to see that Canadians are working through the allocation of these quotas to foreign fishers.

In addition, foreign vessels fishing in Canadian waters are carefully monitored. The member talked a bit about this point. In Canadian waters they must be licensed and they must carry Canadian observers at their expense.

**An hon. member:** What about the reports?

**Mr. Wayne Easter:** As I indicated earlier, the observer reports were offered to the committee in camera. There is confidential commercial information in those observer reports. The worry was that if they were not offered in camera in a confidential way, as the member for Burin—St. George's said, he would make that information public.

The opposition parties really should have looked at the reports. Then they could have confirmed publicly without giving the details that what the minister is saying is correct. The fact is they did not want to admit that the minister is correct on this particular issue in terms of what those observer reports state. Those are the facts.

Despite the fact that these charters benefit Canadians, some have argued that these fish should be allocated to Canadians. That would be great, but Canadians do have the first right of refusal for all fish in Canadian waters. Before any foreign allocations are made, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans undertakes extensive consultations with industry and the provinces.

I believe that the member for Burin—St. George's indicated that he knew of two people who are interested. I would hope he would bring that information forward and negotiations could go on. Maybe they could get their allocation.

Finally, we need to remember that the 200 mile nautical zone is a matter of international consensus. It was established during the negotiations of the United Nations convention on the law of the sea in the 1970s of which we were one of the key players.

Let me move on to a couple of other points that I want to clarify and question the hon. member on. The member talked about the—

**Mr. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the parliamentary secretary wants to debate this, then why does the government not allow this debate to continue instead of using up all the time for questions and comments?

**The Deputy Speaker:** With great respect, I do not think that is a point of order, but I am indicating to the hon. parliamentary secretary that this is questions and comments and there are other members who want to make comments and ask questions. The hon.

*Routine Proceedings*

member has used up half the time already. I would ask him to bring his comments to a close within the next 15 seconds, please.

**Mr. Wayne Easter:** Mr. Speaker, the member raised points in terms of the NAFO meeting in Lisbon and the 100% observer coverage. I just want to point out to him that there are other checks and balances in terms of observers that come from foreign countries on those boats. There is spot monitoring by our own vessels and there is dockside—

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hon. member for St. John's East may wish to respond. If not, I will go to another member who wishes to comment.

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** Mr. Speaker, it is Burin—St. George's. I am sure if the hon. member for St. John's East were here, being a Newfoundlander he would want to respond, but I will take the opportunity to answer the parliamentary secretary.

When I was talking about the changes to the co-ordinates for the first time since 1949 in moving a line in area 3M to be now called 3MA to allow foreigners to catch shrimp on the nose of the Grand Banks, for some reason in his speech the parliamentary secretary conveniently forgot to allude to that.

• (1035)

This is a very serious situation. We are now allowing foreigners to catch shrimp in the nursery area of the Grand Banks for the first time since 1949. As I said before, they have fished shrimp for five or six years. Then we go off to another NAFO meeting and the foreigners will say "Now we have been into that new 3MA zone for five years, we have historical fishing rights there so we want cod and flounder there". I say to the parliamentary secretary that is what is going to happen. And the government will try to justify that by saying "But yes, we have 100% observer coverage. On every vessel we will have an observer, a foreign observer on a foreign vessel".

There is no protection. All it does is make the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans feel good. He pounds his chest about 100% observer coverage, but they are foreign observers on foreign boats.

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my colleague from Burin—St. George's a question. I certainly agree with the comments he has made today.

The parliamentary secretary thinks Canadians are going to believe, and I will quote him, "foreign fishers only get what Canadians don't want". This is an unbelievable statement. He should go back to growing spuds.

The member for Burin—St. George's worked very hard on this report and all it got was the chairman of the fisheries committee fired. There are some great recommendations in that report. They are good for fisheries in Canada.

We also know there is a report on the west coast fisheries coming out. The member for Burin—St. George's has forgotten more about fisheries than the minister of fisheries or his parliamentary secretary will ever know. What advice could he give us on the west coast to make sure the west coast does not end up with the same disaster from this government that there is on the east coast?

**Mr. Bill Matthews:** Mr. Speaker, the west coast has problems that are different and unique.

The problems on the west coast are the direct result of the policy of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. What it has done on the west coast, more so than it has done on the east coast, is it goes under the guise of consultations. It goes about having these consultative hearings but it does not listen to a word that is said. Consequently the minister has had a great charade out there of consultations, but he has not listened to the people.

Those in top management in DFO continue in spite of those consultations in their old ways. Consequently we see the west coast fishery coming apart the same as has happened on the east coast. The same management personnel that have made decisions for the last 10 or 15 years are still there making the same decisions.

If the government is going to go about it right, make some changes in top management and when consulting with the people, listen to the people. Take their message seriously and make some changes.

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.)** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join this debate. I move:

That the House do now proceed to orders of the day.

[*Translation*]

**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 nays have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Deputy Speaker:** Call in the members.



*Routine Proceedings*

● (1120)

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

*(Division No. 238)*

## YEAS

## Members

Adams	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bertrand	Blondin-Andrew
Boudria	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Drouin
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lee	Lincoln
Longfield	Mahoney
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Reed
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Vanclief
Volpe	Wappel
Whelan	Wilfert—118

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Anders	Asselin
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Cadman
Canuel	Cardin
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harvey	Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)	Laliberte
Laurin	Lebel
Lefebvre	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau	Mark
Matthews	Mayfield
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Penson	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Power	Price
Ramsay	Reynolds
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Schmidt	Solomon
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Turp
Vautour	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—94

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Alcock	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Dalphond-Guiral
Bevilacqua	Debien
de Savoye	Discepola
Desrochers	Godin (Châteauguay)
Galloway	Leung
Lalonde	Marchand
Loubier	Normand
Mifflin	Steckle
Richardson	Szabo
St-Hilaire	
Valeri	

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

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

• (1125)

[*Translation*]

**CRIMINAL CODE**

The House resumed from October 7, consideration of the motion that Bill C-51, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak at second reading of Bill C-51, introduced by the Minister of Justice.

This bill is entitled: An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. It cleans out a lot of our penal law system. This is an omnibus bill. Traditionally, these omnibus bills always require particular attention from parliamentarians, since they involve several laws.

A careful examination of the measures proposed in Bill C-51 would show how pertinent the minister's proposals are. I must take this opportunity to point out how important the work of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights will be.

On numerous occasions in this House we have criticized the quality of the work done by the parliamentary committees, because of the government's systematic obstruction. It rarely acts on the recommendations made to it. It is therefore vital for the opposition parties to join together to demand transparency from the government in committee proceedings. As I have done for a number of other bills, I offer the minister my full co-operation in improving this bill, if possible.

Since this is an omnibus bill, I am going to address a number of extremely important matters, naturally those which involve the concerns of Quebecers most directly.

The first part I am going to address deals with casinos on cruise ships. Since other Bloc Quebecois MPs have already spoken on this, I shall be brief.

Bill C-51 deals with certain amendments relating to casinos on cruise ships. I will give a brief historical review. Without the St. Lawrence River, Quebec and Canada—the entire North American

continent in fact—would have developed in a very different way. Very early on in our history, it was the route taken by the foreign explorers who discovered the marvellous part of this continent now known as Quebec.

Although its role has changed over the years, this great navigable waterway has always influenced the development of our communities, culturally, economically and touristically. Until now, however, our legislation has had a direct impact on the river's tourism potential, by preventing cruise ships from operating casinos.

Cruise ships had to shut down their casinos when they hit the waters off Anticosti Island, or in other words two days before reaching Quebec City. The direct result was that a number of carriers avoided stopovers at Quebec City and those that did put in did so for a much shorter period of time, in the interests of keeping their passengers happy.

• (1130)

Since the Bloc Quebecois was elected in 1993, the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans has been trying to get the House and the government to see the disastrous impact of existing legislation on cruise ships with casinos.

If these ships are allowed to operate their casinos in the St. Lawrence River, tourism in the Quebec City area will pick up, as passengers will be able to disembark and spend more time in the area, returning to the ship at night to enjoy the casino. This will be legal. When passengers disembark, they will provide the Quebec City area with a significant economic boost.

For this, we owe a big thank you to the member for Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, and to all members from the Quebec City area, who worked together to get the government to see the advantage of this amendment, and especially how important it was to Quebec to amend the Criminal Code so that cruise ships could continue on their way, but be able to stop over in Quebec City, so that neither the region nor vacationers would suffer.

The other important thing I wanted to mention about Bill C-51 is the accelerated parole review provision. I would like to speak to this briefly.

In 1997, the media brought us the Lagana affair. It will be recalled that this involved a lawyer, Joseph Lagana, sentenced in 1995 to 13 years in prison for his involvement in a drug importing case and for laundering almost \$47.4 million. The worse part of this story is that Mr. Lagana was released after serving only one sixth of his sentence, that is 26 months instead of the 13 years of imprisonment he had been sentenced to by the judge.

The accelerated parole review procedure provided in the Corrections and Conditional Release Act benefited this major drug trafficker, who was released after serving only one sixth of his sentence because his crime was considered a non-violent offence under the law and he had not served time before.

On this subject, let me digress to say a word about the application criteria of this accelerated review procedure. In 1987, the chief justice of the supreme court made a decision in the Smith affair, saying:

Because they are the direct cause of the hardship experienced by their victims and their families, we must ensure these importers of narcotics bear their share of culpability for the countless serious crimes of all sorts committed by drug addicts to support their addiction.

It read further:

With due respect, I believe that, when convicted, these individuals, with very few exceptions, should be sentenced and actually serve long term sentences.

This shows that the supreme court considers drug trafficking to be a scourge of serious magnitude that must be eradicated. In our view, since money laundering sustains this scourge, anyone who is found guilty should indeed, in the words of the supreme court justice, serve long term sentences.

But the Liberal government obviously does not agree, since it is allowing criminals like Joseph Lagana to take advantage of accelerated parole reviews. The Lagana affair prompted the Bloc Québécois, through the member for Charlesbourg, to introduce a private member's bill to have this kind of review denied to criminals found guilty of money laundering, among other offences.

While Bill C-51 is a step in the right direction, the new provisions will not apply to Mr. Lagana and others like him, because bankers and lawyers who are convicted for money laundering but not for an organized crime offence will still get away with serving one sixth of their sentence. This is totally unacceptable to the Bloc Québécois. We will not tolerate other Lagana cases.

Therefore, we are informing the House that, on Bill C-51, the Bloc Québécois will be proposing amendments to offset the Liberal government's lack of courage on this issue.

• (1135)

The fact that the government is making a minor correction to a situation does not release it from all its obligations.

I also want to discuss the powers of the attorney general of Canada.

Bill C-51 affects the respective powers of the federal and provincial attorneys general regarding criminal proceedings. In-

### *Government Orders*

deed, while section 2 of the Criminal Code gives provincial attorneys general exclusive authority to institute criminal proceedings, Bill C-51 introduces an exception in the case of proceedings that relate to the trafficking of uncut rough diamonds. In fact, the bill creates a concurrent power for this type of offence, while pointing out that the new provisions do not affect the powers of the provinces in this area.

In spite of that clarification, we feel the amendment proposed in clause 16 of the bill opens the door to new federal intrusions in the administration of criminal justice which, as we know, is an area under exclusive provincial jurisdiction. The Department of Justice justifies this undermining of the provinces' authority by saying that the mining of diamonds takes place almost exclusively in the Northwest Territories. Under section 2 of the Criminal Code, the attorney general of Canada has, exceptionally, the authority to institute proceedings in the two Canadian territories.

Since the illegal trafficking of uncut rough diamonds can take place across provincial borders, the department feels it would be wise to allow the federal attorney general, who institutes criminal proceedings in the Canadian territories, to be able to bring these proceedings to conclusion in the provinces, if necessary.

However, we feel this is not enough of a justification. The diamond traffic, like many other offences listed in the Criminal Code, can be dealt with through co-operation between the federal and provincial attorneys general, so that criminal proceedings can be brought to a fruitful conclusion. Such co-operation currently exists, and nothing indicates that it would not exist in the specific case of the trafficking of uncut rough diamonds. I am asking the government to respect the jurisdictions established in the Canadian constitution—its own constitution—and not to get involved in areas under provincial jurisdiction.

The other very important characteristic of this bill is that it deals with section 227 of the Criminal Code, which states that "no person commits culpable homicide—unless the death occurs within one year and one day from the time of the occurrence of the last event". The bill would repeal this provision linked to British legislation from the Middle Ages. That was a long time ago.

The centuries old one year and one day rule remained part of our criminal legislation without its relevancy ever being seriously challenged. Over the years, two main reasons were offered to justify this rule.

First, it was argued that it would be unacceptable for a person to be indefinitely subject to prosecution for murder. Second, in cases where the victim lives a long time after an injury, a causal connection between the act in question and the subsequent death may be difficult to establish.

In spite of these justifications, the rule set out in section 227 of the Criminal Code continues to be strongly criticized. The first

*Government Orders*

criticism is that the rule flies in the face of the principle that homicide procedures are not subject to any statute of limitation in Canada. Furthermore, the "one-year-and-one-day" rule is viewed as an arbitrary rule that brings our justice system into disrepute.

While a causal connection may be obvious, death may occur immediately following the period of prescription provided for in section 227 of the Criminal Code, which means that the act in question could no longer qualify as culpable homicide.

Finally, we must bear in mind that, with technological progress, crime victims may survive for longer periods. Technological breakthroughs in medicine help artificially prolong the lives of patients who otherwise would have died much sooner.

By proposing that section 227 of the Criminal Code be repealed, Bill C-51 addresses these many criticisms.

• (1140)

By rescinding the year and a day rule, parliament would, among other things, be acting on the recommendation of the federal-provincial task force on homicide, which, in 1991, wanted to have sections 224 and 227 of the Criminal Code replaced. This recommendation would have led to the formulation of a causality rule, which is in keeping with the jurisprudence.

To this end, it is also important to point out that the repeal of section 227 would clear the way for the rules formulated by the supreme court in the Smithers case on the determination of a causal link between a death and an illegal act.

Under this jurisprudence, the only requirement of the illegal act is that it at least contributed to the death of the victim and that its contribution was not insignificant. Even if the act itself did not cause the death in question, it may nevertheless constitute a legal cause once it contributed in any way whatsoever.

In the light of the foregoing, the repeal of section 227 of the Criminal Code appears justified. Nevertheless, the deliberations of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights should enable us to dispel all ambiguity on this matter and I hope to question doctors and lawyers about it so that we end up with the best section possible in the Criminal Code dealing with this.

In introducing Bill C-51, the government could have been braver and proposed measures more vigorously attacking the real problems of the Canadian justice system. As we mentioned earlier, the amendments to the accelerated parole review in the Corrections and Conditional Release Act are inadequate. The battle against money laundering does not seem to be a priority for this government, which takes a piecemeal approach to things. The solutions it is proposing do not go nearly far enough.

There is no doubt about this government's apathy, because it could, right now, take effective action against money laundering. The Bloc Quebecois has been raising this whole issue for a long time now.

Listeners will probably recall that we even made it part of our platform in the last election campaign, and that we were not short of suggestions for what this government should do about this terrible problem in Canada. As I mentioned earlier, the member for Charlesbourg introduced a private member's bill to deal with the issue. Since its purpose is to do something about the problem of money laundering, I trust that it will have the support of the government.

One thing the government could easily and rapidly do, even in Bill C-51 before us, is to eliminate \$1,000 bank notes, which is a top priority for the Bloc Quebecois. Canada is one of the only countries to issue such a high denomination. Police forces tell us that this makes it easier for criminals to launder their ill-gotten gains.

The Bloc Quebecois is also suggesting that financial institutions should in future be required to inform the police of any dubious transaction involving \$10,000 or more. This requirement would also apply to casinos and travel agencies.

Despite what it is saying, the Liberal government's response to money laundering has been far from effective. Strict measures are long in coming. Because of that inertia, we must constantly raise the issue and hound the government, as we did in the case of the motorcycle gangs, for instance. The government finally decided to act following the enormous pressure exerted by the Bloc Quebecois regarding that issue. I do hope that, following our private members' bills and our representations, the government will finally take action regarding money laundering, if not with Bill C-51, then in a subsequent piece of legislation.

Since time is running out, I will conclude by saying that the Bloc Quebecois is pleased that operating casinos on cruise ships on the St. Lawrence River will now be permitted. As I said earlier, thanks to the hard work of several MPs from the Quebec City area, the government finally realized that the situation could no longer persist. The tourist industry in the Quebec City area will now be in a position to thrive even more.

The Bloc Quebecois is also pleased to have made the government realize that the accelerated review process was flawed.

• (1145)

Again, the Bloc Quebecois said repeatedly that it was unacceptable to see a notorious drug trafficker take advantage of that procedure. Unfortunately, the government did not realize the magnitude of the problem, since its proposed amendments do not go far enough.

When will the government understand that it is useless to try to fight gangs if nothing is done about money laundering?

In the area of crime, as in any other one, money is everything. However, the government does not seem to have understood that yet, or at least it is slow to do so. It is slow to amend the legislation, so that Canada can finally lose its unenviable title of money laundering haven.

The Bloc Québécois supports Bill C-51, to the extent that the government is aware that the legislation has a number of flaws on which the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights will have to work.

[English]

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I am as always pleased to rise and take part in the debate, in particular a debate as important as this involving substantial changes to the Criminal Code of Canada.

Bill C-51, as has been previously mentioned, is an omnibus bill to amend the Criminal Code of Canada, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

The Minister of Justice and the solicitor general both tend to avoid substantive changes to our statutes. I was surprised to see that the government had tendered this bill to change the legislation in June.

Optimistically I would like to believe that this is finally a sign that this government takes issues of law and order seriously, but for reasons that I will outline later I remain sceptical.

This omnibus bill is nevertheless positive legislation. I want to state that at the outset. The federal government, the provinces and the territories share jurisdiction over a number of these issues. The bill itself takes into consideration many of the consultations which have taken place between these levels of government.

As mentioned by previous speakers, it would amend the Criminal Code with regard to homicide, child prostitution, conditional sentencing and parole. These are serious issues of which all Canadians should take note. It was also amend the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act, dealing specifically with sentencing and criminal liability for on duty law enforcement officers. Finally, the bill would amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act to exclude those convicted of organized crime offences from the eligibility for accelerated parole review.

This comes at a time when organized crime units across the country sadly are being cut or scaled down by the current government. In my riding of Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough the local Stellarton detachment has undergone this downsizing. Able and

### *Government Orders*

very dedicated officers like Constable Pat Martin sadly have been taken away from the crime and specifically the drug units of this detachment.

I would like to outline some of the significant provisions of this bill. The Criminal Code currently disallows the prosecution of an individual for murder, manslaughter and other capital offences after more than a year and a day have passed from the death of the victim, regardless of how clearly it may be proven that the victim's death was caused by the accused. This was certainly a situation sadly in need of change. This bill would remove that provision in light of advances in forensic science and the medical profession.

It is ultimately the government with the support of the NDP and the Bloc, however, that decided to neuter the DNA Identification Act which would further strengthen and stress the importance of this particular amendment.

Other amendments to the Criminal Code included in this bill would simplify the prosecution of an individual if he or she attempts to procure the sexual services of a prostitute that they know is under the age of 18 years. It would also allow police officers to use electronic surveillance and technology in this area to investigate prostitution related offences.

I am very pleased to note the government's amendment to the conditional sentencing provisions in Bill C-51. If an offender breaches his or her conditional sentence this bill now allows the justice system to permit the issuance of an arrest warrant until a court hearing is held on the breach itself. Again, I view this as a positive amendment.

● (1150)

The breach hearing limit of 30 days would also be changed to permit the court to deal with the offenders who cannot be found or brought to court within that time period.

It is, however, very unfortunate that the government did not choose to further restrict conditional sentencing provisions period so that no offender convicted of a crime of violence is granted a conditional sentence. This is a situation I would strongly urge the government to reconsider. It should be remedied and, at the very least, there should be efforts made to ensure that conditional sentences are not applied to certain designated offences such as sexual assault and capital offences and those involving high end violence.

The amendments themselves would ensure that offenders with ties to organized crime or gangs would no longer receive accelerated parole review. I view this as positive change. While this is an extremely positive step, I would like to know why the government has lectured members for months that it would be inappropriate to



*Government Orders*

propose amendments while statutory review of the Corrections and Conditional Release Act was underway at the justice committee.

Once again we have seen a bit of a contradiction in what the government says and what the government does.

If the Liberal government is willing to amend the Corrections and Conditional Release Act in this way before the statutory review is complete then surely it should be willing to support positive and constructive amendments to the CCRA review from private members in this House on both government and opposition side because I know there are government members who have brought forward very intelligent and insightful private members' bills as they reflect on the criminal justice system.

I also question the government's true commitment to fighting organized crime given that the solicitor general and the Liberal government itself could be doing much more in this area. Recent revelations from the auditor general seem to indicate that contrary to what the solicitor general announced publicly about this government's commitment to organized crime, the reality is that millions of dollars have been taken out of the RCMP budget.

We also know that in the last year to year and a half we have seen the devolution of the ports police in areas like Halifax and Vancouver. I assure this House that one very prevalent factor waiting in the wings is the decision to make Halifax a post-Panamax port. With this decision there will be significantly increased traffic on that port. Instead of a specialized police force, the ports police aimed at combating organized crime and the importation of drugs, weapons and other contraband materials, now we have that duty being passed on along with other duties the current Halifax metro police and RCMP are charged with.

It is not a partisan comment on my part. That is simply the conclusion that has been reached in examining these facts. I do not reach this conclusion alone. Each year the U.S. State Department prepares a report called "International Narcotics Control Strategy Report". In its most recent report, the State Department singled out Canada as an easy target for drug related and other types of money laundering. The same report also listed Canada in the same category as Columbia, Brazil and the Cayman Islands as an attractive location to hide illegal cash. Finally, the same report was very critical of Canada's lack of legislation to control cross-border money flow.

The Canadian Police Association, as it is a very insightful group, has also echoed similar concerns. London police Chief Julian Fantino, head of the organized crime committee in the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, said that money laundering is an easy feat in Canada. According to some reports, the RCMP has estimated the value of laundering money in Canada between \$3 billion and \$10 billion. The solicitor general recognizes this problem, should be aware of it and should act on it.

During the government's first ever annual statement on organized crime, the solicitor general promised new anti-organized crime legislation that would finally require significant steps toward combating this situation. It would also require that financial institutions report suspicious transactions and cross-border currency movements.

As a matter of interest, the solicitor general's predecessor and the current Deputy Prime Minister made a similar commitment in September 1996 following the conference on organized crime. Sadly, Canadians continue to wait and organized crime continues to penetrate this country.

• (1155)

In April of this year the present solicitor general repeated that promise again and had a conference that was very well publicized. There was a great deal of ballyhoo about the solicitor general's initiatives and spoke quite openly about his intentions for combating organized crime.

He made the same promise to the police in the past year in August and in the span of nearly two years this government has made the same promise on four separate occasions but have delivered nothing.

I would concede that the solicitor general has a laudable commitment to consultation as well as airline conversations but he also should know that the law enforcement community has had enough and does not want any more shallow promises. The government is incessantly holding conferences under the guise of consultation and yet there do not seem to be any meaningful consequences that come about as a result of these consultations.

The solicitor general's dismal response to the problem of organized crime and this government's manipulation of consultation has become a tool of delay and frustrated police to the point where the executive director of the Canadian Police Association recently stated to the media: "Quite frankly, we don't care what this government has to say anymore". That is a very telling comment from the Canadian Police Association when saying this in response to the government's commitment to organized crime.

Are we to believe the brave talk of the solicitor general? Given his credibility problems of late, that does stretch it quite a bit. The solicitor general since June 1997 has said we would do away with any problem recognizing his statements that fighting organized crime is one of his strategic priorities.

We are patiently waiting, as are the Canadian people, the Canadian Police Association and indeed all police associations across the country. Police and the public are forced to judge the solicitor general's commitment to strategic priorities by actions



*Government Orders*

and results. Words alone, no matter how tough they sound, just do not cut it when it comes to fighting organized crime.

There are also significant amendments with respect to telemarketing fraud. Proceeds gained from deceptive telemarketing practices that would be subject to seizure and forfeiture under Bill C-51 are a positive step. This bill would also make it illegal to generate currency by copying bank notes by computer assisted or electronic means. Certainly forgery has become a problem in this country as it has around the world.

I commend the government for this positive amendment although it is unfortunate that we have yet to see other measures aimed specifically at organized crime in this country.

Given the rising market value of forged currency, this amendment would establish theft and smuggling of other valuable commodities such as diamonds, gemstones or any rock or ore. It is a positive focus of this omnibus bill and would make offences aimed at those types of forgeries punishable under the Criminal Code.

Bill C-51 is also an amendment to legislation regarding non-communication orders. Previous speakers have highlighted this as one of the more positive and more significant changes brought about by Bill C-51 and I tend to concur with that assessment. This amendment would allow a judge who remands or denies the bail of an arrested person into custody to order that they not communicate while in custody.

Mr. Speaker would know that unfortunately this does happen and where the riding of Kingston also includes the Kingston penitentiary, there are means now available for prisoners to contact victims or contact other cohorts involved in their crime or perhaps involved in the case itself that may still be pending before the courts.

I suggest this is a very significant amendment that has been brought forward and one which I commend the government for.

This amendment would allow judge who remands the arrested person into custody to order that they not communicate with any witness or any other person between the time of the arrest and the bail hearing for judicial interim release hearing. The law currently deals with the judge's power to order non-communication orders only at the time of the bail hearing. That lag time in between does permit for this communication to occur.

With respect to gaming which is also touched by this bill and the Criminal Code, we would like to highlight the fact that under this bill to exempt international cruise boats from offences pertaining to the Canadian gaming provisions is a positive step as well. Cruise boats would be able to operate casinos while in Canadian waters, but not in Canadian ports. This has very broad sweeping ramifications for the provinces of British Columbia and Quebec as a significant number of cruise ships currently attend ports in both of those provinces.

• (1200)

The bill would also allow provincial governments to conduct and manage dice games in order to compete with similar operations that are under way in the United States. There are tremendous earnings and tremendous amounts of money that change hands over the dice games.

I have some concern with this provision in light of the ongoing capitulation of the provincial Liberal government in my home province of Nova Scotia in dealing with the ITT Sheraton casinos in both Halifax and Sydney. I would like to see this amendment further scrutinized by the justice committee to see exactly what the long term ramifications will be.

Bill C-51 would also provide that a peace officer or agent is not guilty of an offence while acting under and for the purposes of upholding the provisions of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act. This amendment is aimed specifically at support for front line police officers and officers who find themselves in the line of duty in a situation that results in a charge surrounding their behaviour. This would be outside any internal disciplinary action that might be taken under a forum like the RCMP Public Complaints Commission which is going on currently in Vancouver.

This allows an opportune time to suggest to the House that the commission as we have come to know it is aimed specifically at police conduct, not the conduct of any individual outside the RCMP Act. It is not the forum to look at situations such as political interference that might come from sources like the PMO or other bodies in Ottawa. The RCMP Public Complaints Commission is a body that has a mandate set up to look at RCMP conduct and to call witnesses and as we see under the current process, to look at the actions specifically of officers of the RCMP.

This particular change to the provisions of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act is an important move forward. Our party is in support of this particular change. The act has been sorely lacking and needs to have a change in this manner.

In conclusion I would like to express the guarded support of the Progressive Conservative Party for these initiatives. We would like to see further amendments as they are deemed appropriate under this omnibus bill. Hopefully the government will take a more open, constructive and non-partisan attitude toward bills that are brought forward in the House as they pertain to justice and criminal law in Canada.

We would have liked to have seen a number of changes to other bills such as Bill C-3, the DNA data bank bill, or to the Bill C-68 regulations at the very least if we could not have that bill struck completely from the rolls. We would have liked to have seen some amendments that perhaps would have been a little kinder to organized shooting clubs and to members of the public generally who are engaged in the lawful exercise of either hunting or sport

*Government Orders*

shooting. Sadly however, partisanship raises its ugly head in the justice system as it does everywhere else.

I would like to give our guarded support and our guarded optimistic view that the government has recognized the need for changes in these justice bills in this omnibus bill. Bill C-51 is seen as a positive step forward.

A number of bills will be coming before the House in the next weeks, months and years, bills such as the bill put forward by the member for Mississauga East that deals specifically with the issue of consecutive sentences. I advise the House at this time that the Progressive Conservative Party will be in support of the hon. member for Mississauga East in her ongoing efforts to have the bill brought to fruition.

I will bring forward a bill with respect to changes to the sentencing and probation provisions of the Criminal Code as they pertain to the ability of a judge to put certain restrictions on those convicted of sexual assault or assault against children. It would allow a judge the ability to put restrictions so that a person convicted of those types of offences would not be able to attend the dwelling house and be in the presence of a child without the supervision of an adult.

• (1205)

I would take this opportunity again to commend Ms. Donna Goler from Nova Scotia for bringing this to the attention of all members of the House. Her ongoing efforts in this area are extremely significant in light of her own personal tragedy.

Again, I am very pleased to speak on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada with regard to these important changes to the Criminal Code, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

I would be glad to take any questions from hon. members present with respect to my remarks.

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, again I comment quite favourably on the speech of the hon. member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, or New Glasgow to be more specific. I thank him for his comments. There are a couple of things I would like him to elaborate on if at all possible.

He speaks of the solicitor general but after the last couple of days, I think we should be speaking of the Office of the Solicitor General because we in our party more or less think of the current solicitor general in the de facto mode.

With regard to the responsibilities of the port police and what has happened in Nova Scotia and Vancouver regarding two major ports and the easier access organized crime now has to smuggle contraband items of any kind, whether they are drugs, weapons, forged

money or whatever, those responsibilities are now merging with the ones of the municipal police or the city police of the area. Of course, I am in total disagreement with that. I really appreciated the idea of a separate police force or enforcement agency and that their business was strictly only that, not only in the two major centres but in the smaller centres as well, in the smaller ports.

He mentioned a concern about the drug trade and our cuts to foreign aid. Would he and his party not also agree that one way of reducing organized crime's efforts to bring in contraband drugs for example, would be for our foreign affairs department, our immigration department, CIDA, et cetera to give third world countries more access to capital? Their farmers and people in the agricultural industries, and I am thinking of Asia, Columbia and other third world countries, would then get away from their dependency on things like cocaine, heroin and poppy seeds and would be able to concentrate on more economic alternatives.

As he knows, the cuts to foreign aid to these countries have made these people very desperate for any cash or income of any kind. They resort to what we would call the criminal element and grow the cocaine and heroin that organized crime brings into our country. Of course, the effect of cuts to our military and cuts to our police allow organized crime to bring this contraband into our major ports as well as to our coastal communities.

Communities on all three coasts are being devastated by economic cuts in terms of fisheries and other related matters. People are moving away from those communities and we do not even have a civilian presence in some of these communities, which makes it easier for organized crime to do its job.

I would like the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough to comment, please.

**Mr. Peter MacKay:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore, a fellow Bluenoser. He is obviously very aware of the fact that Nova Scotia in particular, because of its extensive coastline is very vulnerable to the importation of illegal drugs and other contraband material.

With respect to any number of the questions he posed, regarding Canada's increased foreign aid as a means of attacking the continued worldwide problem of production of drugs by less financially sound countries, it may sound somewhat shallow but my initial reaction is that we have a great deal to do in our own country first.

• (1210)

Canada has had a wonderful international reputation for having given foreign aid to any number of countries, in any number of causes and causes that are very important and very real. As the hon. member knows, we have a very significant economic problem facing our country, with a \$600 billion debt, a dollar that is continuing to fall on the international markets and decreasing confidence from outside the country as to the economic stability of Canada. In simple terms we have to clean up our backyard first and

*Government Orders*

foremost. If we cannot take care of things here, we are not going to be in a position in the future to extend that helping hand.

Regarding the member's comments on the ports police specifically in Halifax which is close to his riding, there has been a very unfortunate decision made by the current government to devolve or do away with Canada's ports police on both the east coast and the west coast. I know that there have been efforts made to absorb some of those officers into the existing forces, like the Halifax Metropolitan Police and the RCMP.

The fact remains, and the member has highlighted it in his remarks, that the ports police served a very specific purpose. They had specific training. They had a specific aim in combating the movement of contraband material through ports in Canada.

The member makes the significant point that there are a number of communities in Nova Scotia that not only do not have the presence of law enforcement officers, but are virtually becoming wastelands because of the departure of their citizens. Nova Scotia and other maritime provinces have been facing this reality and this unfortunate situation for a long time. Young, talented and educated people are leaving because of the lack of work and the lack of economic opportunities. That does not apply only to the young, it applies to young and old and everybody in between.

This gives me the opportunity to state unconditionally that this government has not done its job with respect to taking care of all of the regions of this country, in particular the regions such as the province the hon. member and I share and call our home.

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to speak after the Progressive Conservative House leader and hear his words. I know he was a prosecutor in his province. His words are taken well in this House, in fact so well that I hope he will come to our united alternative convention in February. He would make a great solicitor general in a new government after the next election.

Canadians are very concerned about crime. On a scale of one to ten, Canadians rated it 8.3. Compared to five years ago 91% of Canadians are either much more or somewhat more concerned about crime. Eighty-nine per cent of Canadians strongly or somewhat agree that we should increase the severity of sentences of young offenders who commit serious crimes.

Bill C-51 which is before us now at second reading could have begun a change in the right direction and begun to address the concerns of all Canadians. Instead it is late off the mark and weak in areas such as child prostitution, conditional sentencing and organized crime.

Why is the government so hesitant to provide alternatives to the most likely to participate in crime? Why is the government so

hesitant to provide a tougher prison system and give the police the resources to prevent and fight crime? We only have to look at Bill C-3, the DNA bill.

Bill C-51 is the quintessential omnibus bill, an inch deep and a mile wide. It is cosmetic at best and timid in its degree of efficacy in change. Bill C-51 could have gone a lot further. There are areas where the Reform Party will move amendments at the appropriate stage of debate.

I ask the following questions concerning Bill C-51 and the impact it has on the feelings of Canadians concerning crime.

In 1982, 35% of Canadians were afraid of walking alone at night; today 42% are afraid. Does Bill C-51 do anything to change that? In 1982, 61% of Canadians were afraid of having their homes burglarised; today 63% share that fear.

• (1215)

Does Bill C-51 do anything to allay these fears? In 1982, 48% of Canadians were afraid to go downtown alone. Today 58% are afraid to go downtown alone. Does Bill C-51 do anything to dispel these fears? It is not what is in Bill C-51 that is objectionable. It is what is not in Bill C-51 that concerns the Reform Party.

Bill C-51 surely reflects how the government feels about crime: don't get tough, shuffle some paper, commission a study, hire a consultant, and above all don't offend criminals.

Let us take a look at the specifics of Bill C-51 and what we are being asked to support. The whole concept of conditional sentencing from the start has been ill conceived and an unfortunate episode. In Bill C-51 the loophole in conditional sentencing of having time on a conditional sentence, even when the person is alleged to have breached the condition, is now closed and the hearing can now go beyond 30 days.

This is an acceptable change, but it does not address the most glaring problem with conditional sentencing, specifically its use for violent offenders. Why would the minister ignore this obvious issue? This is the real problem in the area of conditional sentencing. Why avoid it again? The bottom line is that conditional sentencing should not be used for violent offenders. Case after case in this area begs for change. The minister will only go so far to correct the problem and then she pulls back.

A simple amendment to section 742.1 to exempt convictions for serious personal injury offences as defined in section 752 would prevent such travesties as the two Haitian rapists in Montreal last year who did not go to jail. This was a particularly heinous crime by violent individuals who received a conditional sentence, and the two Haitians are licensed to do it again thanks to conditional

*Government Orders*

sentencing. Is there any sense of justice or backbone in the government?

We can be accused in the House of being partisan. Let me quote what a few judges, who everyone in the House would agree are not partisan, say about conditional sentencing. An article in the Edmonton *Sun* headlined "Top judges skeptical of soft sentence trend" read:

Early trends in conditional sentencing, a method of punishing offenders that is still in its infancy, got a damning review by Alberta's highest court yesterday.

Chief Justice Catherine Fraser in a decision indicated:

Surgery should not be performed simply because a surgeon has a new scalpel—. Improperly used or skimpily drafted, it will undermine the respect for the law. Like all tools or instruments, it is to be used for the right situation, not the wrong situation.

This was a judge talking about conditional sentencing, not a politician. In a 50 page ruling the appeals justices detailed several major complaints they had with the way judges and lawyers had been applying the reforms. Yet we see no changes in the legislation which will allay the fears of judges.

Another article headlined "Judges attack improper use—conditional sentencing undermines respect for the law" read:

Alberta's highest court criticized judges across Canada for the unimaginative and skimpily conditional sentences they've imposed and urged them to be tough and creative instead.

These are judges talking about a law brought in by parliament, and the bill does nothing to change that.

Even the Minister of Justice in a headline in the Edmonton *Journal* supports a court ruling critical of conditional sentencing. I quote from the Edmonton *Journal*:

Canada's justice minister says she's pleased with an Alberta Court of Appeal decision critical of the way in which conditional sentences are applied across the country.

"There have been some circumstances in which I believe conditional sentences were used when it was not the intention of parliament to have them used, and those should be appealed"—

That is what the justice minister said Thursday. The justice minister had an opportunity with the bill to make changes so that the courts do not have to appeal these things. She could have made the changes and she did not make the changes. That is why the bill is faulty. That is why we will move amendments when the time comes.

I could go on and on. I have quotes from newspapers across the country indicating that judges, lawyers and Canadians do not like the conditional sentencing that has been brought in by the government.

In a survey of 850 police, lawyers, probation officers and corrections staff the following was revealed: 90% thought the

sentences imposed by the courts were not respected and 69% thought the actual amount of time served should be the same as the sentence imposed. Is it not an amazing thought that somebody can be given some time in jail by a judge and other people in the system would allow them out in a very short period of time? We have all heard of how short some of these sentences really are.

• (1220)

Some 76% of the people in the business thought criminals avoided jail too often and 55% considered the law to be too soft. As one crown attorney said, this does not make any sense. If we do not have the resources to keep somebody in jail then let us not sentence them to jail. The system is losing credibility.

One judge out of eleven interviewed said:

Fundamentally, they couldn't care less what we say when we send someone to jail for 30 days and they only serve 5. It's as if we miscalculated and we were fools for imposing 30 day sentences when they did not deserve them.

When judges imposes a 30 day sentence it should be a 30 day sentence, but the government through its legislation makes the judges look like they are fools. Bill C-51 does nothing to solve the problem. It is about time we had some real truth in sentencing. It could start with Bill C-51 if the government had the will. We will move amendments, hoping the government has the will.

I will discuss another story in relation to conditional sentencing. Domenico Tozzi, the greatest money launderer in Canadian history, was sentenced to 10 years and a fine of \$150,000 for his role in the importation of 2,500 kilos of cocaine plus 25 tonnes of hashish. When he did not pay his fine the sentence was increased to 12 years and he was released after only serving two years in jail.

I do not know what 2,500 kilos of cocaine and 25 tonnes of hashish are worth, but I would guarantee it is in the millions. A judge put him in jail for 10 years and gives him a \$150,000 fine. He wondered why he should pay the fine if he would only get two more years in jail. Then our great system allowed this man back on the streets after just two years in jail.

Bill C-51 does nothing to solve that problem. We are going to make amendments to it. As my Conservative colleague said, hopefully the government and the rest of the House can work on this in a non-partisan way to bring in laws all Canadians want.

Ex-lawyer Joseph Lagana was involved in the importation of 558 kilos of cocaine and in laundering \$47.4 million. He was sentenced by a judge to 13 years. He was released after two years and two months to a halfway house where he is free from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m.

What message does that send to Canadians? He imported cocaine which kills young people and laundered \$47.4 million. That probably goes right over top of the average Canadian's



*Government Orders*

head. It is astounding. Average Canadians cannot even think of figures that large. What does he get? Two years and two months.

That shows young people that a life of crime pays. It creates career criminals. Will this man go back to an honest job? Will anybody in Canada be convinced that after two years and two months he has been rehabilitated?

Anthony Volpato, described by the papers as one of the leading figures in the Montreal Mafia, was sentenced to six years for conspiracy to import 180 kilos of cocaine. He was freed after only one year. This kind of sentencing has to stop and we have to make amendments to the bill to make sure it stops.

Let us talk about organized crime, another area in which Bill C-51 is sadly lacking. As Bill C-51 implies organized crime figures are not choir boys. Why would we treat them that way? The minister thinks she is getting tough in Bill C-51 by eliminating the accelerated parole hearing after one-sixth of a sentence has been served. It is better than before. Organized crime figures will still have access to day parole and be released after serving one-third of their sentences.

• (1225)

As I said in my previous comments on conditional sentencing, this is a joke. It is objectionable, unacceptable and naive. Organized crime laughs at going to jail for a couple of years.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you like going to the movies. The part of the bill on organized crime kind of reminds me of the movie *Goodfellows*. In that movie three Mafia members were convicted of a crime and doing time by having pasta dinners in prison. They are sitting tight being model prisoners, knowing they will get out before their full sentence is served. The notion and the part of the movie with the Mafia members drinking Chianti and making pasta is as comical as Bill C-51 in that regard.

Let me remind the justice minister that members of criminal organizations are by definition in section 2 members of a group of at least five persons, formally or informally organized, having as a primary activity the commission of an indictable offence and the members having been in the preceding five years in a series of such offences. That is very serious stuff. In short, these people should be held for their full sentences. They should not get full parole as Bill C-51 allows. Serious crime, serious time. We have to get that message across to organized crime.

These people should not enjoy the generous system of day parole, full parole and statutory release. There should be no exception for organized crime. Does the minister really believe, be it one-sixth or one-third, that these people can be rehabilitated in such a short period of time?

I gave an example before of those with 13 years sentences being out in two years for crimes involving millions of dollars. They will, as the movie *Goodfellows* portrays so accurately, sit tight, keep up the connections while incarcerated and return to their lives of crime when released. Is the minister expecting organized crime members to have some sort of Epiphany while in prison? This is another sadly lacking element in Bill C-51 and one we cannot support.

Let me turn to another item lacking in Bill C-51 in the area of child prostitution. Bill C-51 calls for giving police more tools in the juvenile prostitution area. All Canadians say wonderful, that is great. Living off the avails of a child prostitute, keeping a common bawdy house and using an underage prostitute are made offences justifying the issuance of a wiretap order. The offence of attempting to obtain such services is expanded to include communicating with anyone for the purpose of prostitution.

This is commendable, but surely we could go further in dealing with this parasitic behaviour by sick people who prey on juveniles. Right off the top, how about a mandatory minimum jail sentence for those convicted of procuring under 18 year olds? Why not send a clear message that society frowns on such perverted, exploitive behaviour?

Let us get these offenders off the street and let us keep them off the street. Why is the government so fearful to change the penalty which remains at five years maximum? The fact is no one changes the penalty. Judges give discharges, suspend the sentence or impose the good old conditional sentence.

Too many young children in our big cities today are getting into child prostitution. We have to let the pimps know, the people involved in that business, that the Parliament of Canada does not accept that. It is happening too often in our cities today. The life of crime has been shown to these young people as a way to live. We have a responsibility with the bill to toughen this law and reduce child prostitution. My party will put those amendments in the proper place.

Around and around the charade goes. The government is doing nothing to change this perverted procurement by perverted individuals. A slap on the wrist will not be a deterrent, and the tools we just gave the police to wiretap are moot. Give with one hand, take away with the other. This ensures inertia, which is a specialty of the government. It is time to get serious with child prostitution. The Reform Party wants mandatory jail time for first offences and repeat offenders to get triple time with no possibility of serving a sentence intermittently.

• (1230)

I put the minister on notice. This is not good enough and we will deal appropriately at committee and report stage with this aspect of Bill C-51.

*Government Orders*

Another area of the Criminal Code that begged for change and for a change got it is the so-called year and a day rule for homicide. It only took 12 years for this lethargic government to move on a recommendation first made by the Law Reform Commission back in 1987. The commission brought this forth and recommended an immediate amendment 12 years ago. But in typical government fashion it had to be studied to death and the government waited to stick this necessary and easy amendment into an omnibus bill. One simple bill and one simple line would have accomplished this but the government has to wait for another example of an outdated law allowing a heinous crime to go unpunished; a government would be so lackadaisical as to allow a law to stand which allows a killer to avoid a murder charge if the death of the person he assaults is a year and a day after the offence. As my colleague says, there is just no value on life. Why does it take so long? It is absolutely incredible.

Allow me to tell a story that finally shook the government out of its sleepiness into including an amendment in this bill. It involves a mentally challenged 50 year old Winnipeg man, Marvin Ward, who was savagely beaten by a 17 year old using a baseball bat. The perpetrator stole a grand total of 75 cents in the robbery of Mr. Ward.

Unfortunately Mr. Ward died 14 months after the vicious attack. Due to the centuries old law, as I said earlier that was recommended to be changed in 1987, the government allowed to languish on the books, the individual could not be charged for murder because Mr. Ward died more than a year after the attack.

This punk served 28 months in closed custody for robbery and assault with a weapon, because the law was not changed, even though an amendment was recommended in 1987. This government should be ashamed that it took this long to make this kind of change.

Why in the world have successive governments allowed this law to go unchanged knowing how easy it would have been to change it and reverse this travesty that took place? It is tragic. Despite the Law Reform Commission expression of concern in 1987, a recommendation by the federal-provincial working group on homicide in 1991 and consultations in 1994-95 by the justice department on the general causation rule nothing was done.

In March 1997 the former minister of justice promised to change the law. It was reiterated by the current minister in September 1997. Why did the current minister wait so long? It was just to tie it into a series of unrelated amendments contained in Bill C-51. Surely there was more urgency or was she just embarrassed by her inaction as she thought no one would notice it hidden away in Bill C-51, the omnibus bill?

The member for Wild Rose attempted through his private member's Bill C-215 to change this year and a day disgrace. Unfortunately it was not deemed votable. It was another example

of the Reform Party leading the way on criminal justice and dragging this lazy government along into the present day.

As Lee Iaccoca used to say, lead, follow or get out of the way. That is certainly not the motto of this government. It does not get out of the way. It certainly does not lead but it is pretty good at following. Liberals just sit back, wait, follow and then when they get embarrassed they sneak it into the middle of a bill.

The government's delay is inexcusable. During debate on the bill by the member for Wild Rose the government's lethargy was exposed. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice said: "While there is little doubt that change ought to occur, it may be premature to support this bill at this time". How often do we hear that? Whether it is in committee or in this House, it is premature to do it at this time because it is not the government's idea.

• (1235 )

A great example of this is a private member's bill that passed in the House the other day because members on the other side on the back benches are maybe getting a little restless when certain people are getting fired and moved around. So to show a little independence they pass a private member's bill. Wait until it gets to committee and they pull the whips out. A good bill will die and that is unfortunate.

Can anyone believe the parliamentary secretary? What more proof did she need? She and her government could not bring themselves to support this initiative and we had to wait until they got around to drafting their own amendment. This was not only insecure and petty on their part, it was also negligent for them to allow this issue to drag on.

There is not a lot to support in this dog's breakfast of amendments. A lot of it could have been done incrementally over the years if the government were not so lazy. The important part is that we will be ready to scrutinize the other aspects of this legislation and prepared to deal with substantive amendments as we proceed.

Many support a triple E Senate. How about a triple E justice system, effective, efficient and equitable. It is time we get started.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to speak to Bill C-51 today. This is a bill that makes at least 12 amendments to the Criminal Code

I will give you examples of some of the amendments, in order to demonstrate what a catchall it is. One could call it a tutti-frutti bill. It tries to cover all the bases. I would like to list some of the amendments.



*Government Orders*

The purpose of the bill is to widen the scope of the offence of obtaining the services of a prostitute under eighteen years old; to modernize the provisions concerning the offence of making likenesses of bank notes; and to bring deceptive telemarketing offences against the Competition Act under the forfeiture provisions for the proceeds of crime.

These are but a few of the amendments, and I have listed them to demonstrate how impossible it is to seriously address all of these aspects—scattered as they are—in the time allotted me.

I would, however, like to point out that this bill marks a great victory for the Bloc Québécois. The section in question is the one on cruise ship casinos. This will have a definite economic impact on the Quebec City region, my riding in particular. I will come back to this later.

I would also like to mention the Bloc Québécois' partial victory concerning amendments to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act that exclude those convicted of organized-crime offences from eligibility for accelerated parole review.

These amendments to the Criminal Code are a result of the pressure brought to bear by the Bloc Québécois, which introduced private members' bills in the House. They are certainly the result of the many questions put by the members with responsibility for these files.

Today, as I have already mentioned, I will be focusing on the Criminal Code amendment that permits the operation of casinos on international cruise ships that are Canadian or in Canadian waters. If time permits, I would also like to speak to the amendment having to do with eligibility for accelerated parole review.

The Bloc Québécois therefore supports the bill introduced by the Minister of Justice yesterday, which we are discussing today, all the more so as it is the response to a request that goes back more than 10 years. Ten years ago, Port of Quebec authorities made a request, which has had the strong support of the Bloc Québécois since we arrived on the federal political scene in 1993.

For 10 years, these harbour authorities have been asking for an amendment to the Criminal Code. It is a small amendment, but one which has deprived the entire Quebec City area of important economic benefits in various sectors of the tourism industry.

• (1240)

I would therefore like to take a few moments to look at the existing legislation, so as to shed some light on the proposed legislation.

Games of chance, including casinos, come under federal jurisdiction, and are prohibited under the Criminal Code except where authorized by a competent provincial authority under section 207 of the Code.

Because casinos on board ship fall under the Criminal Code definition of gaming houses, enforcement of the federal legislation falls under the jurisdiction of the provinces as soon as a ship arrives in one of the ports on their territory, if the ship has committed an offence at any point since it entered Canadian territorial waters 12 miles off the coast line.

This is not much of a disadvantage for international cruise ships headed for ports in British Columbia or the maritimes. Why? Because those ports are just 12 miles away from international waters, all gambling activities are shut down just before docking, which is not the case for the St. Lawrence ports. When ships enter the St. Lawrence, they come under the Criminal Code as soon as they are 12 miles off the eastern tip of Anticosti Island. This means that gaming tables have to be shut down as soon as they pass that strategic point and remain shut down until they sail out of Canadian territorial waters, which takes two to three days.

When tourists pay for cruises that have casinos, it is because they want to be able to gamble. The Quebec City region was penalized because all casino activity had to be shut down as soon as they were off Anticosti Island. This meant that, for two or three days before arrival at the Quebec City and other St. Lawrence ports, passengers could not use the casino. It is therefore quite clear how much Quebec City was at a disadvantage.

As well, under section 207 of the Criminal Code, casino activities in Canada were legal only if directly operated by a provincial government, or under provincial licence by a religious or charitable organization or the board of a fair or exhibition.

Only an amendment to the Criminal Code could settle the question of casinos aboard cruise ships, and today I can state that, as the MP for the riding of Québec, I am pleased the government has finally been able to make this amendment to the legislation.

Let us now look at how the proposed legislative amendment will remedy the situation. Clause 7 of Bill C-51 proposes an amendment to the Criminal Code which will make it possible for casinos to operate on board ship provided they are not within five nautical miles of a Canadian port at which the ship calls or is scheduled to call. Unless I am mistaken, a distance of five nautical miles means about 12 kilometres before arriving to the port. So, we are very pleased with that provision.

Interestingly, one of the positive aspects of these amendments is that they only change in a minor way the legislation prohibiting the operation of casinos in Canada, except for section 207 of the Criminal Code. In spite of its minor importance, this legislative amendment will have a major impact for the province of Quebec. Because of Bill C-51, the St. Lawrence River will finally be on the same footing as the other Canadian maritime regions, such as Vancouver and Halifax, to name but two.

And this fair balance will be restored without having to change the spirit of the law, and without affecting in any way the plans that some provincial governments may have about operating casinos.

*Government Orders*

Indeed, this legislation does not seek to compete with casinos operated by the Government of Quebec or by other provinces. The gambling rooms will be closed when the ship is in a port.

While we stress the fairness that the new legislation will bring about, we should not forget the major economic spinoffs that it will provide for the Quebec City area. The cruise industry has an economic impact of several millions of dollars for the Quebec City region.

• (1245)

Studies indicate that each tourist spends \$110 when a ship calls at a port. Since the provision of the Criminal Code currently in effect prevents about 25 ships with an average of 1,000 to 1,500 passengers from coming to Quebec City, the resulting shortfall is huge. It totals \$2.5 million per year, and we have been asking for that change for 10 years. It is pretty easy to figure out that an annual shortfall of \$2.5 million over a 10 year period represents a considerable amount of money for the Quebec City region.

Supposing that more cruise ships—and everyone knows that the industry is growing—stayed longer, what economic impact would this have on the tourism industry in the greater Quebec City region?

Clearly put, the new legislation will have a major economic impact on our region, lengthening the tourism season and increasing activity.

The decision will have an effect on the life of Quebec City and bring in even more tourists. It could even cause tourists caught in the charm of Quebec City during a stop there to return to visit our region and to promote it within their own communities. We are delighted.

We must remind those watching us and our colleagues in this House that the Quebec National Assembly passed a bill quite similar to Bill C-51, and that was in 1995. The Bloc Québécois has been very active since its arrival in Ottawa in an attempt to correct this inequity.

My colleague from Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans introduced a bill in the House in February 1997 with the full support of the members in the caucus from the Quebec City region. Because of the election in 1997, he had to start all over, as he did in June. A number of press conferences followed the tabling of these two bills. The Bloc Québécois was persistent in this matter, because of the economic benefits for the region.

So, I remind you that the request from the Quebec City port authorities is 10 years old and that many stakeholders were steadfast in their support of our action to have the Criminal Code amended. They include the Quebec City Urban Community, the Quebec City Region Tourist and Convention Bureau, the Secrétariat à la mise en valeur du St. Lawrence, the Corporation of the Lower St. Lawrence Pilots, the Société de développement écono-

mique du Saint-Laurent, the Quebec department of tourism, and representatives of the business community. They were all behind us to have the legislation changed.

We are delighted Bill C-51 has been changed to permit the operation of casinos on cruise ships, but we regret the slowness of the federal government and its lack of flexibility. Bloc members had to press hard for this bill before our efforts finally paid off.

If we relate this issue to other issues, it seems paradoxical that a controversial bill like Bill C-36 establishing the millennium scholarships, for example, would be adopted as quickly as it was. I sat on the committee. A few weeks is all it took to change the legislation and establish the scholarships. The consensus in Quebec was against this legislation, unlike the one concerning cruise ships. We were against the establishment of a millennium scholarship foundation and we find the federal government's logic lacking when it comes to legislation that could favour Quebec.

For Bill C-36 establishing the millennium scholarships that no one in Quebec supported, the Liberal government managed to find \$2.5 billion in two weeks.

• (1250)

But a minor change to the Criminal Code, with a major economic impact, took 10 years. The logic of this government still eludes us, when it is quick to act on issues that serve its interests and drags its feet on those serving Quebec's economic interests.

If I have a few minutes left, I would like to address the part of Bill C-51 dealing with eligibility for accelerated parole review. Here again, we feel the government is not going far enough. Granted, this would be a major change. It would give teeth to our legislation dealing with certain drug traffickers.

I will use the few minutes I have left to try to explain how this amendment could prove worthwhile and be improved upon by the government.

In August 1997, we learned of the Lagana affair from newspaper reports. A lawyer had been sentenced in 1995 to 13 years in prison for importing cocaine and laundering \$47.4 million. As we know, Mr. Lagana was released after serving only 26 months, or one-sixth of his sentence, because he had become eligible for accelerated parole review. After serving just one-sixth of his or her sentence, any non-violent criminal who has never done time before may apply for parole.

In response, the Bloc Québécois, through the member for Charlesbourg, introduced a private member's bill to eliminate this accelerated procedure for those found guilty of money laundering.

In Bill C-51, the government wants to correct this situation. It is proposing to exclude those convicted of organized crime offences from eligibility for accelerated parole review. This amendment is a step in the right direction, but it is limited to the provision of the Criminal Code dealing with organized crime. It does not affect

bankers, individuals or lawyers convicted of money laundering who are not part of organized crime. Such individuals may therefore continue to launder millions of dollars and serve only one sixth of their sentence in jail.

We would have liked to see this amendment extended to include lawyers and bankers who launder money. This is a completely unacceptable state of affairs. We in the Bloc Québécois will not stand for another case like that of Lagana. We will introduce amendments to make up for the Liberal government's lack of courage.

We would also have liked to see \$1,000 bank notes taken out of circulation, because we know that it is easier to launder that denomination. We are one of the only countries in the world with this denomination in circulation.

We would also like financial institutions to be permitted to alert the police about suspicious transactions of \$10,000 and over.

I will not be able to address all the other items. Since there are a good dozen amendments in Bill C-51, it is difficult to give them the attention they deserve in a mere fifteen or twenty minutes.

In conclusion, as I mentioned, we are very happy with the Criminal Code amendment having to do with cruise ships.

• (1255)

[English]

**Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-51 this afternoon, an act to amend the Criminal Code, the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act.

Canadians have been waiting for many, many months to finally see legislation from our Minister of Justice. One would almost think that justice reform is not a very high priority with this government.

Bill C-51 is an omnibus bill which will make amendments to the criminal law. It is an attempt to respond to the changing conditions within our society. Much of what is being proposed is long overdue. Many of the proposals within this bill make sense and cause very little concern. Canadians must wonder why these issues have not been addressed before now.

It is unfortunate that this minister and this government continue to lurch ahead with half measures because of politics. Canadians continue to be shortchanged when it comes to improvements to our criminal law.

First I have a brief comment on the bill's proposal to amend section 186 of the Criminal Code. It concerns invasion of privacy under part VI of the code.

### *Government Orders*

In the 1970s the federal government introduced a whole scheme to permit police to legally intercept private communications to assist them in their investigations.

The law permitted authorized personnel to install, maintain and monitor communications through the installation of devices such as bugs or wiretaps. It has taken over 20 years for the government to amend the legislation to also permit the authorized removal of those bugs and wiretaps. I suppose this falls into the category of "better late than never".

Bill C-51 proposes to permit the operation of casinos on international cruise ships that are Canadian or operating in Canadian waters. Dice games will now be permitted and will be managed by the provinces and territories.

While it can be argued that casinos and dice games will improve the competitive nature of Canadian assets, there is significant opposition to gambling of any form in many parts of the country. I will be interested in the justice committee review of this legislation.

I understand that international cruise ships which operate within the Canadian inside passage route to Alaska already operate casinos within Canadian waters. It will be interesting to see just how this has occurred.

Another proposal would eliminate the requirement for a victim to die within a year and a day of an assault in order that a charge of murder, manslaughter or causing death by criminal negligence can be brought. With modern medical advancements it has become much easier to maintain victims on life support for extended periods of time.

Charges and convictions were often based merely on when the life support machines were turned off. Individuals who cause the death of others must be accountable for their actions, no matter how long the victims manage to hang on.

It seems impossible, but this government and its predecessors have been permitting killers to walk free just because their victims have managed to survive, often in a comatose or vegetative state.

One can only begin to imagine the anguish foisted on a family when they learn that the perpetrator has escaped justice because their loved one lived too long. This problem was first discussed 12 years ago and, as I have stated, some provisions are long overdue.

This bill contains a proposal to amend the offence section for the prostitution of a person under 18 years of age. It is amendments such as this that illustrate why it appears to take forever for this government to bring forth much needed legislation.

Bill C-51 proposes to amend section 212(4) of the code. I note that just last year Bill C-27 amended the same section. A number of thoughts cross my mind when I look at this. I wonder whether the previous Minister of Justice did not know what he was doing the first time around. I wonder whether this government even has a

*Government Orders*

plan to address juvenile prostitution. I wonder why they refuse to consider increasing the penalty for engaging the services of our children.

Why will they not legislate an increase in the age of consent from 14 to 16 years for sexual activity between a young person and an adult?

Two weeks ago, while in my constituency, I attended a function at which Diane Sowden, the courageous mother of one of these sexually exploited young people, was honoured with an award from the attorney general of British Columbia for her tireless devotion to these issues. I have presented numerous petitions in this House on her behalf, but still nothing from this government.

I have similar concerns over amending section 742.6 of the code. Again I wonder whether the previous Minister of Justice got anything right during his term in the position. Section 742.6 came into being through Bill C-41 in 1995. It concerns the very controversial conditional sentencing provision whereby criminals are permitted to serve their sentences at home to avoid the costs of incarceration.

In spite of Reform Party proposals to limit conditional sentencing to non-violent and non-drug offenders, the former minister maintained that he knew better and made it quite clear that he was not open to changes.

• (1300)

Nevertheless there was soon public outrage over the weakness of the legislation. Violent criminals were being released back into the community almost every day without serving any time in jail for their crimes.

The former minister of justice appears to be joining in the Prime Minister's mantra of don't worry, be happy. Perhaps he was auditioning for the role.

Eventually pressures became so great that he was compelled to amend his conditional sentencing legislation. But did he limit it to non-violent, non-drug offenders? No, he cranked up the spin machine to con Canadians into thinking that he was making major improvements when in reality he was only tinkering, again.

In Bill C-17, which was passed in 1997, he tried to persuade our courts to pay more attention to community safety when considering conditional sentencing. But even today we find hardened and dangerous criminals still receiving this Liberal perk of serving a sentence in the comfort of their own home.

For example, we have recently seen police raising serious concerns over losing the battle against organized crime. Canadians have witnessed vastly increased violence among biker gangs as they fight over control of criminal activity.

The solicitor general has been quick to board the political bandwagon to announce a strategic partnership with the provinces, the police and customs officials. I wonder what he must think and what he can say when recently a member of the Hell's Angels was convicted of drug trafficking and sentenced to serve his time in the comfort of his own home.

This government is once again amending the conditional sentencing legislation but as usual it is failing to properly address one of its most fundamental flaws.

Last but not least, the minister wants to change the accelerated parole provisions. They messed with sections in Bill C-45 in 1995 and that same year in Bill C-55 they reduced parole eligibility to one sixth of the sentence. They had another go at it with Bill C-95 in 1997 and now they want to change the section again to exempt organized criminals from receiving such lenient early parole eligibility.

In their rush to reduce prison populations they changed the law to permit the release at one sixth but now realizing that organized gang members are not very nice people, they say they should serve a little more time than that. Reality, what a concept.

Perhaps they should consider truth in sentencing. Many citizens are disillusioned with our justice system just because of instances such as this whereby the government acts irrationally, without forethought and with purely political motives.

If criminals were properly sentenced and served those sentences citizens would be much more inclined to understand and support that process.

I would like to address the funding problems of the RCMP we are having in B.C. RCMP boats are tied up, helicopters are grounded, and there have been overtime bans. My riding is in the city of Surrey, a large city of over 300,000. It is the largest detachment of the RCMP in Canada. Frontline officers have serious concerns about their abilities to provide adequate services and protection to the public. My constituents would like some answers.

The attorney general of British Columbia is now talking about getting rid of the RCMP altogether and forming a provincial police force. He has been requesting a meeting with the solicitor general to discuss these funding problems. Maybe they could meet on an airplane.

I have asked the solicitor general what he is doing about the problems with the violent crimes linkage analysis system in B.C. I have not received any answers. I see today in newspaper reports that the Minister of Justice is now concerned that her youth justice proposals may be in jeopardy unless she can pry some money out of the Minister of Finance.



She did not seem so concerned about that last spring when she unveiled her proposals amid much fanfare and glossy brochures. I have to wonder if this is just another example of a whole lot of talk and no action.

Now instead citizens are told that murderers are to receive life in prison with no chance of parole for 25 years only to learn later that there is a chance of parole in as early as 15 years. They are told that the government is getting touch on crime by increasing sentences only to discover the same government is reducing the period of eligibility for parole to only one sixth of the sentence.

They are told that the government is seriously interested in attacking organized crime. Then they see drug dealing gang members serve their sentences at home.

I have serious reservations over some provisions of this bill. Some elements are long overdue and that is a travesty in itself. Other aspects are a result of this government's again changing its own legislation within months because instead of getting it right the first time it waits until there is a public backlash. And in some cases this government once again only goes half way toward addressing the problem.

Unless this legislation is amended in the areas of juvenile prostitution and conditional sentencing I will be opposing it.

• (1305)

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague and friend this question. Would he not deny that when we see the cutback in police forces across Canada, not just in his area but across the prairies as well, while at the same time we see a massive increase according to the newspapers in the amount of organized criminal activity, we are going in the wrong direction? We should be building up our police forces, not cutting them back.

**Mr. Chuck Cadman:** Mr. Speaker, I would certainly agree with that. We are certainly going in the wrong direction. All across the country people are asking for more public safety, more police on the streets and more protection.

The surge in gang organized crime on the west coast is phenomenal. It is completely out of control. With the shutting down of the port police in Vancouver, with the problems at the airport, with the problems of drugs coming in, with the biker gang problems in Quebec, we are certainly going the wrong way. I think it is about time the solicitor general and the Minister of Justice got this through their heads and start doing what Canadians are asking for.

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the member from the Reform Party speak because he speaks with compassion from what he knows.

### *Government Orders*

As the hon. member knows, we spend a lot of money in this country defending ourselves against the importation of contraband i.e. drugs and everything else. As I asked my question earlier to the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, I would now like to ask this member as well. Would the member not agree that part of the solution would be to increase our foreign aid to third world countries that make this contraband we are talking about? We should hit it right at the source. Would that not alleviate some of the problems we are facing?

**Mr. Chuck Cadman:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. I would have to agree to a certain extent about what the member says but I would also agree with the member for Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough that we have to take care of the problems here at home first. We have to do something about the importation of drugs.

The problem is an international problem and I do not think we are going to solve it by ourselves by spending a lot of money on foreign aid. I think it has to be a concerted attack on the international scene. We have to deal with it more seriously at home and we have to start to address the importation and the major importers. We have to start looking at things such as possible life sentences for major importers with no parole for 25 years and total confiscation of drug assets. We have to start at the top.

I agree that what the member is suggesting could be part of the solution but we have to deal with the problems here at home first.

**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.

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

**The Deputy Speaker:** Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

\* \* \*

### **TOBACCO ACT**

The House resumed from September 30 consideration of the motion that Bill C-42, an act to amend the Tobacco Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

*Government Orders*

• (1310)

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things on the Tobacco Act and the resolution of the government to make some changes to the bill before us.

A number of years ago when I was an instructor at a technical institute, I remember having a number of students who took up the habit of smoking. We all know that it is a habit that is very addictive. In fact, of all the people I have spoken to over the years, and I am old enough to have spoken to a number of them who got hooked on this habit, a number of them have said to me that they wish they had never started because once you are hooked it is very difficult to stop. It is almost as bad as eating. Once you start eating it is very difficult to quit.

Over all the years I have spoken to people who smoke, I have never once encountered a single individual who suggested to me that I should start. It is such a devastating thing for health reasons and also for costs.

On several occasions as a mathematics instructor I was able to persuade some of my students to stop smoking. I did that by utilizing part of my curriculum in the math department. Whether I was teaching computing and how to set up functions on a computer or whether I was teaching exponential functions, one of the things we did in the realm of math or finance was to talk about the future value of a deposit annuity.

I specifically remember one student who admitted to me that he smoked about one and half packs of cigarettes a day and that his wife smoked well over a pack a day. Between the two of them they were putting almost three packs a day away.

It is very costly to do this. A lot of people look at the price of a package of cigarettes and think only of the present value of that. However, as anyone who has ever sold RRSPs or anything else in terms of accumulating value can attest, value is greatly enhanced exponentially as one makes deposits over a long period of time.

I do not remember the exact numbers nor do I remember at the time what the prevailing interest rates were, but I remember my students when they were learning to use their electronic calculators, learning exponential functions and learning computer programming. I had the students compute the function  $365 \times 5$ , if that was the price of cigarettes, multiplied by the nominal interest rate, say .1 because in those days it would have been around 10%, divide by, in big square brackets,  $1 - 1.1$  to the power of say 45, that number of course representing the number of years a student would work from age 20 after finishing his or her degree and working until age 65.

The students as part of their exercise computed the accumulated value of their cigarette money. If instead of putting the money into cigarettes they had put it into an RRSP, it came to, as I recall, \$1.3

million with the assumptions that I used. I had a number of students tell me they were going to change. They said that instead of smoking and having nothing when they retire, they were going to put their \$5 a day into a little box and once a month they were going to run it down to their RRSP agent and when they retired they would have \$1.3 million on which to retire. That is the financial cost of smoking. We all know of the human and health costs. There is absolutely no justification for people who get hooked on cigarettes. They cannot justify it from a health point of view, not for themselves and not for those around them in their own household or in their office. As a result we have seen in the last number of years a great increase in the number of buildings which have become non-smoking buildings because of the devastating health effects. One could probably see in the future a massive lawsuit against cigarette manufacturers. They will be held legally responsible for the devastation they have caused, the early deaths that have been caused and the problems this has caused, not only to the lives of smokers, but also to the lives of their family members.

• (1315)

I do not know whether it is going to come to that or not, but we have certainly had lawsuits of great magnitude in recent years on different issues. Maybe that is going to come. Maybe the cigarette companies are going to have to tally up one of these days and admit that they have caused a lot of devastation.

I say to the Liberal government that ever since we came to the House in 1993 this has been an issue. Very little has been done. As a matter of fact, shortly after we arrived the government took the unusual step of reducing the tax on cigarettes. Its claim was that this would reduce the criminal act of smuggling illegal cigarettes into the country. If the price of cigarettes sold at the counter was reduced, then the motivation for smuggling would decrease and that would reduce smuggling.

I do not think that is a good principle. If we were to take the logic of that principle and apply it to other areas I suppose we could legalize bank robberies, prostitution, theft, embezzlement and other things and, lo and behold, there would be no more crime. It would be a wonderful way of fighting crime, just by declaring that everything we do that is wrong is not a crime any more. Our jails would be empty and we could proclaim ourselves to be the most wonderful country in the world.

Over the years successive governments have tried to reduce the amount of smoking by increasing taxes and, to a degree, they were effective. I personally know people who, when the next tax increase kicked in, said "That is it for me. That pushes the straw onto the camel's back. That breaks his legs and I am not going to smoke any more". Increased costs in fact do act as a deterrent. I believe that it was a total act of wimpishness on the part of the government. Instead of enforcing the laws, it simply reduced the



*Government Orders*

price so the criminals would of their own accord lose their profit motive and quit.

I am not certain whether the whole act of smoking should be illegal. This is a question one really needs to ask. As long as cigarette smoking is legal in the country it is incredible that we should pass laws that would prevent a corporation from advertising a product which is legal.

For example, we have people advertising certain foods. Maybe looking at me sideways, Mr. Speaker, you can tell how much weight I have lost. I have tried to say no to food lately. I do not want to do any free advertising, but that slim trim diet is working.

• (1320)

There are many products which may be harmful, but we do not take draconian measures to say they cannot be advertised. If the government were really honest with Canadians, looking at the scientific evidence about the harmful effects of smoking on health, it would declare tobacco as a dangerous substance. Then it would have moral and legal grounds for reducing and restricting the advertising of the product. As long as it is a fully legal product, from the point of view of freedom of citizens and the freedom of companies to work in Canada, we have to ask that question.

At the same time I recognize the vulnerability, especially of young teens, to the pressures of advertising. As long as advertisers are able to make a product look exciting and youthful, as if all young people are doing it, as if all of our heroes are doing the smoking thing, it will look attractive and will draw more people in. I think that more people begin smoking because of peer pressure than because of advertising. That is just a guess that I am making.

Bill C-42 is an attempt to solve the problem or at least to reduce the amount of smoking, by young people in particular. The government is looking at a five year transition period on restrictions to advertising. It has never been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that advertising causes people to take up the habit of smoking, but this is what the government proposes to do.

This must be true confession time on nationwide television. I have to blushingly admit to all people here and to anyone who happens to be listening out there that I did at one time smoke a cigarette.

**An hon. member:** Did you inhale?

**Mr. Ken Epp:** I don't remember. All I remember is that I found a package of cigarettes that was not completely empty. Of course I never spent my hard earned money on them. For some reason I felt an obligation to try it. I did so all alone. I do not believe I finished the cigarette that I took out of the package because it caused me to cough and wheeze and choke. Being a person who all my life had been somewhat given to an intelligent process of thought and

analysis, I stopped and said this to myself: Self, I think this is stupid. It does not make any sense at all to take into one's body that which the body by natural means seems to so violently reject.

I do not think I finished that cigarette, although I do not really recall. I am fairly old now and that probably happened about 50 years ago. I do not recall what exactly happened, but I do know that I made the decision that I would not smoke cigarettes. It had nothing to do with advertising. It had nothing to do with peer pressure. It had to do simply with an intelligent decision. To this day I am very grateful that I made that decision.

We should take account of the fact that tobacco companies make a large amount of money. One of the ironies that I find in government operations is that while on the one hand we are talking about the increased costs of health, on the other hand we are talking about the dangers to our young people and the need for us to protect each other and ourselves from ourselves, according to the Liberal government's philosophy.

• (1325)

At the same time we are subsidizing and assisting farmers who produce tobacco products. To be pushing and pulling on the same object at the same time seems rather schizophrenic, to say the least, and does not clearly show where one is headed. The subject of assistance to the farmers who produce the product is a whole subject for another day. It seems to me that we ought to rationalize this and at least be consistent in the various arms of government with respect to what we are trying to achieve.

I do not like to use the word hypocritical. I know that it is against the rules to apply that term to any individual member of parliament. I suppose that to collectively lay it on the feet of the governing party today is on the verge of being incorrect. But it is the only word that I really know. If we look at the dictionary definition of hypocrite, from the root word it means that you are wearing a mask. You are trying to pretend that you are something you really are not. That is the definition of a hypocrite. I hear the Liberal government say over and over that it is concerned about the health of Canadians and that it is concerned about the social impact of smoking, but at the same time it pours resources into the production of the product. To me that it is hypocritical. That is doing one thing with the hands while the face and the mouth are trying to give a different message.

I do not believe that we ought to approve this particular bill. We should be opposing it because of its lack of clarity. It does not show a clear direction in terms of where this government is going on this particular issue. It does not, in my opinion, have much hope of significantly changing what is happening in the world of smoking these days.

*Government Orders*

What I would like to see more and more is a really solid education component for all of our young people beginning in junior high. This should include actual visits to hospitals. I have heard of young people who had relatives who got lung cancer. They had to visit those relatives. They saw how they were breathing through a tracheal tube. They saw how they were unable to speak because of throat cancer. They saw firsthand the devastation. Although I am not proposing that we try to shock our young people into an action or a decision, I believe that should be a part of the education process. It should be a part of the experience.

Why does the government not undertake to produce some films that make some sense? Quite often we hear criticisms of the National Film Board and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation about some of the garbage they produce using taxpayers' money. Why do they not undertake to do a good, solid, medically based analysis on film and make it available at a cost that school boards can easily afford? Make it available to the school boards. Show it to children. Maybe show it repeatedly to them. I would like to include the health benefits of not smoking. I would like to include the financial costs of taking up the habit versus entering into a savings program. If all of the Liberal members when they were youths had learned how to save money maybe we would not have a \$580 billion debt today.

We have to stop thinking that way. We need to start thinking in terms of saving our money instead of spending it on a habit which is statistically a proven killer. I certainly urge the government to not promote this type of action but to promote an action that will in reality affect our habits. For goodness sake, let us stop subsidizing the production of tobacco products.

• (1330)

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, again I take great delight in listening to the the Reform Party member speak about his trials and tribulations when it comes to tobacco. Although I cannot verify the actuality of it, the member mentioned subsidization for tobacco farmers. Every time I hear that I think of the Stompin' Tom Connors song and "my back still hurts when I hear that word, Tillsonburg", a great tobacco growing area.

Would the member and his party not agree that if that were so, we would have to assist these farmers in the production of another crop? Of course what is making the rounds these days and becoming popular is industrialized hemp which is non-cannabis. It would enable these farmers to grow an alternate crop which, as we know, is very good for the environment and very useful in various products such as paper and clothing. Would the hon. member not agree that it would be an alternative for these farmers?

**Mr. Ken Epp:** Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge the government has had a policy for a number of years, if not decades of assisting

farmers who want to make the transition out of producing tobacco into producing other food crops. If the same amount of money were made available, one could achieve the same goal and help the taxpayer at the same time by phasing out the subsidy for tobacco on a rational basis, perhaps cut it back 10% to 15% per year until it is gone.

If we had a decent competitive marketing system, these farmers should be able to thrive on the world markets with very superior Canadian products which we are producing. Of course it would include things like a wheat board which is accountable and which allows some freedom for an individual farmer to grow and to sell the crop of his or her choice.

With respect to the subsidization of farmers growing tobacco I firmly believe that should be phased out relatively rapidly.

**Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Bill C-42 is an act to amend the Tobacco Act to provide a five year phased in transition period toward a total prohibition of tobacco sponsorship promotions.

The original Tobacco Act was assented to in April 1997. I was one of the members in the House at the time. I was pretty appalled by what was being done because it just was not tough enough even at that time. Here we are a year and a half downstream and we are watering the whole thing down completely.

The interesting thing is that under the original Tobacco Act the provisions were supposed to go into effect on October 1. I noted last week when we were having a debate on this subject my colleague from the NDP, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, raised the question at the end of her speech about what would happen if we had not passed this bill by October 1. To my knowledge the government still has not answered that question.

I think any hon. person would think that until the bill is passed, we really should be enforcing the provisions of the act as it was passed before. I hope there are people taking steps to do exactly that.

It seems to me that it is a little bit silly, stupid in fact, for the government to continue to play fast and loose with the health of Canadians on this issue when there is already a shortage of money in the system for the sorts of diseases which are caused by smoking and are well known to be caused by smoking, such as heart disease and lung cancer. Everyone knows there is simply not enough money in the system to treat these diseases already.

In the meantime we have governments pandering to the tobacco industry. Frankly, the average person cannot help but wonder how many of these decisions are based actually on the very close connections of the Prime Minister and the finance minister to people in the tobacco industry.

*Government Orders*

• (1335)

I asked a question of the finance minister in the House four years ago because of his association, having been on the board of directors of Imperial Tobacco. For my level of comfort there is just a little bit too much of a close connection between the major Liberals on the front bench and the people in the tobacco industry. It is well known that the Prime Minister plays golf with people from the tobacco industry.

While this government is busy playing fast and loose with Canadians' health, other governments throughout the United States and Canada are getting tough on the tobacco companies. In my own province of B.C., our attorney general Ujjal Dosanjh just recently announced, and I have a newspaper clipping here from September 28, that B.C. was monitoring the U.S. lawsuits down in Washington state against the tobacco companies with a view to using the same argument in the lawsuit which B.C. has taken against tobacco companies.

Of course the tobacco companies argue that they contribute a lot to the coffers of the country in taxes and that is true. However, the B.C. health minister on August 21 stated "It is no secret that B.C. receives \$483 million a year in taxes from cigarettes, taxes that are paid by the consumers. This amount comes nowhere near to covering the true costs to B.C.'s economy, an estimated \$1.3 billion a year, to pay for the direct and indirect health and social costs paid by smokers and non-smokers alike".

That is an enormous burden upon the taxpayers and upon the health care system when we think of it. There really is no excuse for pursuing this track of giving the cigarette companies carte blanche to continue to advertise and promote their product.

In 1993 when I was first elected, the law that was in place and which was subsequently struck down by challenge from the tobacco companies restricted the advertising of tobacco at places of sale. For example, corner stores could not put out signs advertising cigarettes and neither could gas stations. I would often get calls at my riding office. People who saw that a tobacco advertisement had appeared on the sidewalk in front of a corner store would call me. I was in a position to call the owner of the store, explain the regulations and get that tobacco advertising taken inside.

As we know, the tobacco companies were successful in striking down those provisions. Subsequent to that, we now see the proliferation of tobacco advertising on sidewalks and at gas stations. There has absolutely been an increase in the amount of smoking by young people since that time. It is beyond me completely that the government can pursue a policy that results in an increase in smoking by young people. It simply does not make sense.

Tobacco of course is harmful in more ways than if we just smoke it. We know of a certain high profile person who used a cigar for a

most unusual purpose. Then of course there is chewing tobacco, which some people might choose to chew. There has been promotion of this certainly at the corner stores in the Vancouver area. There are display stands of chewing tobacco. There has been no promotion of cigars yet for the purposes mentioned earlier, but certainly chewing tobacco is on display. The advertisements make it a sexy, really upbeat sort of yuppie thing to do to chew tobacco. It is disgusting to see people spitting out their wads of chewing tobacco on the sidewalks. It is well known that chewing tobacco causes cancer of the mouth and the larynx.

This is simply moving the problem around within the human body. We really should be moving toward the total banning of advertising as suggested by the Canadian Cancer Society.

One of my colleagues from the PC Party last week read from a letter from the Canadian Cancer Society. He talked about several of the amendments and points that were suggested. It is worthwhile reviewing some of those points. I will summarize the points that came from the Canadian Cancer Society which said that amendments were needed to this bill.

One, there should be a ceiling on tobacco company sponsorship promotion expenditures during the delay period. In other words, if we absolutely have to have this delay period, please put a ceiling on the amount that the tobacco companies can spend so they cannot just blow away the bank, get all the nice tax deductions and get a whole bunch more young people addicted to the habit.

Two, during the first two year delay period, sponsorship promotion should be prohibited on the inside and outside of stores where tobacco is sold. That would take us back to before the 1995-96 era when there was a prohibition on that type of advertising. It is a perfectly reasonable request. It would not be imposing something that had not already been there before.

• (1340)

Three, the Canadian Cancer Society suggests that the bill should be amended so that the two year and five year delay periods begin on October 1, 1998, which was a few days ago, and end on October 1, 2000 and October 1, 2003, respectively.

At present the way it is set up cabinet can decide the starting date. If the Prime Minister is out with one of his golfing buddies and has a few extras at the 19th hole, he may decide that he is going to delay the starting date indefinitely. Even passage of this bill may mean that we never have the ban on advertising that we are supposed to have.

Four, the bill should be amended so that only events sponsored as of April 25, 1997 when the original bill was passed are allowed to continue with tobacco sponsorship promotions during the delay period. Why would that be a hardship? We have already had the bill

*Government Orders*

in place for a year and a half. Let us not expand it. Let us try to keep it as contained as we possibly can.

Five, the bill should be amended so that the grandfather provision applies only to events sponsored in Canada as of April 25, 1997. This again places a target date coincident with the royal assent of the previous Tobacco Act.

Six, during the delay period, any sponsorship promotion should not be allowed to contain images of people, to be misleading, or to be conveyed through non-tobacco goods like T-shirts, baseball caps and so on. In other words, let us keep the promotion to the barest minimum instead of giving carte blanche approval for tobacco companies to go hog wild, spending an absolute fortune in the next couple of years with tax deductions and blowing their budget promoting like crazy and getting as many people addicted as they can.

Seven, the bill should be amended so that only international auto racing events are able to have tobacco sponsorship during a further delay period and not all sponsored events.

We already know that special interest groups have been able to attract support from other companies than tobacco industries in the last year in anticipation of the act coming into force on October 1. It really is not necessary to maintain tobacco sponsorship for all areas. It should be reduced significantly.

The Canadian Cancer Society has put a lot of thought into the recommendations. I did not read out all the details. I know this was read into the record last week. The Canadian Cancer Society represents a very well-thought out position on this bill. Its representatives obviously do not go golfing with the same people as the Prime Minister does. And neither have they used cigars for the purpose that other well-known person did. I would urge this House to take note of the provisions suggested by the Canadian Cancer Society.

Moving on and associated with this tobacco bill, a few years ago we were trying to deal with the amount of tobacco smuggling that was occurring. A lot of the criminal activity surrounding drugs, tobacco and so on relates entirely to the porous nature of Canada's borders. Our borders are so porous criminals can come and go at any time they like.

By the attorney general's own admission, about 18,000 criminals entered Canada last year under false documentation and were able to carry on criminal activities which would have included everything from the smuggling of tobacco, drugs and arms, to you name it. We should be dealing with these really serious problems rather than pandering to tobacco companies to allow them to make profits over the next couple of years.

In the Vancouver area, the head of the fraud investigations at Immigration Canada, Sergeant Rockwell, says that the problem of

passport fraud in the Vancouver area is mind boggling. He used the term mind boggling. He estimates that the worst areas in the country are North Vancouver, which is my own riding, Surrey and Richmond. He estimates that the amount of passport fraud, allowing criminals into our country, is so large in those three areas that the communities have become blasé about it.

• (1345)

Just yesterday the *North Shore News*, my local newspaper, had a front page story saying it will no longer carry advertisements of lost passports because for eight years now it has been carrying advertisements of lost Iranian passports. It identified them as Iranian passports. There have been three or four per issue and there are three issues per week. We are talking about 10 to 12 passports a week being advertised as lost in North Vancouver.

The reason they are advertised as lost is those people sell the passports complete with the T-1000 form, is a landed immigrant form, so that they can be sent back to Iran to have a new photograph put in them and somebody can come here as a landed immigrant without any authority whatsoever.

Sgt. Rockwell tells me that on average these passports can go around 10 times before they are picked up. When an illegal immigrant comes in using a false passport, looking like a legal landed immigrant, he goes immediately to the forger and sells the passport again to recover some of the money he paid in Iran and then the forger sends the passport back to Iran again so that another photograph can be put in it and it can do the circuit one more time.

This goes on up to 10 times before the passport is so damaged that the immigration officials pick it up at the border. Then of course they say let us check on this person whose name is in this passport and on this T-1000 form. How did this passport get here? They visit the person concerned who says they lost that passport two years ago. It is advertised in the *North Shore News*.

As I said, the *North Shore News* carried the story yesterday. It will no longer advertise these passports lost because it does not want to be party to this fraud.

Every single passport, it is right there in the story, that has been advertised lost in North Vancouver in eight years was Iranian. Does it not strike anyone in the immigration department opposite a bit strange that in eight years the only people who ever lose their passports are legally landed Iranian immigrants? How strange. But in the meantime in Surrey it is mostly East Indian passports that are advertised lost, and in Richmond it is Chinese passports.

This immigration minister would do very well to start getting on top of the problem because it is those people, those 18,000 people a year coming into this country as criminals, who are getting involved in the sort of crime that smuggles tobacco that ends up on the black market, pandering and catering to this expansion of the



*Government Orders*

use of tobacco that we talk about, getting our young people hooked and increasing criminal activity in this country.

It is a disgrace that while we spend time in this House, hours and hours debating a piece of legislation to give tobacco companies carte blanche to spend money, to get people on to their addictive products, we have serious problems in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver of criminals every day getting into this country through our porous borders with nothing we can do to stop them.

I am embarrassed that one of the main problem areas is my own riding and that I have been unable to do anything about it, the number of criminals, and that so easily it could be fixed.

All the immigration minister would have to do is make sure that when a new immigrant like me becomes a Canadian citizen the T-1000 form is taken out of the passport. That is all she needs to do. It is so simple. As soon as that is done the forger's power to send a genuine landed immigrant passport back to Iran, India or China is taken away. That is all it would take.

But the minister says that for sentimental reasons we cannot do that, we might upset somebody. They like to have the T-1000 form in there. I say too bad. If somebody really has to have that form in there they could have a photocopy with a big red stamp on it saying invalid or something like to take care of the problem. Really it comes down to political will.

• (1350)

If there was political will to address the problem it would be addressed. There is no political will on that side of the House to address an appalling situation just as there is no political will to address the appalling situation represented by this bill.

People can openly cause our young people to be addicted to tobacco. Because of this, we know that in 20 or 30 years from now there will be an increasing burden on our health care system and a lack of productivity as they come out of the workforce and have to be dealt with for heart disease and lung cancer that are direct results of this addiction to tobacco.

As has been said many times before, I realize the sad fact that in this place we know how the votes will turn out long before the debates begin. In fact, everything said here is almost irrelevant.

How sad that for all the work that was put into the recommendations of the Canadian Cancer Society, here in a letter to all MPs, not a word will be listened to, not one word will be taken any notice of because we already know how the vote will turn out on this bill. How appalling that those people on that other side can sit there. I would say a goodly portion of them are sorry that this bill is going

to go through but they will stand up and vote for it because they will not have the ability to vote against it.

It is a shame to see the amount of work that has gone into this by health professionals across the country, by people who can see the dangers in the passage of this bill, to be rejected outright by a dictatorial government that will force this issue through.

I will close with one last appeal to people here. If this would be just the first time ever that they would seriously consider this on the government side, please speak with the minister to get her to hold this bill up just a bit longer so we can consider it a bit more, so we can have the Canadian Cancer Society again, so we can have concerned professionals here to convince us that we should hold it off and incorporate many of the suggestions they have made. I urge all members to vote against this bill.

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this bill is one I felt had weakened previous tobacco legislation.

I wondered if the member could make a comment on the fact that the government collects \$2,000 million in taxes from cigarettes and has promised to spend \$20 million per year on measures that would reduce tobacco input by our youth; \$2,000 million taken in and \$20 million per year promised for interdiction for our kids. This year it looks like it has only spent \$6 million.

I wonder if the member could make a comment about that in terms of priorities.

**Mr. Ted White:** Mr. Speaker, the member's question actually relates to the statement I made earlier about the statement made by the health minister in B.C. when she said that B.C. receives about \$480 million a year in taxes from cigarettes but it costs about \$1.3 billion in health care costs.

If that is applying in every province, the fact that the federal government collects \$2,000 million in taxes really becomes almost irrelevant when one thinks of the enormous health costs which would be several times that. If we used the same sorts of proportions, we are talking about several billion dollars in health care costs annually.

We know that tobacco still kills approximately three million people a year worldwide. It is a major killer and we really should not be facilitating the use of this product.

The *Montreal Gazette* had a story on August 30 concerning this bill. It said let's say a kid smokes, fresh young lungs headed for the long dirty road. Why a young person smokes may involve a number of factors, to be part of a peer group, rebellion against parents and authority figures, striving for independence, the excitement of risk taking behaviour, weight control, stress relief, and the list goes on.



*S. O. 31*

• (1355)

So what do you do about that? If parental guidance will not work, if the slick guys at the ad agencies are a lot better at selling cigarettes than selling clean living, how do we give our young people a chance to avoid the kind of addiction that is killing 40,000 Canadians a year?

We have to pour some money into contradicting the advertising of the tobacco companies. The tobacco companies say they are not out to entice young customers to replace the ones who are dying off. I do not know how many exactly believe that, but they have said publicly that they want to help discourage that very thing.

We may well laugh at that and I admit it makes me laugh but there is a way of making those companies put their money where their mouths pretend to be. I know that Bill S-13 has been floating around this House and there has been a lot of support for that type of approach.

The Government of Canada collects about \$1,000 in tobacco taxes for every dollar it puts into anti-tobacco initiatives. Frankly, that is an insult. California's proposition 99 applied a 25 cent tax to every package of cigarettes sold and used in California and it used the money for inventive anti-tobacco programs. As a result young persons and adult smoking in California has dropped.

It is a proven fact that where money has been put into advertising that discourages smoking it works and it really is a very sad commentary on the attitude of this government that it would put such a small amount of money into contradicting the tobacco advertising.

**The Speaker:** As it is almost 2 p.m. perhaps we could get an extra statement or two in.

In 1996 Pat was named volunteer of the year by the Brant County Heart and Stroke and woman of the year by the Cambridge YWCA.

On behalf of the people of Cambridge riding I thank Pat for her dedication to making our community a better place.

\* \* \*

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, again this year Canadian farmers have shown that they can produce a big crop of high quality grain and oilseed. This year's crop of over 23 million tonnes is high quality wheat, 80% of which will be exported.

Canadian grain is recognized around the world for its quality. Yet in spite of this impressive performance Canadian farmers are facing a severe economic crisis. Commodity prices are at the same levels they were some 30 years ago while crop inputs continue to rise.

What is responsible for this serious deterioration in prices? We do recognize the problems Southeast Asia has had and the impacts. However, I believe the major reason for these low prices is due to the massive subsidies by both the United States and the European Union. These subsidies distort world markets by driving down grain prices.

Farmers are asking what this government is going to do to correct the situation. Where are the minister of agriculture and the Minister for International Trade? What are they doing to combat these big \$50 billion export subsidies by the European Union?

\* \* \*

**STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

[English]

**PAT SINGLETON**

**Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate women's history month I rise to pay tribute to Pat Singleton, a woman of great energy, determination and community spirit.

For more than 10 years Pat has been the executive director of the Cambridge Self-Help Food Bank. Organizations like Nutrition for Learning, the United Way, South Waterloo Housing, the Heart and Stroke Foundation, the Cancer Society, Cambridge Interfaith, the Canadian Mental Health Association, the Alzheimer Society, Aids Awareness, International Women's Day and Kiwanis have all benefitted from Pat's involvement.

**NATIONAL FAMILY WEEK**

**Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House and all Canadians that this is national family week. This week we celebrate families and recognize the family unit as a key foundation for a great society.

This year's theme is family can be the greatest source of comfort in the world. Throughout the week families across the country will celebrate their own uniqueness, special qualities and memories. When family life poses special challenges we can strive to do our best and remember that we all have important roles to play.

During national family week and throughout the entire year I challenge communities, organizations, corporations, unions and individuals to encourage the development of a family friendly society. Let us work together in making national family week a well celebrated event all across Canada.

• (1400)

### FAMILY SAVINGS AND CREDIT UNION

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Family Savings and Credit Union is kicking off its 50th anniversary celebrations. It was on October 20, 1949 that this financial institution was incorporated by a small number of pioneers who joined together to own and control a financial business to serve their needs.

Today the credit union boasts 22,000 members and six branches across Niagara. It is the seventh largest credit union in Ontario and offers financial planning and many other financial services.

Over the years the Family Savings and Credit Union has been honoured with several prestigious awards. It is one of only two credit unions to be given the National Community Economic Development Award. It has also received an international marketing award from the Credit Union Executives Society.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Family Savings and Credit Union on 50 years of success and for serving the people of St. Catharines and Niagara.

\* \* \*

### INTERNATIONAL PLOWING MATCH AND FARM MACHINERY SHOW

**Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to draw attention to the great success of the 1998 International Plowing Match and Farm Machinery Show in my riding of Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington.

I congratulate Chairman Ken Keyes and his army of volunteers, all of whom did a fantastic job hosting this prestigious event. I personally thank all the hundreds of volunteers. Many were the same citizens who gave so much of themselves during the ice storm crisis earlier this year.

The 100,000-plus visitors and participants, including more than 15,000 students, were witnesses to the event's theme "Quality Living/A Partnership". The good will and hospitality of the people of Frontenac and surrounding counties exemplified this spirit.

In addition to the great plowing competitions there were the tented city built on this theme and exhibits and events showcasing our culture, history and innovations for a better future. I am confident that all visitors brought home a good feeling from our area and from this event.

*S. O. 31*

### FORESTRY

**Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, seven Reform MPs spent the weekend on B.C.'s central coast visiting logging operations and talking with forest workers and community leaders. We were impressed with progressive attitudes and careful forest practices. They are determined to practise and promote sustainable forestry to ensure the viability of their communities.

Meanwhile, Greenpeace is launching a million dollar campaign to promote an international boycott of B.C. forest products. This misinformation campaign is trying to put B.C. forest workers, their families and their communities on the welfare rolls.

The great irony is that Greenpeace is at the same time asking for charitable status. The federal government must say no to this request, counter this campaign and send a strong statement to the international community defending and promoting B.C. and Canadian forest practices.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### TV5 INTERNATIONAL NETWORK

**Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the ministers responsible for TV5, including the Minister for Canadian Heritage, met yesterday in Quebec City to discuss issues relating to the future of this very important television network.

Founded in 1984, TV5 is one of the world's leading satellite broadcasting networks and can reach nearly 68 million homes.

This year, we are celebrating the 10th anniversary of TV5 Québec Canada. More than a mere celebration, it is the realization that TV5 Québec Canada is becoming more and more important not only across this continent but also throughout the Francophonie.

TV5 is a new milestone in the cultural development of French-speaking countries and one of the Francophonie's greatest accomplishments. The Government of Canada supports the crucial role that our international network, TV5, plays and must continue to play.

\* \* \*

### ALAIN BELLERIVE

**Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the efforts and many years of consistent work by Alain Bellerive, of Cap-de-la-Madeleine, a doctor in particle

*S. O. 31*

physics whose thesis has earned him a two-year contract with the European centre for particle physics research, the CERN, in Geneva. This centre brings together the finest scholars in the world.

Speaking personally and on behalf of the residents of my riding of Champlain, I want him to know how proud we are of him.

Dr. Bellerive, 28, completed six years of advanced studies and is now employed with the leading international laboratory for research in particle physics. This young physicist dreams of coming home to perform similar duties in a Canadian or Quebec university.

Alain, I wish you the best of luck and I hope your dream will come true.

\* \* \*

● (1405)

[English]

### VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

**Mrs. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to commend one of the smaller communities in my riding of Nunavut on its initiative and action.

The residents of Whale Cove, numbering just over 300, are speaking out about violence against women. More than 50 concerned people marched the roads of Whale Cove to create awareness of the issue, carrying posters that were made by children. This is a fine example of what can be done if the community as a whole takes on an issue.

What makes this action even more notable is Whale Cove does not have the protective services of the RCMP. It is served by the detachment in Rankin Inlet 100 kilometres away. Sometimes Whale Cove has to wait for a response to its calls, depending on the seriousness of the situation.

We have to stop violence against women, and I am proud that even the small communities in Nunavut are taking a stand against this terrible crime in society.

\* \* \*

### CANADA PENSION PLAN

**Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Canada pension plan is a key pillar of retirement income for many Canadians.

To head off an approaching fiscal crisis in the plan the Liberal government is increasing payroll taxes by 73%. Many interested parties including the Alberta Chamber of Commerce are convinced the CPP should include an option to invest mandatory contributions into individual retirement savings plans.

At a media conference scheduled for later today I understand the Alberta Chamber of Commerce will call on the Alberta govern-

ment to immediately commit to a provincial consultative process on options to the CPP.

An increasing percentage of the population is losing faith in the CPP and want the option of opting out in favour of their own mandatory retirement savings account, an option Reform has proposed.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### BLOC QUEBECOIS

**Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, ever since it arrived here, the Bloc Québécois has been claiming to speak on behalf of the people it represents.

This means that, each time the separatists ask questions in the House, make speeches and, in particular, hold press conferences, they are expected to reflect the views of their constituents. But today, the truth is coming out once again.

I want to congratulate the member for Rimouski—Mitis. According to yesterday's edition of *Le Soleil*, the member held a consultation in her riding. She sent 2,000 questionnaires to find out what should be done with the employment insurance surpluses. She got 787 replies.

The people of Rimouski—Mitis want the surpluses to be invested in health and education and used to reduce personal income taxes, instead of lowering employment insurance premiums and corporate taxes.

I do hope the member's comments will reflect these results and that she will correct her leader, unless this is yet another case where they have to consult the head office in Quebec City.

\* \* \*

[English]

### TOMMY DOUGLAS

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure many Canadians share my outrage at the pathetic way in which the Prime Minister used the name of Tommy Douglas against the member for Palliser.

If Tommy were here he would be foursquare behind the member for Palliser and everyone else who is challenging the longstanding tendency of Liberal governments to trample on the rights of Canadians when it suits them.

It was Tommy Douglas who stood up to the Liberals over the War Measures Act in 1970. Those of us who regard Tommy as our mentor stand up now against the arrogance and the undemocratic spirit that pervade the government from its handling of APEC to the many other ways in which it seeks to crush dissent within its own ranks and within the country.

The Prime Minister should spend less time misusing the name of those who cannot defend themselves and more time learning from the example of people like Tommy Douglas.

\* \* \*

### COMMUNITY NEWSPAPER WEEK

**Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC):** Mr. Speaker, this week is Community Newspaper Week. Whether in one part of an urban setting or the voice of a rural township, community newspapers give a voice to individuals and to the associations working to build Canada.

These local papers enrich our communities by highlighting achievements of local residents and provide a forum for discussion leading to action.

[Translation]

I am very aware that the local newspapers in my riding play an essential role in keeping the community informed and united. I am thinking, among others, of the *Stanstead Journal*, the *Progrès de Coaticook*, the *Reflét du Lac*, and the *Haut St-François*.

[English]

Let us take a moment to acknowledge the men and women who report, edit, lay out the pages, solicit advertising and manage the distribution of news that is closest to home.

• (1410)

[Translation]

Each newspaper is unique, as is the community that it represents. Together, they make a major contribution to the vitality of the Canadian community.

\* \* \*

[English]

### MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

**Ms. Elinor Caplan (Thornhill, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House and all Canadians that October 4 to October 10, 1998 is Mental Illness Awareness Week.

This public education campaign was launched in 1992 to de-stigmatize mental illness. It is spearheaded by the Canadian Psychiatric Association in partnership with the Depression and Manic Depression Association of Canada, the Schizophrenia Society of Canada, the Canadian Mental Health Association and the National Network for Mental Health.

Serious mental illnesses such as major depression involve substantial personal and socioeconomic costs.

*S. O. 31*

[Translation]

These diseases can have disastrous effects on those affected, as well as on their relatives and friends.

[English]

Mental Illness Awareness Week provides an opportunity for Canadians to increase awareness and understanding of mental illness and to overcome the stigma too often faced by persons with mental illness.

I ask the House to join me in saluting the efforts of the organizers of this event and lend support to this important initiative.

\* \* \*

### MUSEUMS

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the poem I am about to read was written by my wife and is dedicated to the thousands of volunteers across Canada who give their time and their money to keep our small community museums open.

It is called “Keepers of the Past”.

In many a village, city or town  
There's a spot reserved where records are put down  
It may have been a church or a school or a hall  
Now, it houses memories and bits of history for recall.

Treasured possessions preserved through the years  
In this hallowed place, ably manned by volunteers  
Dusty antiques, all rusty and old  
Tin type photos with a story to be told.

Keepers of the past—a rich heritage  
For generations to come, of a more modern age  
Community pride—of this I can attest  
For Souris—Moose Mountain has some of the best.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

**Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, “we must grant that recognition”. Those are the words used a few days ago by the secretary general of the United Nations, when he commented on the will of Quebecers to achieve sovereignty.

Mr. Annan said that, following a decision made by a clear majority of Quebecers to form their own country, and following a democratic consultation, Quebec would have to be recognized. Our new country would finally be a full fledged member of the international community.

The Bloc Québécois wishes to inform the member states of the United Nations that it intends to fight democratically to obtain, in a future referendum, the clear majority referred to by the secretary general, and that it will behave in the most appropriate of ways before, during and after the next winning referendum in Quebec.



*Oral Questions*

[English]

**AGRICULTURE**

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Mr. Speaker, according to StatsCan farm cash receipts in western Canada are down drastically in 1998. In 1997 net farm income fell 55% nationally.

Farmers have started to draw money from their net income stabilization account. For the six months of 1998 NISA withdrawals increased by nearly 70%. Most farmers will not be able to face the current market crisis.

Of greater concern is that while governments of our major competitors, the EU and the U.S., declare that they will help their farmers go through this crisis our government is not reacting to our problems.

Since 1993 federal and provincial government support has dropped 60%. Farmers want a long term commitment from the government and the government must react now.

\* \* \*

**UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL**

**Mr. David Pratt (Nepean—Carleton, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to bring the news to the House that today Canada was elected to serve a two year term on the United Nations Security Council. This will be the sixth time Canada has been so honoured with a security council seat. It is tremendous recognition by the United Nations membership of Canada's longstanding role in promoting peace and security worldwide.

For generations Canada has been an active player through our extensive participation in peacekeeping missions and through our strong support for multilateral institutions.

Canada's involvement in the UN is a reflection of fundamental Canadian values like freedom, equality, democracy, tolerance, negotiation and compromise. We bring our values and convictions to the security council table, but we also bring our willingness to make the tough decisions needed to ensure peace and security around the globe.

• (1415)

The record speaks for itself. The world community values our contribution. A special word of thanks to our Minister of Foreign Affairs, special envoys and those in the diplomatic corps, without whose efforts our bid for this seat might not have been successful.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**APEC SUMMIT**

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, that was the good news. Now the bad news. Within the last hour the lawyer for the students represented at the APEC hearings has filed a motion to kill the commission because of the solicitor general's conversation about the commission, how he compromised that system which he so piously defended.

When is the government going to ask the solicitor general to resign his place in cabinet?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member did not get up to congratulate the government on Canada's overwhelming election to the security council.

The hon. member shows a very misguided sense of priorities in her question. There is no doubt that the minister is an outstanding minister who has the confidence of the Prime Minister, the government and our entire caucus.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** That is great, Mr. Speaker. He may have the confidence of the benches on the other side but certainly not the Canadian people.

The commission is going to hear this motion on Tuesday. It will be before the commission. The member for Palliser is going to appear and testify under oath about the conversation he heard on the plane between the solicitor general and his buddy Fred Toole.

I would like to ask the solicitor general now, after all the clapping and the cheering on that side, will he stand up right now and say he will testify under oath, yes or no?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said in the House many times, the invitation as to who is going to participate in these hearings is at the discretion of the public complaints commission.

**Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.):** Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is a motion on the floor of that place to kill the commission because he has poisoned that process so badly.

Now the premier of New Brunswick has come forward and corroborated the story of the member for Palliser. This is getting more serious by the day. The government cannot have it both ways. It cannot cherry pick. It has already acknowledged that the member for Palliser has it right.

*Oral Questions*

The minister can run from the truth but he cannot hide from the facts. The solicitor general has compromised his office, he has undermined the commission and he has refused to testify under oath. So there is only one question left. When will he resign?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this line of questioning is based on a despicable act of eavesdropping, unworthy of this place and offensive to fair minded Canadians.

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

In jurisprudence there is an expression, notes taken at the time. In trials judges regularly ask police officers to refer to their notes made at the time to refresh their memories and these are considered admissible as evidence.

The information released by the member for Palliser regarding the solicitor general's conversation is from notes made at the time.

Can the justice minister, as chief attorney, tell the House how the solicitor general can claim some of these notes are true and some are false?

• (1420)

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have had a chance to glance at copies of the hon. member for Palliser's notes. I want to say those chicken scratches show the hon. member is certainly not a certified shorthand reporter.

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, these notes have been taken as evidence by the public complaints commission in Vancouver.

Yesterday the Prime Minister said: "I cannot have a better witness than the member for Palliser".

The notes are before a public complaints commission the solicitor general oversees. We cannot have the chief officer of that commission sitting as solicitor general while notes that are saying he did something against that commission are before the commission and under investigation.

Will the Prime Minister have the solicitor general resign until this commission is over with?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the law is clear, a law brought into this parliament by a party the hon. member used to be affiliated with, that this commission is at arm's length from the minister and at arm's length from the government. It is an independent body. It wants to do its work. I do not know why the hon. member wants to use the floor of the House of Commons to impede the commission from carrying out the work it has been given by a law passed by this parliament.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general is trying to convince us that what he said in a plane was not serious because the conversation was in private.

Is he telling us that he is perfectly entitled to discuss affairs of state with just anybody, anywhere, so long as he does so in private and there are not too many people around to hear.

[English]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the Solicitor General of Canada, I am very proud of the correctional service and the RCMP. I have discussions all the time about the pride that I feel for those organizations and the work they do. I will continue to do that.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general is very proud of himself and the Liberals are very proud of him. They are the only people in Canada who are very proud of him.

Since we started questioning him on the APEC scandal, the solicitor general has said he cannot comment in this House, because the scandal is before a commission of inquiry.

What principle gives the solicitor general the right to talk to his Liberal friends about the APEC scandal, while he refuses to discuss it here in this House before members of parliament, as it is his duty and responsibility to do?

[English]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary. Many times in the House I have discussed my faith in the public complaints commission and how important that instrument is as a civilian oversight instrument. I discuss it regularly. I believe in the process and I wish members would let it work.

[Translation]

**Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said yesterday that, had the solicitor general spoken of the Airbus affair in the plane, he would have dealt differently with him.

Could the Prime Minister explain why discussion of the Airbus scandal is serious enough to warrant dismissing the minister, while discussion of the APEC matter, which is also under investigation, is not serious and he will do nothing? Why the double standard?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times, I did not discuss anything inappropriate. That has been substantiated by the gentleman who sat beside me.

I talked about the public complaints commission and that I had all the faith in the world in that commission, and I have.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Richard Marceau (Charlesbourg, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, how can it be that a minister who does not know better than to talk about his business in public could have sufficient judgement to know that what he said can be prejudicial to an inquiry?

*[English]*

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would never say anything that would be prejudicial to the process or to an ongoing investigation.

I can speak very proudly of the civilian oversight history in this country. The public complaints commission is a part of that, I support that commission and I wish members would let it do its work.

• (1425)

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House both the Prime Minister and the solicitor general accused me of fabricating my story.

I stand in my place today to tell this House and the Canadian people I swear now that I am telling the truth. I would swear under oath that I am telling the truth. The solicitor general, better than anyone else, knows what happened.

Will he now withdraw his allegation?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on the contrary. The member for Palliser made serious allegations based on his eavesdropping on a private conversation on a noisy aircraft.

That report has been discredited. I denied those allegations with the support of the person to whom I was speaking. I think it is reprehensible that an hon. member would stoop to this kind of tactic.

**Mr. Dick Proctor (Palliser, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, far more in sadness than in anger I say that the solicitor general continues to question my honesty.

I give the minister one more chance to withdraw these allegations, or is he calling me a liar?

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

**The Speaker:** The question as put is in order.

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said, the hon. member has taken snippets of a

conversation that he eavesdropped on and put them together as facts.

There are many inaccuracies in that report. He suggested I had said something that would prejudice the process or outcome of the public complaints commission.

It has been established by the person sitting beside me that was not the case. I stand by my story.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, when it suits the Prime Minister he likes to use the words of the member for Palliser to defend the solicitor general. The member for Palliser is reported as saying: "The solicitor general lied in the House of Commons".

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, we are not allowed to use words in this House used by someone else outside the House that we ourselves are not allowed to use. I want the hon. member to withdraw that statement and I would like her to go directly to her question, please.

• (1430)

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne:** Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw and I will go directly to the question.

Why has the solicitor general not taken the very action the Prime Minister has threatened to take in the past if the statements made by the member for Palliser are not true? Is it because the solicitor general's friend, Fred Toole, would not be able to corroborate the solicitor general's version of the remarks he made about APEC under oath?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said, the member for Palliser alleged that I had said something that would compromise the Public Complaints Commission exercise both by way of process and by way of the outcome, and I denied that. That denial has been substantiated by the person with whom I was speaking on the airplane.

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, only the solicitor general and the Prime Minister believe the solicitor general's changing versions of his APEC chat in the air. They use the statements made by the member for Palliser to defend the solicitor general when it suits them and deny or refuse to confirm other statements when it does not.

Why will the Prime Minister not stop letting the solicitor general undermine that office and the smidgen of integrity that is left in this government and ask the solicitor general to resign?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that the Prime Minister, the government and the caucus have confidence in the minister. He is a fine minister and he is doing a good job.

I guess the hon. member does not care about veterans any more. What happened to her priority with respect to veterans? What happened to her party's concern about the economy? Is that all she

*Oral Questions*

has to talk about is this issue, which has been more than adequately and effectively answered by the solicitor general?

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Prime Minister stood in his place and said “I could not have a better witness than the member for Palliser”. He then said that he was nothing but a snoop and tried to discredit him.

Today I think the Prime Minister should change his mind one more time. Will he change his mind and now ask for the resignation of the solicitor general?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate that the Prime Minister has no intention of doing that. I know there is a new unholy alliance between the Reform Party and the other right wing parties, the Conservatives and the NDP, but that does not make what they are saying right.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the member for Palliser stood in this place and vowed that he would swear under oath to the veracity of his statements.

The solicitor general has not denied the statements and will not testify under oath. Meanwhile the lawyer for the students has said that the testimony of the solicitor general has compromised the commission and is asking for it to be shut down.

Will the solicitor general do the right thing, realize he has compromised his position as well as the commission's and resign?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the situation here is extremely clear.

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

**Hon. Andy Scott:** Mr. Speaker, I could not have imagined that in this country the principles of fundamental justice could be parked so eagerly in the interest of political theatre.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the only thing that is perfectly clear in this matter is that the version given by the Solicitor General, who is trying to save his skin, contradicts the version of the hon. member, who has nothing to gain except bringing out the truth.

How—

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

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Roberval.

• (1435)

**Mr. Michel Gauthier:** Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General is the minister responsible for internal security. He is the one responsible for state secrets. The portfolio is so different from the others that newly appointed Solicitors General are given more training about security than other ministers.

How can the man responsible for security in Canada not understand that the words he spoke, as reported by the hon. member, are unseemly and incompatible with his position?

[*English*]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I understand my responsibilities very well and I live by them proudly.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, when the Deputy Prime Minister was Solicitor General, he never got into such a situation because he understood he needed to keep his mouth shut. That is what Solicitors General have to learn, and this one did not.

Someone from a foreign power, someone with an interest in getting some information on Canada, could have been the one sitting close to the Solicitor General on that plane, so what he was saying did constitute a risk to national security. How can a man in charge of national security behave in such a way as to endanger the—

**The Speaker:** The hon. Solicitor General.

[*English*]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the allegations made against me in terms of inappropriately speaking about the Public Complaints Commission by way of process or outcome have been denied. That denial has been substantiated by the gentleman with whom I was speaking directly, not an aisle and a half away.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said one day “When confidence is lost, the system no longer works”. How things change after five years in office.

Canadians no longer have confidence in the Solicitor General, who is still with us. Why is the government not keeping its word?

[*English*]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is very clear what is happening. Members opposite have embraced inaccurate observations, snippets from a very noisy aircraft that have been put together as truth.

There are many inaccuracies in these statements, including in my own constituency the name of the St. Mary's First Nation. It turned up across an aisle as St. Michael's. That is just an example.

**Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the syndrome called recovered memory syndrome was largely discredited in medical circles.



*Oral Questions*

The solicitor general's sudden recovery of memory has actually discredited him, both in this House and through the rest of the country.

Which one of this cabinet will stand up and finally say "We are going to fire the flyer"?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see from the hon. member's question that he is now satisfied with the government's approach to the tragedy of hep C victims.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. The Prime Minister has claimed that the remarks of his minister have no impact on the commission of inquiry. They caused RCMP officials to say in Vancouver yesterday that they were not prepared to take the blame for anyone else in the Peppergate scandal.

Can the Solicitor General not see that his chats are far from neutral, that they are having serious repercussions for the inquiry and that he must really step down?

[*English*]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the House on Tuesday I advised that the allegations made against me were not accurate. My statement on Tuesday was supported by the gentleman who was sitting beside me on the plane, with whom I was having a private conversation, not somebody eight feet away, a seat and an aisle away, on a noisy plane.

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General must realize that since his chat in the plane, the RCMP is in a state, secret agents are giving interviews and the media talks of nothing else, from coast to coast.

What does it take to get the Solicitor General to do what duty requires he do—resign?

[*English*]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone in this country would want the government to make decisions based on inaccurate information.

**Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in this government when cabinet ministers are having problems—and yes, we do have a cabinet minister with a problem, and we have been at it all week—the Prime Minister usually will not allow the minister to resign. The Prime Minister usually waits until he can shuffle the cabinet minister out the back door.

Instead of waiting for the next cabinet shuffle, why will the Prime Minister not just let the solicitor general do the honourable thing and resign?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has said that he has confidence in the solicitor general and that he is doing a fine job. There is no reason the Prime Minister should follow the precedent of the Leader of the Opposition and kick people out of the caucus completely or sentence them to the back row because he does not like the way they are disagreeing with him. That is no precedent for this party or for anybody else in this House.

**Mr. Werner Schmidt (Kelowna, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in his idealistic youth as Prime Minister, the Prime Minister said: "Integrity and honesty are the cornerstones of this government". That was 1996—

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

**Mr. Werner Schmidt:** Will the Deputy Prime Minister now prove that statement and fire the solicitor general?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the rather uncharacteristic endorsement of the Prime Minister's policies by the hon. Reform member. It is because of the Prime Minister's daily proof of commitment to these policies that he is not going to follow the unwarranted advice of the Reform Party or any other opposition party in this matter.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères—Les-Patriotes, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

Since the Solicitor General has demonstrated his flagrant lack of judgment to all, since he has failed to convince anyone other than perhaps his Liberal colleagues of his version of the facts, since his arguments do not stand up to those of the member for Palliser, will he, in a flash of lucidity, submit his resignation right now?

[*English*]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday in this House I denied the allegations that were made with regard to the process of the Public Complaints Commission or its outcome. That denial was substantiated by the gentleman with whom I was speaking on the aircraft at that time and not by someone a seat and an aisle away.

\* \* \*

## GOVERNMENT OF ONTARIO

**Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the people of Ontario were justifiably outraged recently when the Government of Ontario lowered the minimum age for hunting with a firearm to 12. As soon as the reformatories realized this was a terrible mistake they blamed the federal government.

Would the Minister of Justice please give this House and the solicitor general for Ontario an elementary lesson in jurisdiction between governments?

*Oral Questions*

• (1445)

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raises a very important issue. It is an issue that has been of concern to the people of Ontario.

I want to clarify for all members in this House and the people of Ontario that in fact the law surrounding hunting, who hunts and the age at which one can apply for a permit to hunt, is in fact within exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

I want to reassure this House and the people of Ontario that this government had no part in the decision made by the Government of Ontario to permit 12 year olds to apply for hunting licences.

\* \* \*

**APEC SUMMIT**

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general, the guardian of this nation's most sensitive information, has loose lips. His loose lips violated the elementary rule of policing, that you only release information on a need to know basis. As a former RCMP officer, the nation's top cop is a major security risk because he cannot follow this rule. When will the Prime Minister ask the minister for his resignation?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise of the hon. member's question regarding the way the hon. solicitor general has carried out his duties. He is a fine minister and he deserves the support of all members of this House.

**Mr. Charlie Penson (Peace River, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the solicitor general has lost the confidence of this House. He has lost the confidence of Canadians. He should be gone today, not in the next cabinet shuffle. If fingering your employees will not do it, if jeopardizing ongoing investigations will not do it, what will do it? How low does the bar have to go, Mr. Prime Minister?

**The Speaker:** I remind members to please address your questions to the Chair. The hon. solicitor general.

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this line of questioning is based on a despicable tactic of eavesdropping. The results of that exercise have been discredited in fact. I would not want to think that Canadians would see this government making decisions based on that kind of inaccurate information.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, in his notes the member for Palliser wrote that the solicitor general said he was going to have an international college of correctional studies built in Fredericton. Yet an aide to the minister said that

could not be because the only site that was being considered was Kingston. Now we have the premier of New Brunswick, Mr. Thériault, saying that he discussed this several times with the solicitor general and credited the solicitor general with working hard on the file.

Is the premier of New Brunswick fabricating a story, or do we now know very clearly where the fabrication is coming from?

• (1450)

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, yesterday I permitted the word fabricated or fabrication to be used in the House but I would much prefer that you do not use that word in this question period. I am going to allow the solicitor general to answer the question, but I do not want the word fabricated used.

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, once again as I said earlier, the story that was put forward by the hon. member for Palliser was drawn from snippets of words coming across the aircraft. As a consequence the hon. member has mentioned the facility. Unfortunately he got the location wrong and there was another different project that I have been working on in the province with the premier and that is the basis of the mistake.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in these kinds of affairs when a cabinet minister knows that he is a liability to the process no matter what he believes to be true about himself. The minister has arrived at that point. Whatever he believes about himself he should see clearly that he is now a liability to the process going on in Vancouver and he should do the right thing and resign.

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have more respect for fundamental justice than to do that.

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, in 1996 the Prime Minister accepted the resignation of the member for Don Valley East when he breached the government's supposed ethical standards.

Yesterday the solicitor general admitted to discussing the location for the centre for correctional justice, a cabinet decision that could lead to a commercial advantage to insider information from the solicitor general.

Will the Prime Minister please explain why the member for Don Valley East lost his cabinet position and the solicitor general keeps his? Why the double standard?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no double standard here except in the hon. member's own mind.

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, there are double standards around here lately.

The solicitor general needs to be one of the most discreet and security conscious members of the cabinet, as does the Minister of Justice. He needs to be trusted by our police, our intelligence, agents and our allies. In one conversation the solicitor general destroyed that trust. He spoke of APEC, Frank Moores and a pork barrel project in his riding. He cannot separate the private from the public.

This is inappropriate behaviour on his part. It is a firing offence. When will the solicitor general resign?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, serious allegations were made. I stood in the House. I responded to those allegations. They were inaccurate. I established that the gentleman whom I was speaking with substantiated that those allegations were inaccurate.

I do not feel any obligation to discuss a private conversation that has nothing inappropriate with regard to my job, that was overheard on an aircraft by an eavesdropper.

\* \* \*

**FOREIGN AFFAIRS**

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

In light of the rising tension between Turkey and Syria, would the minister explain to the House what diplomatic efforts Canada is making to defuse the increasingly dangerous situation that could have lasting implications for peace in the Middle East and Asia Minor?

**Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the member as I could not understand the beginning of his question. Mr. Speaker, would you allow the member to repeat the question?

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

• (1455)

**The Speaker:** Order, please. The hon. member for Calgary Northeast.

\* \* \*

**APEC SUMMIT**

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe I missed the punchline on that last commercial from that side.

I have a question for the top police officer in the country, the chief administrator of law enforcement. I want to check the facts on this letter.

Mr. Toole's letter does not corroborate the solicitor general's story. The letter is very carefully and legally crafted by a lawyer to say nothing.

My question for the solicitor general is, is he calling the member for Palliser a liar?

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

**The Speaker:** The question as it is put is in order.

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, unlike my hon. colleague from Palliser, I would never question someone's honesty. I am simply questioning the accuracy of his hearing.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General.

In the light of all these events, will the Solicitor General not now acknowledge that it is time to bow out, with dignity?

[*English*]

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, no.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the solicitor general.

I have heard the solicitor general say many times in this place that he really believes in the process, he believes in the commission, he cares about that commission and its process. I ask him now does he not see that regardless of what he thinks about the matter, he now has a duty to absent himself from this in the name of the work of the commission and the confidence that Canadian people have to have in that process?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I believe profoundly in fundamental justice. I think it is being convoluted in this place to impugn my integrity. In the name of my integrity, I remain the Solicitor General of Canada.

**Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC):** Mr. Speaker, CBC this morning is reporting that New Brunswick Premier Camille Thériault had full knowledge of a correctional college to be built in New Brunswick, the same correctional college that the member for Palliser overheard the solicitor general discussing on a very public plane.

The member for Palliser could not make this up. In fact, he heard all too well the solicitor general breaking secrets in public. Will the solicitor general not do the honourable thing? Will he recognize his error in judgment? Will he resign?

**Hon. Andy Scott (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I never suggested that he made it up. He just got it wrong.

## FOREIGN AFFAIRS

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

In light of the rising tension between Turkey and Syria, will the minister explain to the House what diplomatic efforts Canada is making to defuse this increasingly dangerous situation that could have lasting implications for peace in the Middle East and Asia Minor?

**Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for asking the question again. There is a little bit of noise coming from the other side, Mr. Speaker, and it becomes rather confusing for a neophyte parliamentary secretary.

Turkey has been concerned in the past by the incursions by the PKK, the workers party, into Turkey.

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

**The Speaker:** I think I better quit while I am ahead and draw to conclusion today's question period.

\* \* \*

• (1500)

## PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

**The Speaker:** I draw to the attention of members the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Festus Mogai, President of the Republic of Botswana and a delegation from his country.

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

\* \* \*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, given what went on here today, I do not suppose there is any great question I could ask, but I would like to ask the government House leader the nature of the business in the House of Commons for the remainder of this week and for the next time we sit.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the business of the House of Commons for today and tomorrow will be Bill C-42, the tobacco legislation, and Bill C-40, the extradition legislation.

It would not be my intention at this point to call other government business before the adjournment tomorrow.

Next week is the Thanksgiving break. When we return we will commence with Bill C-54, the electronic commerce bill. This will be followed by the resumption of consideration of Bill C-43, the revenue agency bill. Tuesday, October 20 shall be an allotted day.

## Government Orders

I take this opportunity to wish all members an excellent Thanksgiving holiday and hope that everyone will come back here reinvigorated with the best interests of the nation at heart.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## POINTS OF ORDER

MEMBER FOR BOURASSA

**Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis, BQ):** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Earlier this afternoon, in his statement, the member for Bourassa misled the House. I never asked the voters in the riding of Rimouski—Mitis what they wanted us to do with the surpluses in the employment insurance fund.

What I asked, and I am prepared to table the text of the question, is—

• (1505)

**The Speaker:** Sometimes, when members are making statements, they quote facts that can be taken in several ways. If I understand correctly, the hon. member for Rimouski—Mitis is seeking unanimous consent to table a document. Is that correct?

[English]

Does the hon. member have the permission of the House to table the document?

**Some hon. members:** No.

---

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1), I wish to table a notice of a ways and means motion respecting the Excise Tax Act and I am also tabling explanatory notes.

I ask that an order of the day be designated for consideration of the motion.

**Mr. Randy White:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, does the hon. member not need the unanimous consent of the House to do that outside the regular debate session?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Standing Order 83(1) states:

A notice of Ways and Means motion may be laid upon the Table of the House at any time during a sitting by a Minister of the Crown, but such a motion may not be proposed in the same sitting.



*Government Orders*

As long as it is being laid on the table and not proposed, we are all right.

\* \* \*

**TOBACCO ACT**

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-42, an act to amend the Tobacco Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Before the start of question period the hon. member for Vancouver North had six minutes left in questions and comments. However, I believe we will be resuming debate.

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to rise and speak to Bill C-42.

This bill is very close to me at this time. It is a one that is affecting my family right now. It is a bill that has affected my family in the past.

• (1510)

I really wish that every member of the government was in their place right now to examine what they are about to do with this bill. This five year phase-in on tobacco advertising will probably kill thousands of people and start thousands of more teenagers into an addiction habit.

If members opposite and those who want to support this bill would just sit for a moment. Never mind the tobacco tax they are going to receive because they are going to lose all of it in extra health care. Never mind the grant they are going to get or political patronage from the tobacco companies. Let us just sit down for a moment this afternoon and ask ourselves is it worth it. Is it worth it to see thousands of young people become addicted to the still massive advertising of the tobacco companies? The bill should not be phased in over five years. The bill should come in now and everybody in the House would support it.

My colleague from Elk Island did not want to use the word hypocrisy. I have to use that word for this reason. When the government was faced with massive smuggling, what did it do? Instead of dealing with the smuggling, it said to the teenagers of Ontario and Quebec mainly we are going to drop the tax, we are going to lower the price of cigarettes, go ahead and smoke, you will not have to work a full hour on the lowest pay scale for one package of cigarettes, you can now get two or three packages. So the in thing was to smoke.

The government created the highest teenage level of smoking in Canada in years by its inability to look at an issue and say we are going to put our money into stopping the smuggling of cigarettes back into Canada. It did not want to do that. It created a double standard. The rule of law did not apply in Canada.

In Dryden, Ontario people could buy cigarettes for less than half of what they could a few miles away in Manitoba. The government continues to justify that.

I agree with the hon. member that we should have an educational program, taking all the money, all the revenue and putting programs into our schools.

Let me tell members about an incident in my life. My brother was 49 years old. I was 35 miles out of the office when the call came to go back to the office. The message was that a 49 year old prince of a man had just died of lung cancer. Today I have another family member who is in serious trouble health wise.

Just think how many people in the next five years are going to become addicted because the government has more concerns about the filthy lucre it is going to get and the political patronage grants it is going to get from the tobacco companies than to face this issue square on. Think about it.

The government failed to recognize what the cancer societies said. It failed to recognize what the Health Association of Canada said. No, the government has to do it its way.

I sat in on a lung operation. I sat in on a smoker's lung being removed. A high tech camera should show that picture in every high school classroom in this country. Watch them take out a gross lung, completely ruined by tar and nicotine.

Here we have a bill that is not going to curb but will be phased in.

• (1515)

Knowing the record of the government, it will never get truly phased in as long as there is kick-in under the table on political patronage and grants. All people in Canada know that. The Canadian Cancer Society knows it. Members on the government side know it and all hon. members know it.

Tobacco has many defenders but, no matter what, nobody can come up with a defence.

Immediately the government has shied away from what it promised. This is not what it promised. It promised it would bring about an immediate change in encouraging the use of tobacco and it would stop this. The hypocrisy continues.

Bill C-42 is the height of hypocrisy. No matter what hon. members want to say, no matter what gestures they make, the public knows that this is hypocrisy.

The government zealously defends health by publicly attacking tobacco companies verbally, but not so realistically. It is still going to take the tax and the political donations and it is still going to be the cause of hundreds of young people becoming addicted to cigarettes in the next five years. The government and the Minister of Health cannot deny that.

*Government Orders*

The Minister of Health is in a very uncomfortable position with this bill. Go ahead and collect the large revenues and spend less than 1% on public advertising for our youth not to become addicted. That in itself is an act of hypocrisy of the highest degree.

The Minister of Health can tell us that the revenue they take in from tobacco does not even cover the cost of the medical problems caused by tobacco, let alone providing any educational material to put into our schools.

The hypocrisy in this bill, in not dealing with one of the biggest problems facing the health of Canadians, is to phase it in over five years. Even if 10% of those kids who are now 12 years of age become addicted simply because of the inability of this bill to do what Canada wants it to do, then the fault will surely fall on the government opposite. It has to.

The government is phasing this in over a five year period and is still allowing limited advertising and the whole bit. However, when it needs more money, does anyone know what it will do? Canadians know what it will do. It will make amendments down the road in about three or four years and will go over the whole process again.

I have lost relatives to tobacco. I have seen many young people destroy their lives with tobacco. I have seen an adult of only 30-some years of age, addicted in his teens, laying in a hospital bed. How can hon. members opposite sit there and support a bill that is going to be phased in? I cannot understand it and I do not think they do.

I know they say they received a letter on their desk which told them to support the bill, but let each member examine themselves. Let every member who votes in this House examine themselves. Let them take a look at a brother dying of throat cancer at 49 years of age because there was no program. They are not justifying it.

I happen to have a twin brother. The same fate awaits him because we did not have the medical knowledge that the hon. Minister of Health has now. We did not have all of the medical knowledge from the Canadian Cancer Society. We did not have thousands of people who were deadly against this bill.

• (1520)

Death and destruction is being phased in to untold millions of young Canadians who will be addicted under this rather fluffy policy. I beg of all members on both sides of the House to please examine their positions. Never mind the tax revenue. Never mind the political grants. Let us just think of the teenagers who will be addicted, have a free vote and watch Bill C-42 be defeated.

Please, for the sake of our young people, vote with your conscience and not with your party.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the member has certainly spoken in very strong terms about this bill. It is clear that he feels very emotional about it.

Can the member elaborate on why he believes that not just this government but governments over the past several years have refused to take a tough stand on this issue when we have known for some time through scientific evidence that this addiction is deadly and that children are taking up the addiction because of advertising?

I would also ask the member to elaborate on the comments he made surrounding his belief that there are several people on the government side who would vote against this bill if they were given the chance to do so. I would like him to explain clearly what he means by that.

**Mr. Roy Bailey:** Mr. Speaker, I will respond to the latter part of the hon. member's question first.

I believe that people on that side of the House, as well as on this side, if they are given the opportunity to do some soul searching, and if that soul searching is strong enough and rises above the party's position, will vote this bill down.

I respect hon. members on the other side of the House and I know how many of them want to vote. They have told me how they want to vote.

With respect to the other part of the question, it has been proven beyond a doubt that more advertising, more accessibility and a cheaper product increases consumption. All it does is bring about more death. It brings about more addiction. The fault, as we look at the five year phase in period, will hang very heavily on some people's shoulders. It will be on the shoulders of the people who vote yes for this tobacco bill. Make no mistake about it.

As Abraham Lincoln said about liquor, it has many defenders, but so far nobody has come up with a defence. I would challenge anyone on either side of this House to realistically study Bill C-42 and come up with one good defence as to why we should continue to advertise tobacco products and make them available over the counter. I know they have taken strong action, but the fact is that I cannot go to any high school in my riding and not see youth smoking, despite what they are doing.

With this phase in period, all they are doing is asking them to continue in dribbles.

My conscience, and I am sure the conscience of many members, both in the back and front rows, will say that Bill C-42 is a mistake. Take it back to the drawing board and come up with something that is saleable to Canadians and to all the health organizations in Canada who do not think kindly of this bill being passed.

• (1525)

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member made another comment that I would like him to elaborate on, and that is that he believes that the portion of this bill that is supposed to be phased in will never happen. I have heard others in the debate make that comment as well. They believe that the phase in will never

*Government Orders*

happen, that the government will back off on this once again, as it did on the original piece of legislation.

**Mr. Roy Bailey:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. As long as the profits from the tobacco industry contribute to the revenue of this government, or of any government, without going directly to health care or directly to education, then it is going to be wiggled around forever because it likes to get its hands on money.

Secondly, as long as the tobacco tycoons are able every four years to shovel a whole bunch of money into the coffers of this party or any other party, this bill will never become a reality.

I can assure members from experience that this bill will never become a reality because the government always wants money and it just loves political patronage from tycoons in the tobacco industry.

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, to respond to the hon. member for Souris—Moose Mountain, it is clear that his emotional involvement in this issue has clouded his usual judgment and has led him to speak excessively, inappropriately and inaccurately.

I will put aside the inappropriate and excessive remarks, some of which were clearly out of order. But let me deal with the inaccuracies because it is important that the record be set straight.

The bill before the House strengthens the Tobacco Act which already is the toughest in the western world. When I was in Geneva last June at the World Health Organization a number of countries asked me for a copy of our legislation. They want to copy it. This is the most intelligent and effective anti-tobacco legislation in the western world.

Bill C-71, which as passed by this House a year and a half ago, provided for promotion by tobacco companies forever, although it was limited. This bill goes further. It prohibits sponsorship and promotion by tobacco companies altogether within five years.

The Canadian Medical Association said “We are pleased that health minister Rock has recognized the need for a full ban”.

The Cancer Society, through its spokesperson Rob Cunningham, said “A total ban on sponsorships is an important improvement to the act, one that we strongly support”.

Garfield Mahood of the Non-Smokers’ Rights Association said “We are pleased the government has finally recognized the need for a complete sponsorship ban”.

The Calgary *Herald* wrote “The new legislation is workable and defensible”. I could go on.

The public, the spokespersons, the informed members of the public in this country support the government. The step we have taken will end sponsorship by tobacco companies within five years and that is very much in the interests of the health of Canadians.

**Mr. Roy Bailey:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the minister has come into this debate saying that it is most progressive.

Will the minister not agree, and I know that he will, that phasing in something of this nature does not work? It has never worked in this country and it is not going to work now.

If it is a good thing to bring about a total ban on cigarette and tobacco advertising in the year 2003, what is wrong with a total ban in 1998? That is what Canadians are asking.

I say to the Minister of Health that a lot of people will lose their lives to cancer during those five years and the guilt is going to lie on those people who support this bill.

• (1530)

**Hon. Allan Rock:** Mr. Speaker, I will respond to that. The member speaks as though the bill is the only step we are taking in relation to tobacco.

The bill represents a few sections in a statute which is elaborate, comprehensive and powerful. It empowers the government to regulate tobacco as a product. It makes it an offence to sell tobacco to kids under age 18. It puts the tightest restrictions on advertising as well as dealing with sponsorship.

The member ought not to pretend that Bill C-42 is the only step we are taking against tobacco. It is a small part of a large strategy. I remind the member that the government will also be spending \$100 million and enormous energy over the next five years to persuade young children not to smoke.

I have a 13 year old daughter and two 11 year old sons and I am as concerned as anyone that they not become addicted to tobacco. I will take every step I can to ensure that they do not. I want the help of governments across the country in achieving that objective.

I do not want the member to pretend that this is all, because it is only part of a very large strategy.

**Mr. Roy Bailey:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. minister has spoken. He said that they will spend \$100 million on education programs.

Where I come from people have an expression “Put your money where your mouth is”. How much money will the government take in revenue every time it spends \$100 million in five years? The problem is that a very small percentage of the revenue taken is being spent on educational purposes to prevent smoking. Yet they are filling the coffers of the government on the backs of healthy

*Government Orders*

young people and are spending a mere percentage of what is taken in. That is why—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Just like question period, when your 35 seconds are up your time is up.

That last exchange was getting fairly close to innuendo which was not strictly parliamentary. I was listening to it, but I want to make the point that at no time were any comments made that were specifically directed to specific individuals. In the opinion of the Chair there was nothing in any of the exchanges which was out of order.

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today after the recent exchange. It is nice to have a minister in the House. He is looking rather relaxed and cool these days. We have not been after him very much, but that too will change. He can obviously pose a question as well. It was nice to see that.

We are here to talk about Bill C-42, the bill to amend the Tobacco Act. It provides a five year phased in transition period toward a prohibition of tobacco sponsorship promotion.

My constituents in Lethbridge have talked to me about the bill. They are concerned with keeping harmful products, particularly tobacco, away from youth. I received a number of letters, phone calls and visits to my office indicating that we have to keep our kids away from this stuff.

Tobacco comes in many forms. Chewing tobacco has become popular. When I think back to when I was a youth I smoked for a number of years. I do not smoke now. I have not smoked for 12 or 15 years. Some days around here I am about half an hour away from starting again, but I hope I never do.

I still remember the flashy full colour ads on the back of magazines and billboards such as the Marlboro man. More and more the advertising was scoped to youth. Tobacco companies saw where their future was and they targeted them.

At first glance when the bill was introduced we felt it was good, that the bill would restrict advertising to young people and help protect the youth of Canada. As we started to study it and see the phase in part of it and the fact that there is no firm date to start, it began to lose some of its lustre.

• (1535)

The fact remains that tobacco companies are huge, powerful forces in the world. They have lots of money. They can crank up advertising agencies across North America to target whomever they wish.

I think it has been said that advertising on Formula One race cars is one of the most highly visible places in the world to advertise. It attracts young people. The fact that the bill was introduced was

great, but on the one hand the government is trying to show that it cares about health and about young people and on the other hand is still taking tax money from the sale of tobacco.

The government has slowed down the process so that it could keep the revenue flow going while still looking like it is championing this act. As originally intended it was good and it would have done what we wanted. Slowly it has looked to us like the government is dragging its feet and will not move on this.

I have talked with people in convenience stores and corner markets who sell cigarettes. They do not have a problem with any legislation. Some good legislation has been brought in so that they cannot sell tobacco to minors. The other day a person indicated that it was an offence if young people asked for the price of cigarettes and it was given.

Lots of things have been done. To do that on one end and still allow the phase in time for advertising just does not add up. If we are serious about keeping these products away from our young people and if we are serious about the health of Canadians, let us start as soon as we can. Let us not extend this phase in program and let us do the job.

Regarding education, the minister said that \$100 million over the next period of time would be spent to educate young people on the hazards of smoking. The hon. member who spoke before me referred to the personal tragedy he saw because of cigarette smoking in his family. I think we can relate to that. We have all had family, friends or neighbours who have suffered because of it.

Smoking is an addiction and something not to expose our children to, but it is a product that can be legally bought when someone becomes 18. I guess there are ways of getting them before then. To allow the advertising, to encourage it to happen, is wrong. We should work very hard in our approach to changing that.

The Reform Party certainly would support protection for youth from being targeted for tobacco products. We would encourage the government to have another look at it and to implement its policies as quickly as it can.

There is the whole public relations aspect of what is happening whereby the government has legislation before us that would keep tobacco out of the hands of children. It is making a lot of noise about the subject, but it is taking a long time to implement it. In the meantime it is still reaping benefits from the sale of tobacco. We would like to see this aspect changed.

If the minister were serious about the legislation, he would put it into motion. Let us not move the deadline to start implementation further and further away. Let us get it into law now.

Regarding the whole sponsorship agreement, advertising can be targeted to any sector of society. We can target young people. We can target the baby boomers, whomever we wish. There are ways



*Government Orders*

to poll people to find out what people are interested in. The agencies can design advertising to do that.

As far as adults are concerned, if I choose to start smoking tomorrow, who will stop me besides my own personal thoughts? However we have to help our young people today realize that smoking is causing problems.

• (1540)

I go to quite a few rodeo events during the summer and I see young people with a round can of chewing tobacco in their back pocket. It gets to become a trademark: if you have one of those you are macho. Where does the idea come from that chewing tobacco is cool? It comes from advertising. We saw a few years ago the different forms in which this product was packaged to appeal to young people.

Let us have a picture of a cancerous lip or a young man or woman with throat cancer or stomach cancer from this stuff. Let us make them aware that aside from the glorified side that is advertised and portrayed there is a side that is dangerous and can harm them.

I reiterate that if the legislation moves forward and prohibits advertising directed at youth the answer would be to do it quickly. The phased in program leaves it open to interpretation. While the government is holding off from implementing the legislation it continues to reap the benefits of tobacco sales. Let us stop that aspect of it. Let us truly target advertising directed at young people and get on with the bill.

**Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of my hon. colleague and would like to ask him a question.

In the speech I made earlier I indicated that the government was cowardly in bringing in legislation which limits the advertising of cigarettes. It is something that I agree with in principle. I do not think we should be allowing a process that encourages young people to start smoking. However, the government is cowardly in doing that without also declaring that tobacco is a dangerous substance.

By labelling it so, the government would then have the moral and legal right to actually limit that advertising. Otherwise it runs into the question of being challenged under the human rights protection act or whatever in terms of limiting freedom of speech when it says to a company that produces and markets a legitimate product that it cannot advertise its product. Presumably the product is 100% legitimate. It is even subsidized by the Government of Canada. It seems to me that there is an anomaly.

Would the member for Lethbridge comment on that? Would he also favour declaring it a dangerous substance and going all out to stop this cancer on our society, with a pun intended there?

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Elk Island. It is a dangerous substance. We can call it whatever we wish, but the proof is in that it does cause disease. It causes all kinds of problems, lung problems and cancer. I believe most of the product is labelled today to indicate that smoking cause lungs cancer.

On one hand to label the product and try to discourage the use of it but on the other hand to allow glitzy advertising through any means possible to get the word out that it is there and is to be used is a conflict.

The hon. member is right. We say it is a dangerous product and label it as such because it contains all things that will hurt people. There are warnings on the packages that pregnant women should not smoke and that it will cause lung cancer. Then let us realize that and not allow advertising of a dangerous product.

• (1545)

**Mr. Grant McNally (Dewdney—Alouette, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments.

Earlier we heard the Minister of Health speak on this bill. He talked about how good it was, how people from other countries are singing the praises of this bill and how it is to be duplicated, replicated by other nations, that they are clamouring at the doors for this piece of legislation. While perhaps well intentioned, I do not agree with the premise in his argument that this bill goes far enough.

As a former teacher I taught grade seven students for a number of years. Sadly, a number of them did start smoking at the very young ages of 10, 11 and 12 years old.

Does my colleague think this bill goes far enough and quickly enough to make the necessary changes to stop young people from getting involved in this habit which is so devastating?

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Speaker, I might have alluded to that somewhat in my presentation. When we first saw this legislation come through we felt that this would stop the advertising. As we got into it, we realized that there was a phase-in period. The time when it will start has not been set.

We need to move quickly. Every day that goes by is a day lost to stop this practice. We should do it, but we should do it now. This phase-in time is not necessary. If we are serious about protecting young people, then let us get serious and do it.

**Ms. Elinor Caplan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate. Frankly anyone watching this debate would wonder whether or not the members who have been speaking actually understand what this legislation is intended to do.



*Government Orders*

It amends the most progressive legislation in the western world and it creates an ultimate ban on sponsorship promotion within five years. That is applauded and lauded by all of those who know that Canada has had an enviable record worldwide. That should be acknowledged by the members opposite.

Why will they not stand and acknowledge the progressive record of this government in dealing with these important issues of public policy?

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Speaker, something that will probably not happen is for us to stand in this place and congratulate the government on this.

I made the point previously. If we are going to be serious about the health situation, if we want to be the big leaders in the world, and the government claims it is, then let us get serious about it. Let us not say that we are going to have a five year phase-in period. From when? It should have started years ago. It should be in effect right now.

Maybe it is the most progressive bill, but it is progressing further and further down the line. If the government wants to be the guardian of all that is righteous, it should start doing that right now.

**Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I have been involved in the business of education for a number of years. I am surprised with the advertising and the means by which young people are getting tobacco products. Does my hon. colleague not see that there are more and more young people, particularly young girls, smoking cigarettes now than there was during my time in the field of education?

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Speaker, yes there is. It is obvious from the stats, and it is especially young girls. It is all part of the strategy that has been put in place to attract certain sectors of our society to smoke. We have seen this increase recently.

This legislation should be implemented as quickly as possible. Had the five year phase-in program started a year ago, we would have been into it. We should not have the phase-in period. There is no firm date established by the government as to when that five years will start. It is important that we start as soon as we can.

• (1550)

**Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the government is so reluctant to take a strong stand on tobacco use. Why does it not bring forward legislation that is really progressive in the idea of not only preventing smoking, but to absolutely outlaw advertising totally.

I suppose industry giants, corporations are influencing the government. I think this is one issue where the average Canadian would stand behind the government and say that this time the corporations do not get their way.

The tobacco farmers of southern Ontario can grow tremendous crops, healthy crops such as vegetables and grains that do some good for Canadians. In the hon. member's opinion, should the government choose the health of Canadians over the corporations in this case?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Before the member for Lethbridge responds, I remind everyone to please address questions and comments to each other through the Chair.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Speaker, absolutely, the average Canadian relies on the government for those types of things. Far too many times the government is worried about getting into other areas, but basic health, basic protection are things Canadians should expect.

Right now we are facing a crisis in the agricultural sector. My colleague from Selkirk—Interlake is very well aware of that. We have had discussions in our caucus over the last few days about exactly what can be done. The government needs to be involved in some areas and it does not need to be involved in other areas.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am going to make a very short intervention on this bill. We have heard debate on the bill. I was very pleased earlier to see the Minister of Health get involved in the debate. I am going to ask the minister to get involved again.

We heard the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health say that this legislation will eventually lead to an ultimate ban. She used those terms. I have a concern, because while the government is talking tough, we have seen absolutely nothing from the government. We do not know whether it is going to carry through. I think it is accurate to say that this is the first time in Canadian history we have seen a government actually back off and get weaker in this area.

I would like to see the minister's real commitment on this issue. I really want to test the minister's commitment and ask him two questions.

Will the minister direct all revenue from tobacco, or at least any extra revenue that his government will receive as a result of the phase-in as opposed to immediate implementation, not to general revenue but to prevention and health care? That is the first question.

The second question I would like the minister to respond to is will the minister pledge that his party and all candidates in the next federal election and any byelection will not take a penny from the tobacco lobby or individuals involved in the tobacco lobby?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** This is certainly an interesting twist on debate. Before we get too far into it, I would ask members again to address each other through the chair.

*Government Orders*

**Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the member is terribly wrong. He said that this government has done nothing, yet when the Supreme Court of Canada invalidated the old Tobacco Act, struck it down, said it was invalid, the former Minister of Health, the one who preceded me, introduced the Tobacco Act.

• (1555)

I have already said to the House that it is considered a model internationally. It is tough, it is smart and it is effective, and it is going to help enormously in keeping cigarettes out of the hands of kids. In addition, the Tobacco Act that was passed in this place in April 1997 permitted tobacco companies to continue sponsoring events and putting their names in front of the public. It would have allowed them to do that forever, although only on the bottom 10% of signs.

The member suggested that the bill now before the House weakens that act. It does anything but. It strengthens the act by introducing the notion that in five years tobacco companies will have to stop altogether sponsoring and promoting events. The member has it wrong. We are doing the right thing. He should support this legislation.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, I know this is not question period. I know the minister does not have to answer but I appreciate his getting up on questions and comments to make some comments. I asked two questions. If the minister is going to respond, he should answer those questions. Canadians would really appreciate hearing his response to those questions.

Will the minister commit any extra revenue his government will get as a result of the phase-in as opposed to immediate full implementation to prevention and health care to deal with the problem? Will he commit that any candidate running for the Liberal Party at the time of the next election or any candidate running in a byelection will not take one penny from the tobacco lobby?

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate and noting the great passion expressed by the members on the other side in their concern for children's health. This is somewhat contradictory and puzzling in relation to their positions on other issues that affect children's health.

For example, many experts say that climate change will have a greater impact on children's health than it will have on any other demographic age group. Yet members opposite seem to have the official stand on climate change that it does not exist. I wonder how on one issue they can be concerned about the health of children, yet on another very important issue on which there is a consensus by people around the globe the member's party seems to object.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate this question and I mean that so sincerely.

We stood here in the House in the last session when the Kyoto deal was being talked about and we asked the environment minister time after time, day after day to show the study the government is basing Canada's position on that indicates man plays any role in climate change and to bring that evidence forward. We wanted to see it and we still want to see it.

The member talks about the harm from climate change. We know that climate change has happened throughout history. We know from records that have been left that climate change has happened. However, when it comes to evidence that man plays a significant role in any way in climate change, I would like the member to cite her sources so I can look into this evidence as well.

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan:** Mr. Speaker, I apologize sincerely to this House for heckling but as I indicated in my heckling I find it rather disturbing that the members of the Reform Party can choose the issues they feel are important in terms of children's health while they ignore a whole pile of other issues that affect children's health. They can be quite happy about regulating on certain kinds of issues that affect children's health but they choose to ignore a whole pile of other issues.

• (1600)

I would be more than happy to drown the member on the opposite side with volumes and volumes of evidence on the effects of climate change and how it would impact on children and our grandchildren.

Perhaps I could suggest that the hon. member contact the Canadian Institute of Children's Health and it could provide all kinds of detail for that member.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by asking the member who did not respond by giving me even one single source—

**Ms. Elinor Caplan:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, with all due respect, this is not question period, this is debate. The member opposite has inappropriately—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** That is not a point of order.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, of course the member does not have to respond. It is not question period. We do not get responses in question period anyway, quite frankly.

The member made a point that climate change would do this and that. Is the climate change she is anticipating global warming or global cooling? The sources are pretty evenly matched on that issue. They do not know whether the climate change is likely to be

global warming or global cooling. I asked her to cite just one solid reference, one source for this information.

As we asked this in question period dozens of times and during the debate on Kyoto before and after Canada took its position. Again, she has refused to give even one reference. I guess that shows where this debate is going.

**Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan:** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member was not listening. As I said, I am more than happy to drown the hon. member in paper. There is one very good source, the Canadian Institute of Children's Health. There is not just a single source but a whole network of people working on children's health issues and environmental health issues and showing a link between those.

I would be more than happy to give the member hundreds of sources on this issue. I point something out to the member opposite. I said climate change. I know that for some members in this House this is a very difficult and complex issue to understand. Climate change means climate change. It means that in some parts of our country it will be cooler and in some parts of our country it will be a lot warmer and hotter. It is called climate change.

As the climate heats up out west, because the Reform Party refuses to acknowledge the fact of global climate change, it will find that its votes have all burned up.

**Mr. Leon E. Benoit:** Mr. Speaker, she really does not know which way this climate change is going. I certainly acknowledge the climate will change, it has changed throughout history. I have no problem acknowledging that at all nor do I believe any member of the Reform Party would have any problem acknowledging that.

We know that is happening and will continue to happen. What is important is to get some good evidence as to man's impact. I welcome very seriously her offer to send some good documentation that this is happening.

• (1605)

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

**Some hon. members:** Question.

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

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

### *Government Orders*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions among the parties and I believe you would find consent to defer the recorded division on second reading of Bill C-42 to the expiry of Government Orders on Tuesday, October 20.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

### **EXTRADITION ACT**

**Hon. Allan Rock (for the Minister of Justice, Lib.)** moved that Bill C-40, an act respecting extradition, to amend the Canada Evidence Act, the Criminal Code, the Immigration Act and the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act and to amend and repeal other acts in consequence, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

**Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to speak to Bill C-40.

The bill overhauls extradition laws in Canada and creates a modern, effective system for extradition appropriate for the 21st century. It will help us to better meet our international commitments and ensure that Canada is not a safe haven for criminals seeking to avoid justice.

The Extradition Act, which is of general application, and the Fugitive Offenders Act, which applies to the extradition process between Commonwealth countries referred to as rendition, both date from the late 1800s.

Aside from amendments to the extradition appeal process enacted in 1992, these statutes have remained essentially unchanged from the last century.

*[Translation]*

Extradition laws as they now stand cause serious problems, as we are unable to turn over criminals to countries with which we do not have extradition agreements or treaties; to entities other than a state, such as United Nations tribunals for war crimes; or to countries where extradition treaties are in force but where an outdated list of offences does not include modern offences like drug trafficking, money laundering and computer crimes.

*Government Orders**[English]*

The current extradition process places onerous evidentiary requirements on foreign states and the legislation does not set out clear and adequate procedural and human rights safeguards for persons whose extradition is being sought.

Given the increasing ease of international travel, the advancement of technology and the global economy, major crime and criminals are no longer local in nature.

Transnational crime and criminals are now the norm, not the exception. Canada's laws must be modernized in recognition of that reality.

• (1610)

We have seen in the last few years a number of cases where Canada's extradition laws have not been sufficient to enable Canada to fulfill its international obligation and expeditiously extradite fugitives to other countries in order to face justice. The problem has been most acute in respect of countries of a different legal tradition such as those in Europe.

In the case of a number of requests from countries other than the United States extradition proceedings cannot be instituted. In other instances states are so discouraged by the different hurdles imposed by our current extradition law that they do not even initiate an extradition request. The primary problem is that the current legislation mandates that the foreign states submit evidence in support of their request in a form which meets the complicated requirements of Canadian evidentiary rules.

For countries which do not have a common law system, and for which concepts such as hearsay are unknown, this requirement makes the preparation of a request for extradition a tremendously difficult task, and in some instances an impossible one. Even with countries with a similar legal tradition such as the United States, we have heard on numerous occasions how difficult it is to obtain extradition from Canada. In the context of our other common law jurisdictions such as Great Britain and Australia, Canada's system is viewed as one fraught with difficulties due to the antiquity of our legislation.

With global crime becoming a significant concern at home and internationally, we know that the deficiencies in our legislation will continue to be questioned. Within the G-7 P-8 forum for example, states have been requested to modernize their extradition laws in order to be responsive to the challenges of today's transnational crimes and criminals. All the fora which have considered the serious problem of transnational organized crime have identified extradition as a critical tool to combat this growing threat to world order. In the P-8, the United Nation and within the Commonwealth there have been calls for countries to put in place a comprehensive, effective and modern process for extradition.

In light of Canada's antiquated extradition laws and the magnitude of the changes necessary to modernize our current process for extradition, an entirely new proposed extradition act was drafted, amalgamating and substantially adding to the provisions of the current Extradition Act and the Fugitive Offenders Act.

An important feature of this bill is that it will allow for extradition not just to states but to the United Nations war crimes tribunal and any future entities of this nature, including the proposed international criminal court, the statute for which was recently adopted by the United Nations diplomatic conference in Rome.

This bill will enable us to fulfill our international obligations to comply with the United Nations security council resolution establishing the international criminal tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. According to these resolutions we have to provide assistance and surrender fugitives to the tribunals if so requested.

As our law now stands, we could be in breach of our obligations as members of the United Nations if persons sought by either tribunal were located in Canada and we were not able to extradite.

In addition to allowing for extradition to the international criminal courts or tribunals, Bill C-40 will apply to all requests for extradition made to Canada. Unlike our current limited extradition regime, the new scheme allows for extradition on the basis of bilateral and multilateral treaties, or where the state or entity making the request is designated as an extradition partner in a schedule to the bill.

• (1615)

It also permits the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Minister for International Trade to enter into a specific agreement for extradition with any state or entity on a case by case basis.

The bill will also apply to all requests for extradition made by Canada to a foreign state.

*[Translation]*

I would like to emphasize three particular aspects of the bill, as they mark the most significant step toward modernizing our extradition procedures.

As I said, one of the worst problems with the current extradition process in Canada has to do with the complexity of the evidentiary requirements imposed on foreign countries filing requests for extradition with Canada.

For many countries, especially those with a legal tradition different from ours, it is extremely difficult to collect all the extradition documents required under Canadian rules of evidence.

*[English]*

Under the new bill the legal standard for extradition would be retained. That is, a Canadian judge will still have to be satisfied



that there is sufficient evidence before her or him of the conduct underlying the request for extradition which, if it occurred in Canada, would justify a trial for a criminal offence. Lawyers like to refer to this as the prima facie test.

What would be modified is the form of evidence that could be presented to the extradition judge. This approach addresses the current difficult evidentiary requirement for first person affidavits devoid of hearsay, which is the main problem encountered by states requesting extradition from Canada.

Experience tells us that it is already extremely difficult for states to meet the prima facie case standard through the use of first person affidavits in relation to certain types of modern day crime; for example, complicated fraud. With the increasing complexity of transborder and international crime, it will be more so in the future.

As I have said earlier, under the current system some countries simply decide not to seek the extradition of fugitives because they cannot comply with our current legal requirements. Those fugitives, therefore, remain at large in our communities.

Under the new legislation the judge would admit into evidence documentation contained in a record of the case. The record would contain evidence gathered according to the rules and procedures followed in the requesting state. It may contain a summary of the evidence available prepared by the appropriate foreign judge or official. The evidence may not be in the form of an affidavit and may be unsworn. The objective is to accept the evidence in the form used by the foreign state, provided it is sufficient according to a Canadian extradition judge to demonstrate criminal conduct under Canadian law and to require a trial in the requesting state.

This record of the case would be certified by appropriate authorities in the requesting state and accompanied by certain assurances in relation to issues such as the availability of the evidence, its sufficiency for prosecution purposes or its accuracy.

The notion of a record of the case is consistent with the recent Supreme Court of Canada decision on hearsay in which the supreme court abandoned the strict formalism of the hearsay rule to adopt a more flexible standard based on necessity and circumstantial guarantee of trustworthiness.

In some respects, therefore, the existent evidentiary requirements for a Canadian extradition hearing are more formalistic and onerous than those for a Canadian trial.

Following a careful consideration of other options, we concluded that the record of the case should be available to all foreign states irrespective of their legal system. The minister believes that the "record of the case for all states option" is the best compromise between the present impractical evidentiary requirements and the absence of any judicial assessment of the evidence, as is presently the procedure followed in Australia and the United Kingdom in respect of its European partners.

### *Government Orders*

With this option the legal test would not change. What would change, however, is the form in which that evidence would be acceptable in a Canadian court.

[*Translation*]

Bill C-40 also includes a number of improvements and safeguards.

• (1620)

First, when he submits an extradition request so that the person sought can be tried, the competent prosecutor will have to certify in Canada that the summarized evidence is available for the trial and is sufficient, in a common law system for example, for prosecution purposes in that country.

[*English*]

Second, the person sought will receive a summary of the case rather than just affidavits on particular elements. These will provide a clearer picture in our opinion of the evidence supporting the request.

Third, the Minister of Justice may decline to issue an authority to proceed with an extradition hearing if the minister is not satisfied with the content of the record.

Finally, as noted above, the extradition judge will order committal of the person into custody to await surrender only if evidence would justify committal for trial in Canada if the offence was committed here in Canada.

This brings me to the second important feature of this reform. The extradition law, as it currently stands, does not provide for a code of procedure. If one were to consult the Extradition Act or the Fugitive Offenders Act, one would be hard pressed to understand how proceedings commence, whether the fugitive is entitled to bail, how someone is to be arrested, how one can waive proceedings, whether temporary surrender is possible, et cetera. In other words, there is a clear need to spell out the procedure.

It is important at a time when transborder crime is becoming more prevalent to have an extradition process which is effective on a practical level.

At the same time, it is equally important that the process be a clear one and that the written statute detail the nature of that process and the protections accorded to those who are the subject of extradition proceedings. We simply cannot afford to be in the position where we will be criticized by Canadians for having let the country become a haven for criminals by not evolving with our times. Yet we must also produce a reform which addresses the basic procedural requirements needed for a fair extradition process in Canada.

Let me briefly go through the main procedural features included in the extradition law reform. The first point, which is clearly related to the evidentiary requirements that I just spoke about,



*Government Orders*

concerns the respective roles of the courts and the executive branch in extradition cases.

The current two-track system will be maintained. The judicial track will continue to ensure that the underlying conduct would be criminal in Canada and there is a case against the person.

The Minister of Justice, on the other hand, will have the responsibility for assessing the foreign legal system to ensure that human rights are respected and a fair trial will be provided in the requesting state.

The bill outlines the mandatory and discretionary grounds for the refusal of surrender by the minister, such as political offence, lack of jurisdiction, death penalty, humanitarian considerations, previous acquittal or conviction and trial in absentia.

However, the Minister of Justice will continue to have discretion to decide in each particular case whether or not to seek assurances from the requesting state that the death penalty will not be imposed or carried out.

It should be noted that under no circumstances shall the minister make a surrender order if he or she is satisfied that the surrender would be unjust or oppressive or that extradition has been sought for the purpose of prosecuting or punishing the person by reason of race, religion, sex or other similar grounds.

Where a person could face prosecution or punishment because of a prohibited ground of discrimination, the clause we chose was directly taken from the United Nations model treaty on extradition. The UN treaty provides greater protection than exists in most bilateral treaties.

However, I am aware that the list of grounds could be considered under-inclusive and, as a result, the minister is asking the committee to analyse this clause in particular.

Overall, the safeguards referred to in the legislation are provided in addition to any protection under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms which the person sought may have.

• (1625)

As well, the decisions to be made by the extradition judge or by the Minister of Justice will be subject to appeal or review by provincial courts of appeal.

Finally, the proposed legislation also seeks to harmonize the extradition and refugee processes, as conflict may arise when someone subject to an extradition request makes a claim for refugee status.

Thus, Bill C-40 modifies the Extradition Act and the Immigration Act in order to avoid duplication of decision making and to limit delay in the extradition process. The legislation also provides a means for consultation between the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in such matters.

More specifically, the Immigration Act would be modified to provide that if extradition proceedings have been initiated for an offence punishable in Canada by a maximum of 10 years' imprisonment or more and that person has claimed refugee status, a hearing by the convention refugee determination division of the Immigration and Refugee Board shall not be commenced or shall be adjourned until a final decision on extradition is rendered.

If the decision is made not to extradite the person, the convention refugee determination division hearing may commence or resume.

If the person is committed for extradition by an extradition judge and ordered surrendered by the Minister of Justice, the order of surrender is deemed to be a decision by the CRDD that the person is not a convention refugee because of the evidentiary grounds presented in the extradition case of a serious non-political offence.

This is in keeping with the exclusion on grounds of serious non-political crimes provided by article 1F(b) of the Refugee Convention to which Canada is bound.

I cannot end my overview of Bill C-40 without mentioning the important modifications to the Criminal Code, the Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Act and the Canada Evidence Act which allow for the use of video and audio-link technology to gather evidence and provide testimony from witnesses in Canada or abroad.

Although these modifications will contribute to a more efficient extradition process in specific cases, their aim is much broader as they will allow the use of such technology in criminal and other proceedings as well.

In an age of amazing technological development it is critical that our laws and justice system are flexible enough to permit the use of that technology where possible, appropriate and beneficial to proceedings.

When globalization of new technologies is expanding the reach of organized crime we must ensure that our justice system also uses new technologies to capture and prosecute criminals. Where witnesses cannot be brought before the court because they are outside Canada or they are in another part of Canada and circumstances preclude their attendance, the use of video or audio-link technology is a much better alternative than the written statement or the taking of evidence by a foreign court.

I believe that these modifications represent a major, possibly revolutionary, change in testimonial evidence which takes into account modern day realities and the rights of the accused.

The bill provides that, in respect of video and audio-link evidence from Canada to a foreign state, the laws relating to evidence and procedure of a foreign state would apply as though the person testifying in Canada was physically before the court outside Canada, but only if the evidence would not disclose

information otherwise protected by the Canadian law of non-disclosure of information or privilege.

However, the bill also provides that the Canadian law relating to contempt of court, perjury and contradictory evidence would apply to these persons, parties or witnesses, whether they are testifying from Canada to a foreign state or from outside Canada to Canada.

In the case of evidence given by the video or audio-link in Canada by a witness elsewhere in Canada, the bill amends the Criminal Code so that the court could order that such evidence be provided by such means if it is appropriate considering all the circumstances.

The court shall receive evidence given by video-link by a witness outside of Canada unless one of the parties satisfies the court that the reception of such testimony would be contrary to the principles of fundamental justice in this country. The court may receive evidence given by audio links from a witness outside Canada, if it would be appropriate considering all the circumstances.

● (1630)

[*Translation*]

In conclusion, I wish to once again stress the importance of that legislation for Canada and its partners. It brings about a comprehensive review of Canada's extradition provisions, so as to provide law enforcement authorities and prosecutors with the tools they need to co-operate with other states and entities, in order to counteract the threat of transborder crime and ensure that Canada never becomes a haven for fugitives.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Sackville—Eastern Shore, Automotive Industry; the hon. member for Tobique—Mactaquac, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Summit.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill C-40. It is noble to modernize the Extradition Act and in fact is long overdue.

Canada's current policies are outdated, slow and complex. As a consequence we have members of genocidal regimes, killers and illegals by the thousands in Canada living off Canadian society. We do not know how many or where they are. Maybe Bill C-40 will not be of much use until we devise a more efficient screening and monitoring system for illegal refugees in Canada.

Reform supports extraditing these individuals to face international criminal courts like Rwanda and Yugoslavia war crimes tribunals. We believe in justice. These tribunals and the concept of an international court with independent powers to prosecute war

### *Government Orders*

criminals is a 50 year dream and is laudable. The process to establish such a court has been a very difficult road. Canada can take some solace in knowing that it has played such a pivotal role in getting members to the table in the last minute negotiations and in the hesitancy of some.

The new international criminal court will have power to investigate, prosecute, indict and try persons for the most serious crimes of international concern, including genocide, crimes against humanity and crimes of aggression.

Canada is one of the 119 signatories to this historic event. By the Canadian government's own admission Canada has been a refuge for war criminals and former members of genocidal regimes. Due to our ineffectual immigration screening, removal and enforcement system the problem is out of hand. Now at least if we can find these illegals we have somewhere to send them.

The solicitor general keeps promising a crackdown on Canadian organizations that are fronts for foreign terrorists. He says that this is a serious problem. The auditor general agrees and says that Canada has been negligent in dealing with it. We all respect what the auditor general says because it is his group that is independent and tells us what is going on in the government of the day, no matter who it is.

It is not comforting to hear the solicitor general say that Canada had become a haven for every known terrorist group in the world. It is a sobering thought and it is about time we did something about it. I repeat that because it is not too often the solicitor general of any government would say that. He said that Canada had become a haven for every known terrorist group in the world. The bill is a small part of solving some of that problem.

We not only have terrorists groups in Canada. We have some 324 modern day war criminals and another 62 suspected war criminals in Canada. Those are the ones we know about. We have among us death squad members, torturers, individuals accused of genocide and officials from corrupt regimes in Somalia, Bosnia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Haiti, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Rwanda and El Salvador, a virtual cornucopia of the world's worst.

● (1635)

That is a pathetic statement about the pathetic immigration system in Canada. We would not be here today debating Bill C-40 if we had an immigration system that really worked. Our immigration system has played the refugee game with these individuals for too long. War criminals are not refugees just because they arrive at the border and say that they are refugees. They are war criminals and we have to take a very tough stand on that issue.

Bill C-40 changes a 120 year old law. There are not too many members who will ever get to debate a bill that old in the House. The present statute allows Canada to extradite criminal suspects to other countries but not to the tribunal set up by the United Nations

*Government Orders*

to prosecute war criminals from the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

Bill C-40 will now allow Canada to send suspects to a permanent international court. For years Canada pressed for such courts but ironically our law would not allow us to extradite the suspects.

Bill C-40 will modernize extradition proceedings by allowing extradition to face international criminal court like Rwanda and Yugoslavia war crimes tribunals, by broadening the grounds for extradition but removing the list of indictable offences and replacing it with the requirements that the conduct be an offence in both countries, and by permitting the temporary surrender of a convict who is serving time in Canada to another state to face trial there. Is it not interesting that they use the phrase "the temporary surrender of a convict who is serving time" to somewhere else to face a trial there? I will discuss that later.

Bill C-40 will modernize extradition proceedings by permitting the use of video and audio technology to conduct hearings. It is nice to know we are getting into the modern age. It will link the extradition and refugee appeals process where a person has sought to avoid extradition by claiming to be a refugee. The law had to be changed to save Canada from the embarrassment it is facing on this issue.

The Reform Party is not without its reservations regarding some elements of Bill C-40 despite what it purports to do. Bill C-40 is meant to streamline the extradition process by rolling two existing bills, the Fugitive Offenders Act of 1882 and the Extradition Act of 1877, into one bill.

Will the system be less complex? We do not know that. These two old bills have not worked and now we have one new bill. Will it be less complex? Will it allow Canadians to know that the people arrested for these offences can be extradited, tried somewhere else and removed from Canada in a very expeditious manner?

The clause in Bill C-40 which would effectively broaden the grounds for extradition by abandoning what is known as the list approach to offences is a welcome change. The current system, which only allows for extradition of the criminal when the act is part of an official list, is outdated and cumbersome. The list of offences varies from country to country.

Under Bill C-40 an extraditable offence will be a crime in both countries. This will not just happen. I sense a lot of co-ordination will have to take place to get the system working properly.

Bill C-40 will ease the rules that dictate the sort of evidence that must be presented by a nation seeking the extradition of an alleged offender. Canada has been criticized in the past for its narrow approach to what can be used as evidence. This is new territory. In fact it is a quantum change. I suspect much preparatory work will have to be done.

Bill C-40 will allow the flexibility to deal on a case by case basis with extradition requests where no treaty is in place.

Getting back to the two war crimes tribunals established in The Hague and in Tanzania, this is the first time in 50 years since Nuremberg that the world community has acted to create an international jurisdiction to hold individuals responsible for international crimes.

In the Rwanda situation alone 32 people indicted by the tribunal are facing charges for the slaughter of an estimated 800,000 people during a three month rampage in 1994.

• (1640)

As I said before, there are some concerns with the bill. Bill C-40, despite removing many layers of appeals in the extradition process, involved courts to minister, to refugee board, back to minister and then back to court. It would be naive to believe that Bill C-40 makes extradition immediate.

Delays have always favoured the accused because witnesses die. The supreme court in the Askov case asked that trials be held within a six month period to ensure that justice be done. That does not happen very often. Six months is a very short period of time for most of these cases. As Justice Gibson of the federal court ruled, Canada cannot deport people without a fair and just assessment of whether they would face the risk of torture if returned.

What this means to me is court challenges and charter defences right up to the supreme court. Bill C-40 will be tested. Is it watertight? We have to produce bills in the House that can meet the test of the supreme court. We cannot be using the supreme court as a judge of what the people who were elected to govern Canada should be doing. I am afraid the bill does not meet that test. The supreme court may have asked for hearings within a six month period, but as we all know extradition routinely takes many years.

Let me talk about charter appeals and provide four examples of delay and why I am fearful Bill C-40 will not conclude this charter madness. Charter appeals on the grounds of cruel and unusual punishment allow multiple appeals as highlighted by the following: Rafay and Burns. Murder was committed in 1994 by this pair. The case will be heard in the supreme court in November. The B.C. Court of Appeal found that the minister had to refuse extradition because they faced execution for bludgeoning Rafay's parents to death.

Pierino and Michael Divito are Mafia figures wanted in the U.S. for conspiracy to import 300 kilos of cocaine. It goes to court because of a much harsher drug sentence handed out in the U.S. Their lawyers vow that they will go all the way to the supreme court. Why are they going to the Supreme Court? They do not want to be tried in the United States because they will go to jail for a long

*Government Orders*

time. They want to stay in Canada. Does this law solve that problem? I do not think it does.

Salavatore Cazzetta, leader of the Rock Machine biker gang, wanted in the U.S. for drug trafficking charges, was delayed extradition for four years with arguments taken all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Michael Gwynne, a fugitive serving a 120 year sentence, was apprehended in 1993. He has argued his case for five years all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. In short, Bill C-40 does nothing to preclude these types of appeals.

I would like to read from a July 29, 1997 article by Jeffrey Simpson in the *Globe and Mail*. It has to do with the Rafay case and what he calls charter madness. I believe this article represents what an overwhelming majority of Canadians think. He wrote:

On July 12, 1994, the parents of Atif Rafay were bludgeoned to death with a baseball bat at their home in Bellevue, Wash. Local police suspected the murderers were Atif Rafay and a friend, Glen Burns. Lacking enough evidence, however, the police asked for and received undercover co-operation from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, since the two suspects lived in Canada and were Canadian citizens.

Courtesy of the undercover operation, Atif and Glen admitted they had killed Mr. Rafay's parents for life insurance and the value of the parents' home. These admissions were voluntary.

Case closed. But hold on. We live in the Age of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which gives the ruling of judges greater impact on criminal law than anything done by a mere minister of justice or group of parliamentarians.

Now, in the Rafay-Burns case, the B.C. Court of Appeal relied on the Charter to block the extradition of the two men wanted for murder in the United States.

Why? It was because Canada had abolished the death penalty. He continued:

Were the two men found guilty in Washington and put to death, as that state's laws allow, then their charter rights would be violated, including the one that any Canadian citizen is allowed to return home.

Canada, of course, always waxes indignant when the United States or any other country tries to impose its laws on others. Nothing gets Canadians to sit more upright on their white charger of morality than denouncing the "extraterritorial" application of U.S. laws. But if Canadian laws, as in this charter case, are being applied in an extraterritorial sense, that is, our charter must protect even those accused of first degree murder, then everything is fine because we just have to believe our sense of justice is superior to that of the Americans.

If these had been U.S. citizens, the extraditions would have proceeded.

But because the two are Canadians and therefore entitled, in the opinion of the court, to the full protection of the charter wherever they are, including for acts possibly committed in another country, they cannot be extradited.

This is charter madness, of which plenty is going around. When foreigners travel in this country, they obey Canadian laws and pay the penalty if they break them. They may not like our penalties, they may think their system of justice back home is superior, but that's one of the risks people take when travelling, let alone committing first degree murder.

Similarly, when Canadians are on U.S. soil, U.S. laws apply. If we break those laws and flee back across the border to escape punishment, an extradition treaty properly clicks into place so that Canada is not a "safe haven" for criminals of whatever nationality, Canadian or otherwise. That we might not favour capital punishment (and I don't) doesn't mean we impose our sense of what is right for Canadian citizens accused of first degree murder somewhere where the death penalty applies. But of course, in the age of the charter, this sort of common sense, community protecting sort of reasoning is out the window of judicial policy making.

• (1645)

That story alone should let us know there is a serious problem.

I have heard debates in this House over the last couple of weeks that sometimes members on this side do not listen to what the public wants. There is a quote on the gun control bill, why do you not listen to what the public wants. In this case, 85% of Canadians would vote for capital punishment if there was a referendum.

Yet we have two young people who murdered one of the fellow's parents in a terrible crime and should have to face that penalty. But here they are sitting in a Canadian jail at Canadian expense just because of where they were born.

None of us would respect that. None of us expect that we can run across the border, rob a bank and head back home because perhaps our laws are better. That is what is happening with our laws in this country. That is why we are becoming one of the biggest import-export areas for drugs in the world. Our sentences are too weak and one cannot be extradited if caught.

This bill is not going solve those problems. We are going to have a lot of interesting times in committee asking questions of those who drafted this bill to see if it really gets to where it has to get. The people in the House right here get to make the laws, not those people sitting a couple of blocks away in the supreme court.

I have another objection to Bill C-40. The bill preserves the minister's discretion in cases. This is part of the delay problem. It injects the minister into a judicial process. It is wrong and we will not support that aspect of the bill. This should not be the minister's role. This is a judicial role, an independent role.

We cannot have any tinge of political interference when it comes to extradition for criminal offences. The minister should have no discretion to seek assurances on sentences, period. What it does is it imposes standards which necessarily vary from one minister to the next, or from one country to the next.

The role of the court should be simple in these extradition cases. The conduct complained of is a crime in Canada, a very simple rule. The person sought is in fact the person accused. Again it is very simple. There is a valid extradition treaty. The bottom line is



*Government Orders*

that the severity of the punishment in the other country should be irrelevant.

I have another concern. Extradition is costly. I have some questions about the mechanics and the logistics of Bill C-40. We have called a number of government departments and have read the bill very thoroughly ourselves. These questions are not answered in the bill.

• (1650)

Who pays for the transportation of a criminal to the War Crimes Tribunal or the International Court? Who pays any related costs? Who pays for legal counsel for the accused in charter cases? And we know they are all going to go to the max, to the supreme court. Who pays for the legal defence before the tribunal? It had better not be Canada that is on the hook. Why should we pay to get rid of someone wanted by someone else?

It is not unlike the process right now. When someone comes to this country and says the word refugee at the border, we accept them. We pay their health costs and their legal costs, all the way for every court they go to. We know the majority of these people are just trying to jump the queue which is not acceptable to most Canadians. To an overwhelming majority of Canadians that is just not acceptable.

Bill C-40 may improve some things but it is not perfect. We will be exploring many more details of this bill in the committee and seeking answers to the questions I posed in my opening remarks today.

We look forward to working with members on this side and the other side in the committee to get, after 120 years sitting on the books of Canada, a bill that will work, that will please Canadians and a bill in which the will of Canadians cannot be changed by a small number of people up the street from the House of Commons. We want to make sure this bill is airtight so that it does the job and works for all Canadians.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonneuve, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I want to say from the outset that the Bloc Québécois supports the principle of this legislation, and in fact the bill itself, since, as it was mentioned, it updates a century old act. Who knows, Mr. Speaker, you might reach that age too.

Before getting into the thick of things, I would like, with your permission, to wish a happy 20th birthday to an employee of the House of Commons who works in the West Block, and who is at our service every day. That young person is Jude-Étienne Blan-

chette. I would ask the members of this House to join me in wishing him a happy birthday.

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

**Mr. Réal Ménard:** I also wish much success to a new clerk of the House of Commons, Nancy Hall, with whom I had the pleasure of working in the subcommittee on HIV and AIDS.

Let us now turn our attention to Bill C-40. This is an important piece of legislation, because extradition must be viewed with two realities in mind. The first one is of course the movement of people between countries. We are well aware that one of the reasons for this bill is that 100 years ago, the means of communication were not what they are now.

We must remember that, 100 years ago, people traveled by train. A hundred years ago, there was no Internet. A hundred years ago, the whole issue of telemarketing did not exist. A hundred years ago, the burning issues were railroads and electrical energy. Those were the days of Sigmund Freud, with whose name people will be familiar. I myself am an admirer of Freud, the father of psychoanalysis, a man who left his mark.

A hundred years later, we realize that the question of population flows—the word itself suggests mobility—is connected with crime. There are all sorts of new types of crime one must think about.

Before going into Bill C-40 in detail, let us think about money laundering alone. If any one member in this House has raised this matter, it is the very one who speaks to you now, because money laundering is connected with the most troubling threat, the parallel economy. If I asked you to bet on the figures involved in money laundering, I am sure you could not hit on the figure.

• (1655)

That is why I will promptly provide you with that figure: somewhere in the order of \$20 billion involved in money laundering. Not a figure to be sneezed at.

The merit of the bill lies in its desire to bring the legislation up to date, to simplify it. For this reason, it must be understood right off the bat that, in reality, two pieces of legislation are involved when we are discussing Bill C-40: the Extradition Act, for there is such a piece of legislation, and the Fugitive Offenders Act.

Until very recently, Canada was not in a position to honour its obligations on the international level. The parliamentary secretary has said so, eloquently moreover, and I must congratulate her on this. She reminded us that this hundred-year-old legislation was completely unsuited to the realities of modern extradition.



*Government Orders*

We are seeing an international consciousness, in which the Bloc Québécois is playing a large role, and an increasing interest in the concept of international tribunals. As we speak, there are 97 conflicts going on in the world. Amazingly, of this number, 94 are intra-state, meaning that they do not extend beyond a country's borders.

In such conflicts, there are people who commit crimes and leave their own country for another, hence the need for extradition legislation.

I have forgotten to mention the two lawyers who briefed me. I am thinking of Mr. Lemire, and of Mr. Roy. I wish to thank them. I think they are seated nearby. I thank them for the serious and professional manner in which they shared their knowledge with me. I cannot claim to have attained their level of expertise, but I did my best.

The bill we are discussing, Bill C-40, will combine two statutes. It will amend the principle of extradition, producing a completely modern bill.

In times gone by, extradition was associated with a list of offences for which an individual was sought, here and in other countries. This posed a problem because there were certain acts that were considered offences in Canada, that were not necessarily viewed that way in other countries.

Nowadays, I understand that, with this bill, there is less interest in maintaining lists, which necessitated legislative amendment to make the changes; we are now going with the legal concept of comparable offences. The offence we are talking about must carry with it a sentence of a minimum of two years. I think we will find this flexibility very useful in the future.

Another very important aspect of the bill is that it clarifies the roles of the department, that is, the minister, and the various courts. We are talking about a regular court of law here, if my notions of law are correct. This in fact was one of the exam questions when I was interested in such things. The difference between a court of law and an administrative tribunal—I imagine all my colleagues could slip me the answer, but I am going to continue with my own theory—is that a court of law does not administer a specific law, but responds to a set of laws.

As my example of an administrative tribunal, I cite the Régie du logement and the CSSTs. The Immigration and Refugee Board is an administrative tribunal, which administers a law, and therefore may develop a certain specialization.

It establishes a division of labour, a specialization under which the law establishes very specific and defined roles for the judges whose prime responsibility will be to ensure that an offence against Canada has truly occurred.

• (1700)

They will also have to assess the evidence, and that is extremely important. As you know, justice is not served if the evidence cannot be objectively, intelligently and impartially assessed.

Then there is the Department of Justice. Our fine and attractive Minister of Justice will, under all circumstances, have to make a decision on the extradition process. She will have to ratify—I say ratify, but members will understand that in each case that is submitted to her—

I was surprised to learn of the level of intimacy in the process. I thought it was automatic, until Mr. Lemire and Mr. Roy told me otherwise. In a way this is reassuring, because it means that political authority is more than just political authority.

The human authority must take a look at the extradition issue. Why? First, to make sure that when a state asks for the extradition of an individual who is guilty of an offence both in Canada and in his country of origin, his extradition will not expose that individual to abuse or to violations of his rights as a human being.

I was very pleased to learn during a briefing that a provision of the bill specifically provides that when human rights are violated, when the individual committed a punishable offence that carries a two-year jail term, and when it is feared that the individual will be discriminated against for motives that are prohibited under the Canadian law and charter, then the minister can reject the request for extradition.

We are, referring to possible violations based on political beliefs or marital status. One's sexual orientation is not included in the legislation, but I know we can count on the parliamentary secretary to agree to an amendment that the Bloc Québécois will table in committee.

The minister will have the option, when she is concerned about the conditions surrounding the extradition of an individual detained in Canada, to oppose such extradition.

Again, the great merit of this bill is, of course, that it updates a century old act that was rarely amended, but it is also that it targets the new forms of crime.

Crime is a national reality, but it is also an international one. This is something that reaches across borders. In fact, until recently, and I am not sure it is not still the case to some extent, Canada was considered a haven for organized crime.

Mr. Speaker, you know—not from personal experience but from what you heard—how organized crime works. There are usually three phases. I had this explained to me at the time when I was taking a special interest in this issue.

*Government Orders*

In 1995, the late Daniel Desrochers, a 13-year old boy, was the innocent victim of a car bombing a few feet away from my constituency office in Hochelaga—Maisonneuve. This incident reminded us of the battle going on in the underworld, especially between two biker gangs, namely the Hell's Angels and the Rock Machines, for control over the drug market. Following this incident, many of my fellow citizens and I felt the urge to find out more about organized crime.

I then came to realize that it is not only a national but also an international phenomenon.

• (1705)

I also came to realize that organized crime works in stages or phases. The first stage consists in taking control over a territory. That makes sense. Members of criminal organization need a place to operate. These places meet very specific criteria.

There is no organized crime to speak of in the third world. There is a lot of corruption of course. There are drug traffickers, and several countries come to mind. But organized crime as we know it in Canada and Quebec is only possible in a country of plenty.

There are a number of prerequisites for organized crime to flourish. First, this requires a state with a highly complex legal system. We already know how many people hold that the charter of rights adopted in 1982, without the consent of Quebec, constitutes a hindrance in the battle against organized crime, because in a bureaucratized state with a highly complex legal system there are fundamental guarantees, over and above sections 7 through 14 of the charter, which slow down the judiciary process.

Of course, like my colleagues on the other side of the House, we in the Bloc Québécois would not like to go back to a time when there were no judiciary guarantees and a person could fall victim to wrongful acts by the judiciary without much hope of redress.

A brief aside: some of my colleagues, militants from way back, who lived through the 1970 October Crisis, when habeas corpus was suspended, know what it is to live with discretionary imprisonment, hateful as that is, and other judiciary abuses. This is why it is so important to have judiciary guarantees in a constitutional state.

Now, back to the bread and butter of the issue, or perhaps I should speak instead of sheep and lambs, to please the hon. member for Louis-Hébert. Our thanks to her, incidentally, for the excellent lamb she offered us this morning. I wish our Liberal colleagues could have been there too. It brought our thoughts back to the battle this hon. member has been waging, along with some of her colleagues, for instance the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques. The excellent lamb served reminds us of the Department of Agriculture's need to review its policy on scrapie.

That said, back to organized crime. Organized crime runs in stages, and this is a national reality. With cross-border trade, the figure of \$20 million laundered has become an international reality.

The first stage of organized crime is gaining control over a territory, and the second, almost inevitably, is money laundering. I do not wish to go too far off-topic, but what does it take to convince this government—

I would like the parliamentary secretary to look up and take note when I ask her to work very hard within her caucus to convince the Minister of Justice—a woman who is generally easy to get along with, except when she is speaking about constitutional law and can get carried away—to take \$1,000 bank notes out of circulation, because it leads directly to money laundering.

If we were to do a little informal survey of our colleagues, of those in the gallery, of listeners, and ask how many of them had a \$1,000 bill on them, with the notable exception of yourself, Mr. Speaker, there would be very few. That is why the \$1,000 bank note lends itself to money laundering. Canada is the only country to have this denomination.

The first phase, therefore, is taking over an area. The second is money laundering. The third, and most important, is the phase which, according to a certain number of analysts, Canada is well into, in which the underworld invests in legal and illegal activities. This is a cause for concern.

• (1710)

It is a cause for concern because, without strong legislation, and of course Bill C-40 is a step in the right direction, legal and illegal activities can cover quite a range.

For example, the underworld is now investing in luxury items such as jewels and fur coats, and, we have to be honest, casinos. And of course, the drug culture provides it with its main source of income.

Crime is a very real concern. Just recently, perhaps a year and a half ago, I believe we passed an extremely memorable milestone, providing our society with more weapons for the battle we must wage against those on the other side of the law. That milestone was the passage of legislation on gangs, and I believe I made a modest contribution to this.

Of course, it will always be the government that gets credit for its enactment, but I believe that, without the political pressure brought to bear and the arguments made daily by myself and my Bloc Québécois colleagues from Montreal and other regions, there would not have been such early awareness of the necessity of legislation against organized crime. That legislation created a new criminal offence, and provided both police forces and judges with additional tools.

For those who may have just joined us, Bill C-40 is a bill which combines two existing laws with the intent of bringing the extradition process into the present day, not only bringing it into the present day, but also simplifying it, by not only listing the criminal offences but also including the concept of offences punishable in both states.

As we know, Canada has extradition agreements with 49 states, as well as being a signatory of eight multilateral conventions. If there should happen not to be a treaty with the states concerned, it will be possible to proceed on a case-specific base and the law will allow extradition without a treaty, using the process of a designation or agreement specific to a particular case.

Another quite interesting clause in the bill concerns the Immigration and Refugee Board, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Immigration, the hon. member for Westmount—Ville-Marie.

It may happen within the extradition process that the person involved is also claiming political refugee status. We know how the refugee status determination process works. It is a pretty rotten, petty and patronage-ridden system, in my opinion. Essentially, however, how it works is that it allows a person from another country to come into Canadian territory and apply for political refugee status under the Geneva Convention, asking for asylum in Canada.

Generally, it is because we have reasons to believe that, in his or her country of origin, the person could be persecuted on the basis of political or religious beliefs. It is also increasingly frequent to grant refugee status to people because we fear for their physical integrity and are concerned that they might suffer some kind of reprisals because of their sexual orientation.

Since Canada is a signatory to the Geneva convention, refugee status is determined by first accepting a person into the country. An officer meets the person, who fills out a personal information card. The officer then determines if there is a credible basis for the claim.

• (1715)

If so, the person is allowed to continue the process. The file is then referred to the Immigration and Refugee Board, more specifically to the Convention Refugee Determination Division. The board makes decisions. It makes its decisions through an accelerated process, or with two board members being present.

We hope, of course, that the process will change. It must change, if only because, on average, it takes three years to reach a decision. This is rather unbelievable, considering that if a person comes here as a political refugee, it is because that person is in trouble. The process should be a lot faster than it is.

### *Government Orders*

What happens when a decision takes a long time, when it takes three years? As the member for Jonquière pointed out, people get used to being here. They learn the language, they find a job, they develop relationships with their neighbours and they become part of our society.

Sometimes, after having been here two or three years and having integrated themselves to the Canadian society, they are told they are not recognized as political refugees. They must then leave the country. Some will argue there are ways to appeal the decision. It is true, particularly through the federal court. But in reality, the decisions made by the Immigration and Refugee Board are very rarely overturned at the appeal level.

The process is somewhat inefficient, but with Bill C-40, it will be possible to consider that a decision made by the justice department on refugee status determination will also apply for the purposes of the Immigration and Refugee Board.

Some may construe this as interference. I for one think it is a sensible approach and that it makes sense, for the sake of consistency, that a decision made by the justice department on refugee status determination be binding and apply to the Immigration and Refugee Board.

I hope that we will dispose quickly of Bill C-40, which is not a very controversial bill. I heard our colleagues from the Reform Party express a number of grievances, and there is nothing wrong with that. They probably had more to do with the cost of implementing the legislation. This is a concern—I was about to say an obsession—but I personally believe that the real challenge, as events will show, should lead us to consider and thoroughly review the Immigration Act. We can agree that two here is work to be done in that area.

Yesterday, the Minister of Immigration, a woman always perfectly in control of her faculties, who is not prone to anger and verbal abuse and always speaks in a soft voice whether the moment is grave and solemn or festive, told us “We will be tabling legislation shortly”.

That is not enough. We must know when legislation will be tabled. It is especially important since the Trempe commission, masterfully presided by the former deputy minister of immigration in Quebec, concluded in its report that the immigration system did not make any sense. If there is one priority we must raise as members of parliament, that is it.

The Trempe report asked that a distinction be made between people who come here as immigrants, who chose Quebec or Canada often on the basis of professional skills, and those who come here because of hardship due to the international situation or to problems inherent to their country of origin and seek political asylum. The Trempe report suggested that a distinction be made and that a protection agency be established.

*Government Orders*

• (1720)

There is a problem that must be mentioned, that I think people should be aware of. I am sure the parliamentary secretary knows what I am referring to. The Immigration and Refugee Board is a patronage haven.

I could give examples. I do not know whether it parliamentary to do so? I will take a chance. There is Mrs. Robic, the former Minister of Immigration for Quebec, for instance. That is a good appointment, because she was the Minister of Immigration. She was a Liberal, of course, but nobody is perfect.

There were other appointments to this Immigration and Refugee Board, including the president of Alliance Quebec. We are hearing a lot about Alliance Quebec. The shock waves can surly be felt all the way out in Edmonton. He was appointed. Is there anyone that can say to the House that the former president of Alliance Quebec was familiar with international law? Was he interested in immigration? Of course not. That has nothing to do with his ability to learn. I would agree, but could we not leave patronage behind, and follow the example of the Parti Quebecois, which will have an objective procedure and where the candidates chosen will be career public servants?

That was what the Trempe report called for. It recommended that there be a process whereby people with an interest in immigration law and international law and who would make it their career would be appointed to the public service, by competition. Is there anything nobler than a career in the public service of one's country?

This is the direction that should be taken. For my part, as a member of parliament, I hope that we move rapidly to adopt such a process. Let me say right off that the government will be able to rely on the enthusiastic, not to say ardent, support of the opposition, particularly yours truly.

Those are my comments. I will conclude by saying that we will support the general philosophy behind the bill, as well as its economic impact. Certainly, there will be a few amendments, because we have a dual objective. First, we want to attain sovereignty, as everyone knows, but our more immediate goal is to improve government. That is what the opposition is all about. It is arduous work, with no end in sight. We will work in committee to improve the bill. We will move a few amendments but, on the whole, this is a worthy bill that we will support.

[*English*]

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise on behalf of the NDP caucus and address Bill C-40 at second reading. On behalf of our justice critic, the member for Sydney—Victoria, I would like to announce that our caucus is supportive of Bill C-40. We are pleased to see many of the changes

being introduced in terms of trying to harmonize a piece of legislation that was spread out over many other pieces of legislation in the past which made it very cumbersome and complicated.

I do not have nearly as much to say about this as the previous speaker from the Bloc. This is not my area of expertise. I will stick to the very limited, narrow subject matter here, the proposed legislation.

The legislation is intended to bring our extradition procedures more in line and closer to those of other countries to prevent Canada from becoming some kind of safe haven for international criminals, those who do not benefit our country. We want the international co-operation and the tools at our disposal to send these people where justice will be served.

• (1725)

One of the major problems with the current legislation, as pointed out by the parliamentary secretary, is the difficulty for Canada to meet its international obligations in any kind of an international criminal court or tribunal. It is ironic that Canada has been one of the most outspoken countries in trying to create such an international court and to oblige people to serve or to attend that international court, but under the current system we cannot extradite a fugitive to such a body. Obviously that is a limitation that needs to be corrected.

We feel that Bill C-40 is necessary and beneficial because the current legislation does not deal with things like the newer high tech crimes and is not flexible enough to accommodate changes arising from the globalization of criminal activity, for instance the drug trade, organized and transborder crimes. The increased mobility of individuals makes the need for effective extradition relations with other countries more important than it ever has been in the past.

When we look at the two acts that covered extradition in the past, the Fugitive Offenders Act and the Extradition Act, both were enacted in the 1800s, 1877 and 1882. That kind of legislation is even older than my colleague from Sackville—Eastern Shore and obviously needs to be revisited, updated, reviewed and amended. We are glad to see Bill C-40 coming in to do that.

The NDP caucus is in support of measures to prevent Canada from becoming a safe haven for fugitives, as I mentioned. We are in favour of enhanced human rights protections and safeguards for persons who are the subject of an extradition request. I believe Bill C-40 will further enhance those human rights issues associated with the extradition.

The NDP caucus is in favour of provisions for extradition of persons to international tribunals and courts, as mentioned. We feel that is one of the big benefits. Obviously we are in favour of modernizing the act to deal with high tech and organized crime.



One of the things we have reservations and concerns about is with the changes being proposed that would permit the admissibility of a broader range of types of evidence in cases of extradition hearings. We have some serious reservations and concerns with the powers to exclude certain persons from extraditions hearings. We believe Bill C-40 will augment the ability to exclude certain types.

The non-publication of evidence provisions has been dealt with in Bill C-40. We have some serious concerns about that. Most fundamentally, the NDP has a very grave concern that safeguards regarding the imposition of the death penalty are not really made binding. We have not really ever addressed whether Canada is going to promote or allow the extradition of criminals to places where they could stand and be executed where the death penalty still exists. We do not believe Bill C-40 has really addressed that adequately and that is one of the serious reservations we have.

I would like to add a small anecdotal piece of information. I do not know a great deal about the legislation and the history of extradition, but I know in my own riding of one case that I have been working on at great length trying to get a woman extradited to the United States so that she can stand trial for the murder of her husband, a Canadian citizen and a member of the Canadian military who was murdered in Florida. The grand jury of the United States stood for eight minutes before indicting this person that there are probable grounds for this person's standing trial. I can attest to how frustrating it is to try to get a person extradited from this country.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** When next this bill is before parliament, the hon. member for Winnipeg Centre will have approximately 15 minutes.

[Translation]

It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

• (1730)

[English]

### PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

**Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC)** moved:

That, in the opinion of the House, the government should overhaul all its programs for young people, in order to evaluate their impact and performance, and in order to ensure that all funds for such programs maximize young people's chances of joining the labour force.

### Private Members' Business

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I start I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to pass over to my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's West, the closing five minutes that I have available to me.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean Dubé:** Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged to be able to raise an issue that is particularly close to my heart.

The motion I am putting forward today reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should overhaul all its programs for young people in order to evaluate their impact and performance, and in order to ensure that all funds for such programs maximize young people's chances of joining the labour force.

In the coming minutes, I will explain my reasoning on the merits of this motion.

We all agree that the government is already paying out a significant amount of money in various programs for young people. According to government documents, the Youth Employment Strategy alone "makes effective use of investments of over \$2 billion the Government of Canada has set up for young people". That is quite a sum.

The Youth Employment Strategy combines 250 programs. Funding for these initiatives comes from some 12 departments, including Human Resources Development Canada, Industry Canada, Heritage Canada and a number of others.

Sometimes several departments share in the funding of a program. This can create an accountability problem. There can be a whole slew of programs, but they have to be effective, and the resources must not be wasted.

Since there is no central body controlling all these programs, they are not readily available to young people. There is a web site, but the government must make it much better known. A number of young people simply do not know about all these programs.

I want to assure all the members of this House that my motion does not arise from a preconceived idea that all the programs are bad and useless. Far from it. My aim is to ask the government to ensure that the money intended for young people is spent on effective and useful programs. Young people deserve it.

As parliamentarians, our duty is to insist on an accounting and to ensure that Canadian taxpayers' money is put to good use.

In order to focus today's debate, let us take the Canada student loans program as an example. I am sure all MPs are aware of this program, which affects nearly 60% of post-secondary students.



*Private Members' Business*

The Canada student loan program, or CSLP, represents a huge investment by the government.

• (1735)

The Department of Human Resources Development estimates that the CSLP has given out loans of some \$15 billion to over 2.7 million Canadians since its inception in 1964. Also according to the department, the average debt load in 1990 of a student in a four-year program was \$8,700. In 1998, they expect the debt load to be some \$25,000. In other words, student debt has grown by 187% in Canada in only eight years.

Can we talk of effective investment when so many Canadians are struggling under the weight of overpowering debt even before they start their career?

The government has taken a number of steps to try to ease young people's passage from their studies to the workplace. I am sure its intentions are good, but the results are sometimes dismal.

Let us take a look at the current youth employment situation. In August, youth unemployment was at 14.5%, almost double the Canadian rate. In my province of New Brunswick, youth unemployment is close to 25%. In 1996, 17.7% of welfare cases in Canada were single parents under the age of 24. These figures certainly suggest there is a problem.

Part of the problem is that, in recent years, the transition between school and work has been made more difficult by the limited job creation that had taken place since the 1990-91 recession. This has particular impact on those who do not have the training or skills currently in demand on the job market.

Young people in the high risk group, those who did not complete their secondary education, are particularly affected. There are simply no jobs for them. Most of the jobs available for low skilled workers before them have been made obsolete by technological innovation or have moved to a third world country where labour is cheap.

As for young people in the average risk groups, those with secondary education but no post-secondary education, they have seen their diploma lose much of its worth. More and more employers are looking for people with post-secondary education for positions that, less than one generation ago, would have gone to high school graduates.

And young people at low risk, those with post-secondary degrees, need something to help them make the transition to the labour force, to help them get their first job.

Traditionally, the unemployment rate among young people goes up when the economy is weak. However, what we are now seeing is

that young people are not taking advantage of the benefits created when the situation improves. During the last economic recovery, the gap between the unemployment rate of young people and that of adult workers did not close as much as in earlier cycles.

Whether they are studying or not, young people are over-represented in atypical jobs, that is to say part time, temporary, fixed rate, piecework, or occasional jobs, most of which are low paying and require few skills.

If society turns a blind eye to the problem, it will have to pay increased costs because of the number of unemployed workers and welfare recipients, as well as the inevitable social problems in a polarized society.

• (1740)

Studies show that long periods of unemployment result in a loss of skills and permanently alter potential employers' opinions of young people. Unemployment therefore has an impact on the present and future contribution of young workers to society.

That is why it is so important to ensure that we supply all the winning conditions that will help young people join the labour force quickly.

It is also important not to focus exclusively on the government's role. Businesses have also produced good results in the fight to help young people find jobs.

In 1997, the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce published, with the Canadian Youth Foundation, studies and profiles of very successful programs. I invite members to take a look at these documents.

I want to quote a few excerpts from one of these publications, which I find particularly relevant to our discussion:

Big numbers encourage big responses, including massive government-let "wars" against the latest social scourge. Even in these times of fiscal restraint, the first response to a big number is still to throw some money at it.

When the youth employment crisis is seen in terms of people rather than statistics, the response changes.

Programs become humanized and flexible when it's understood that real people never fit into the categories of those oh-so-precise charts and graphs.

Programs also become more unassuming without the illusion that there is one true path, one best solution for all young Canadians or for the nation. Together, these elements help make these people-centred programs particularly effective.

The government often announces with great fanfare its initiatives for young people. Just think of the millennium foundation announced in the last budget. In spite of a \$2.5 billion budget, only 7% of Canadian students will benefit from millennium scholarships. Is this a really good investment? I doubt it, particularly when you consider that this government cut \$17.3 billion from transfer payments for health and education.

Would the money not have been made better use of by the provinces, who have had to cut funding to colleges and universities, thus forcing them to raise tuition fees.

Without these cuts to the transfer payments, perhaps students would be less in debt and less in need of these millennium scholarships.

Members will have figured out that these are hypothetical questions I am asking. I have not done enough research to assess the impact of all these measures. That is why I moved the motion now before the House, moreover. If we do not have the means as individuals to assess the need for, and effectiveness of, over 250 government programs involving billions of dollars, it is absolutely necessary for someone to do this.

In conclusion, youth unemployment and underemployment rank foremost amongst the major social and economic questions facing Canadians as this century draws to a close.

I also realize that these matters cannot rest solely in the hands of governments. The private sector must also determine what it can contribute to solving these problems, and what approach it must take to give today's and tomorrow's young people the chance to play an active role in the Canada of today and tomorrow.

• (1745)

However, what we can do today is to urge the government to take the first step.

If the government absolutely wants to help improve the situation for our young people, then it will not mind reviewing the existing programs. Nor will it mind sharing the results of these reviews with members of parliament and the general public.

Lastly, the government will not hesitate to consult and involve all stakeholders, including young Canadians themselves, and to take advice from them.

Young Canadians are waiting for us to show some leadership. Let us not disappoint them.

[English]

**Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter this debate on this very important subject. I am especially happy to have a chance to outline the efficiency and the effectiveness of the Government of Canada's youth programming.

There is no question Canadians have a right to expect the best possible performance from Government of Canada investments. Certainly young Canadians are looking for results. They deserve and expect results.

I assure the member for Madawaska—Restigouche that the monitoring and evaluation of the Government of Canada's youth programs is already underway. When it launched the youth em-

### *Private Members' Business*

ployment strategy the Government of Canada instituted a comprehensive strategy to monitor the performance of its programs for youth and to evaluate their impacts.

Even more assuring, our youth employment initiatives are producing concrete results. Thousands of Canadian youth know from their own experience that the Government of Canada's youth employment strategy is working to help them find work.

I want to explore these two important points one issue at time. The first is a matter of program monitoring. As I mentioned, the Government of Canada's youth employment strategy has a built-in system to measure the strategy's success. This system includes participant follow-up surveys, longitudinal studies and individual program evaluations.

I will do a quick review of some of our key findings to date. I think they will be found very important. Youth Internship Canada, a program that provides wage subsidies to employers who create work experience opportunities at home and abroad for youth, has a stellar record. This program will create 25,000 internships in the current fiscal year. Each year Human Resources Development Canada conducts follow-up surveys with former youth internship Canada participants to assess the results of the program.

The most recent survey was in November 1997. That indicated that 88% of former project participants are now employed or have returned to school. The youth service Canada program has an equally impressive record. This initiative provides funds to community organizations to help higher risk youth find their place in the workforce.

This year some 5,000 young people will receive youth service Canada support.

The 1997 survey of the youth service Canada program found that 6 to 12 months after taking part in a youth service Canada project 85% of the youth are employed or have returned to school, and that is very impressive. Incidentally, this year Human Resources Development Canada will be going ahead with an in-depth evaluation of youth service Canada.

The Government of Canada student summer job action has enjoyed similarly positive results. Like other youth programs, this initiative is reviewed periodically through follow-up surveys with young Canadians. The 1996 survey found that 55% of placements provided work experience in the student's area of study and, just as important, we discovered that 69% of employers would not have hired a student without the Government of Canada subsidy.

Findings like these demonstrate that we are on the right track. But let me assure my hon. colleague this government is not about to rest on its laurels in this matter. In addition to the measures I have already outlined, all federal departments and agencies involved in all our 250 youth programs under the youth employment strategy

*Private Members' Business*

are required to conduct and report on the evaluation of their youth employment strategy initiatives.

• (1750)

To give members some sense of our commitment to quality of this program let me profile just one department. Human Resources Development Canada alone is conducting an interim formative evaluation as well as a final summary evaluation of its youth employment strategy initiatives. The formative evaluation is already in progress. We should be able to report back to this House on its findings by the fall of next year.

Equally valuable, all these review activities are being incorporated into longer term evaluations of the Government of Canada's youth initiatives. Human Resource Development Canada has developed an evaluation framework to integrate the results of individual departmental evaluations into an overall evaluation of the youth employment strategy. This massive undertaking will be completed within two years.

Even the newest initiatives such as those developed for youth at risk are going under the microscope. These initiatives which provide work experience and assistance to young people facing multiple barriers to employment are currently being assessed as part of the comprehensive evaluation of the youth employment strategy.

I point out that all the major initiatives under the youth employment strategy grew out of our experience with early youth programs such as youth internship Canada and youth service Canada. Our new programs are built around feedback and refinements to these pioneering programs.

Clearly there is no shortage of opportunities to identify any program weaknesses, nor is there any lack of willingness to address them properly should problems be found. That is important to note.

The fact that our youth programs enjoy such remarkable ratings, however, reinforces that Canada's youth employment strategy is meeting its commitment to help young Canadians find their way in the world of the job market. Yet we are still not content that enough is being done. That is why this year we added the Canadian opportunities strategy as well.

The Canadian opportunities strategy provides Canada study grants, Canada education savings grants, the Canadian millennium scholarship fund, tax measures for interest on Canadian student loans, part time student and child care expenses as well as more funding to university granting councils. We are making these investments in young Canadians because we know there is no better investment in the future. Learning is the absolute best guarantee for better jobs in the new millennium and the new economy. I was happy to hear the hon. member for Madawaska—

Restigouche acknowledge in his speech early on that the government is making an enormous investment in our young people.

If there is any lingering doubt about this government's ability to maximize young people's chances of joining the labour force let me bring my fellow parliamentarians up to date on our overall success. I point out that youth service Canada has helped 12,000 young Canadians in three years. Youth internship Canada has given work experience to more than 89,000 young people since 1994. I also point out that student summer job action had over 75,000 participants this last summer. I finally point out that approximately 100,000 work experience opportunities are provided each and every year. Anyone looking for evidence of the effectiveness of the Government of Canada's youth employment initiatives need look no further than these figures.

Do not get me wrong. This government is always receptive to new ideas about ways to improve our youth programs. We regularly consult with our public and private sector partners who help us to implement the youth employment strategy. Partnerships and collaboration form the cornerstone of our approach to youth programs and are the primary reason for the strategy's overwhelming success.

I do not want the hon. member to conclude that we are not open to his input and support. We are. I hope he will recognize that his motion is not necessary. This government is already doing its job of ensuring that our programs to put young people into jobs are fulfilling their mandates. That is in the best interests of young Canadians and all Canadians and in the best interests of this great country of ours.

• (1755)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, as the new youth critic for the Bloc Québécois, I am pleased to speak today on the important issue of young Quebecers' access to the labour market.

The motion before us today will shed some light on the two injustices the federal government is committing with its overall program for young people. First of all, the Liberal government is unfair to young Canadians because its first goal is not to maximize the efficiency of its youth programs, but to maximize its visibility in the eyes of young people. The government is also unfair to Quebec and young Quebecers, because of the unfair distribution of money among the provinces.

Also, the motion will demonstrate the lack of openness shown by the Liberal government, which will once again object to any public review of its programs in order to conceal their unfairness.

Before explaining my point of view any further, I will read the motion by the member for Madawaska—Restigouche we are debating today:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should overhaul all its programs for young people, in order to evaluate their impact and performance, and in order to ensure that all funds for such programs maximize young people's chances of joining the labour force.

First of all, I would like to stress that we, in the Bloc Québécois, totally agree with this motion. Such a performance review of the Liberal government's youth programs would compel it to be more transparent. To measure the performance of a new program, its goals must be clearly stated.

In theory, youth programs are aimed at creating jobs. Granted, but how many? Nobody knows. What everybody knows though is that these programs are a blatant intrusion into the provinces' jurisdiction. They create more duplication, which is bound to harm our young people.

This motion brings to mind one of the basic rules the auditor general quotes every year. In order to assess the effectiveness of government programs, we must know what their total budget and measurable goals are, and be able to measure progress in the field.

If these requirements are not met, taxpayers cannot know whether their money is wisely invested. This is a situation common to young people in Quebec and Canada as a whole.

In reality, if the Liberal government is refusing to assess the impact of these programs, it is not because it ignores basic accounting rules. It is because the first objective of the government's youth strategy has nothing to do with employment for young people.

According to the Minister of Human Resources Development himself, the ultimate objective of that program is to, and I quote "continue to work to keep our country strong and united". He said that in the House of Commons last year on October 2, 1997, in a formal speech in response to the Speech from the Throne. It is now clear that the strong and united country he is trying to impose on Quebecers will be brought about by attractive and highly visible programs.

The millennium scholarship fund is a very good example of a program that completely disregards the real needs of the young people of Quebec, of a program where visibility is the priority. First, it duplicates the Quebec loans and bursaries program. On average, Quebec students already have a smaller debt load than their counterparts in the rest of Canada: \$11,000 compared to \$25,000. In Quebec, tuition fees are about half what they are in the rest of Canada: \$1,700 compared to 3,200\$. Moreover, Quebec is the only province to award bursaries on the basis of financial need. The others only give loans.

But, as the prime minister said in this House, the visibility of the program is not negotiable, no matter what choices Quebecers made collectively concerning their education system. This is a totally unacceptable situation, but there is worse.

### *Private Members' Business*

Where is the money to finance such encroachments in areas of provincial jurisdiction coming from? The budget surplus was reached by robbing the provinces of transfer payments, for education in particular.

• (1800)

The Quebec government must now impose cuts of several hundred million dollars on its education system. This is one of the tangible results of federal budget cuts.

In other words, the federal government takes the money from one pocket and puts it in the other one, after stamping it with the Canadian flag. It has absolutely no concern for the provinces, which are responsible for consistently managing their education system as a whole, or for young people who gain nothing from being used by a government willing to do anything to promote its strong and united nature.

The money for these highly visible programs also comes from employment insurance reform. The fund surplus, which will reach \$20 billion by the end of the year, was achieved mainly by excluding many young people from entitlement to benefits.

In fact, since these limitations have been imposed, thousands of young Quebecers have had to go on welfare. The numbers speak for themselves: the recipient-unemployed ratio went down from 72% in 1990 to 26% in 1997.

Now, more young people than ever before pay premiums, while only one young person out of four is entitled to benefits if faced with unemployment. But do they receive this money back in the form of active measures, as the government claims? Let us compare the amounts.

The government wants to spend as it pleases the \$20 billion surplus that will accumulate this year in the employment insurance fund whereas, for the same year, it plans on spending \$391 million for all youth programs, which is less than 2% of the amount taken from workers and businesses who pay EI premiums.

In short, the federal government is hindering the academic training of our young people by contributing to the deterioration of the education system in Quebec. It makes our young people poorer by forcing them to go on welfare instead of making them eligible for EI benefits. And, to make itself look good and to promote a strong and united Canada, it fills university and city newspapers with ads praising its youth strategy.

As suggested in today's motion, it is high time the House of Commons as well as Canadians and Quebecers examine the real objectives of the Liberal government's cynical youth strategy.

The figures are just as disturbing with regard to Quebec's fair share. Of the \$391 million earmarked for federal youth programs,



*Private Members' Business*

Quebec gets only \$63 million. That is only 16% of the allocated funds, even though we represent 25% of the population.

Moreover, effectiveness is not the ultimate goal for these programs. The federal government has already recognized that the provinces are in a better position to meet this type of need.

That is what led the Liberals to give Quebec full responsibility for manpower training before the last federal election. If it was fine just before the election, why is the federal government now rejecting any opting out by the provinces, which could then keep on working in close co-operation with those affected by these programs?

First of all, a significant reduction in EI premiums would result in the creation of tens of thousands of jobs. As it stands now, small and medium size businesses are penalized by the regressive payroll taxes of the federal government. The end result is that the way we are financing the EI system not only kills jobs by increasing the cost of labour, but kills a great deal of them in the businesses that tend to create most jobs.

I used a few examples to show that a good youth strategy is not necessarily a strategy that will give the most visibility to the federal government. I support motion M-213 because it would help us make a clear distinction between these two fundamentally different goals.

Such a review would demonstrate once and for all that the federal government has lost touch with the young, because of its obsession with visibility.

• (1805)

[*English*]

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the problem of youth unemployment has been one of the more persistent difficulties in Canada in recent times. Though I have problems with the motion before us, I commend the member for his attention to a very pressing need in our country.

I want to begin by saying that my overall concern with the motion introduced by my colleague from the Progressive Conservative Party is that it seems to share the Liberal Party assumption that the problem of youth unemployment can be fixed by improved government programs.

Whether we are talking about increasing the size of government programs or merely restructuring and re-focusing those programs, the motion as it stands assumes that specific government programs are the answer rather than focusing on government policies across a much broader front, policies that would create an environment in

which the problem could be solved by young people, by educational institutions and by employers themselves.

That such a broader view of this problem is needed was confirmed last week by the study entitled "Hire Expectations", released September 30 by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. In that survey young people did not view government programs as the key to solving this problem. This was from the mouths of the young people themselves. They did not regard government programs as the key.

On the contrary, of the various groups regarded as being responsible for addressing the youth employment issue, government ranked lower than the self-reliance of youth themselves, the efforts of schools and also behind job referrals from family and friends. In other words, job help by way of government programs was way down on the list.

The majority of youth surveyed, almost 60%, said that finding work is primarily their own responsibility. Less than 10% of the respondents said that it is the government's responsibility to make sure they have work.

The point is not that students should be left to fend for themselves, but rather that our students are smart enough to know that direct intervention by the government as urged by the present motion is not the answer.

These young people in this extensive study were clearly saying that they do not expect the government to be directly—and I underline that word—involved in the job creation or job search process. Rather, in their view the government's task is to create an environment in which young people have the best chance possible of finding meaningful work.

Most Canadians would say that the government has failed on this score. As the authors of the study "Hire Expectations" put it, "Despite numerous programs targeting young workers, youth employment rates have not significantly dropped in the last 20 years, which suggests the need for new approaches to the issue".

Where should the government focus its approach? The government needs to lower payroll taxes, as a beginning, on small business and create a more tax friendly environment for small and medium size businesses. Incidentally, a reduction in employment insurance premiums would be a good place to start. Instead of raiding the EI surplus, as the Minister of Finance has intended to do, a reduction for these small businesses would be of great assistance to the problem of youth employment.

The study also revealed a genuine willingness on the part of small businesses to hire young people. Business owners emphasized that they were not looking simply for skills, but also for enthusiasm and a willingness to learn. This willingness to hire young people is especially true of new firms which are likely to

have twice the proportion of young employees compared to older businesses.

I believe that tells us something very significant. It tells us that if the government could bring itself to create an environment in which business start-ups are attractive, this would have a tremendous positive effect upon employment opportunities for youth.

But 40% of these small businesses also said that payroll taxes, which are a barrier to hiring, are far too high. Small business is not presently confident that the government is intent on lowering the costs associated with hiring someone. They do not believe there is any genuine effort to do that.

That is what the study "Hire Expectations" had to say about the broader economic environment in which jobs are created for young people. It also had some needed advice for governments. At the most basic level this study warned that government should avoid make-work programs. Such schemes, they said, affect only a small minority of youth and have more political value than actual substantive value for young Canadians looking for work.

• (1810)

The level at which government has a genuine contribution to make is in the role of facilitator, encouraging communication among educators, employers and youth. I want to emphasize again in the context of the present discussion that this must-read study, "Higher Expectations", urges greater facilitation by government, not direct intervention by government.

A good example of an area in which facilitation is needed is in the area of education. The study revealed a lack of interaction between schools and businesses, and youth feel that school does not prepare them for the transition into the workplace. They report experiencing a form of culture shock when they begin their working life. They indicated that they wanted a better understanding of the workplace before they leave school, university or college. This suggests that a greater role could and should be played by co-op education in Canada. We could talk about apprenticeship programs as well.

Co-op education and other kinds of measures have proven to be an effective means of smoothing the transition from school to the workplace.

While I cannot support the motion as stated, I thank the member for raising this very important issue in the House.

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in the House today to speak in support of this motion. I would like to congratulate the member for Madawaska—Restigouche for bringing forward what I think is a very thoughtful and reflective motion which needs to be seriously addressed by this House and certainly by the Government of Canada.

### *Private Members' Business*

It was surprising to hear the government member across the way say earlier that this motion is not necessary. I was very surprised to hear that.

Is it possible that they believe the motion is not necessary because it would actually be an embarrassment for the Liberal government to go forward and, as this motion states, overhaul all of its programs for young people in order to evaluate their impact and performance and in order to ensure that all funds for such programs maximize young people's chances of joining the labour force? Who could disagree with that?

It was very surprising to hear the Reform member and the Liberal member actually speak against this motion, which I think is something that could well be done and from which we would get a lot of benefit.

In looking at this motion I think it is incumbent upon us to actually look at what is the situation for young people in Canada today. Unfortunately, the facts present a very gloomy picture for young people.

When the government announced its youth employment strategy in February 1996 there were 2,065,000 youth who were employed. But the StatsCan figures for November 1997 show that there were 2,039,700 young people who were employed. That is a drop of over 26,000.

In fact youth unemployment is at 16.8%, up from 15.7% in February 1996. As we all know, those are only the official numbers. The real numbers are much higher.

Since February 1996 when the government first announced its major youth employment strategy, and we heard today a very rosy picture about that, the reality is that 48,300 more young Canadians are out of work. It is not a rosy picture at all.

Even according to the CIBC, one of the major banks in Canada, about one in four youth, aged 15 to 24, has never held a job. That is more than double the rate in 1989.

How can government members stand here today and tell us that we do not have a crisis? This motion should be supported today because there is a crisis in this country for young people.

In December 1997 the proportion of the youth labour force with no job experience was 24%. That is up from 9.8% in December of 1989. There are so many statistics that it is just mind-boggling. What the trend really shows is that throughout this decade there has been a continuing drop in the participation of young people in the labour market. There is persistent high youth unemployment. There is just no getting away from it.

As well, there has been growth in involuntary part time employment. At the same time there has been a decline in real wages.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1815)

What has often been characterized as the recovery from the 1990s has basically bypassed young people. They are still, to a great extent, very marginalized and do not have the kinds of opportunities that we hear in the rhetoric and the propaganda coming from government members.

We have to ask the question of how we address youth unemployment. We in the NDP believe that two key issues need to be addressed. One is through education and the second one is through a comprehensive youth employment strategy.

If we agree—I think all members would agree—that education is the key for our young people then we also have to ask why the government is attacking post-secondary education. As my colleague from the PC who presented this motion pointed out, the attack and the assault on post-secondary education is simply unprecedented.

The Liberal youth strategy must be seen in the context of the massive cuts to post-secondary education in Canada. It becomes just an empty promise for the government to say that it wants young people to get jobs. It knows they have to go on to post-secondary education to obtain jobs, but it does not really care that tuition fees have skyrocketed, that student debt has gone up and that university and colleges are less and less accessible. That is the reality facing young people when it comes to education today.

Even Human Resources Development Canada tells us that 45% of new jobs by the year 2000 will require post-secondary education. The reality is that the ability of young people to get into post-secondary education is more and more limited, particularly for low income Canadians.

Since 1995 the federal Liberals have cut \$1.5 billion from federal funding for post-secondary education. Since 1980 the Liberal and Conservative governments—we have to put this on record and look at the historical context—have cut federal funding from \$6.44 for each dollar of student fees to less than \$3. We see the real decline in support for post-secondary education.

Tuition fees over the last 10 years climbed by 240%. What an absolutely shocking statistic. Tuition fees in Canada have reached a national average of \$3,100. That is higher than the average tuition fees of publicly funded universities in the United States. The story goes on and on. Student debt is up from \$13,000 in 1993 when the Liberals took power to \$25,000 now. Student bankruptcies have increased 700% since 1989. The picture is very grim. Given this situation, one would hope that the government would be assessing and reviewing its commitment to support post-secondary education.

What did we have yesterday? The Minister for International Trade attended the second annual Canadian education industry

summit and actually talked about further industrialization and privatization of post-secondary education.

What is quoted in the Toronto *Star* today is the minister saying that education is an industry and that Canada needs to improve its marketing. This is how the government sees education now. It does not see it as a social investment, not as something that we provide as a societal responsibility to our young people, but simply as a marketing strategy, as something that the private sector wants to get its hands on.

The minister said that we need to identify our markets, develop and promote our products, differentiate them from those of our competition, and create business plans to bring all those elements together. Does this sound like we are talking about post-secondary education? It sounds like we are talking about the private sector to me, but that is what one of our cabinet ministers is saying.

The second part of a comprehensive strategy is a youth employment strategy. We have to point out that \$129 million of the \$345 million allocated to youth job creation programs go to short term summer jobs. There is no emphasis on the long term investment that needs to be made for young people. Virtually none of these programs are targeted at economically and socially disadvantaged youth.

• (1820)

Research has shown that to help such young people the programs must be targeted specifically and be designed to meet their very unique needs. Unfortunately these programs do not exist. Most of the Liberal youth programs benefit the most highly educated young people, which cynics say is more about cheap labour than real opportunity.

What should be done? We can learn by example from my province of British Columbia where our premier, Premier Clark, has made a personal commitment to make youth a priority. We have an extensive summer job program. We have environmental youth teams and environmental youth groups. We provide first jobs to graduates in science and technology.

There is entrepreneurial training for young people. There are thousands of jobs that have been created in B.C. crown corporations. In fact the B.C. government's record when it comes to supporting post-secondary education has been superlative in comparison to what the Liberal government has done. In fact our B.C. minister has called for a national tuition freeze on national grants program.

In conclusion I say that this is a very good motion. It deserves our support. We need to make that commitment to the young people of Canada, to evaluate the Liberal programs and to expose the fact that they are not helping the young people of Canada.

*Private Members' Business*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** We have about three minutes remaining in the debate. The hon. member for Lac-Saint-Louis has three minutes.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in the three minutes that you have granted me I would like to address some remarks related to those of the MP for Rosemont. I heard his diatribe. I do not know how long he spoke. It seemed endless. All of it was laced with the usual contempt for everything federal: all the faults in Quebec are as a result of the federal government. It is due to the federal government that unemployment is very high in Quebec. It is due to the federal government that the economy is so bad and so many youth have to find work.

Amazingly enough, I never hear a word about the provincial Government of Quebec. I never hear a word about the problems caused by wanting to have one referendum after another.

**An hon. member:** Referendum fever.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln:** Referendum fever. In October 1995 we went through a searing referendum, a divisive issue which put Quebec on hold for months at a time before, after and certainly during.

**Mr. Walt Lastewka:** It scares business away.

**Mr. Clifford Lincoln:** It scares business away like nothing else. What does the Quebec government, the Bloc Quebecois and the Parti Quebecois have for a solution for young people and for older people? It is: "Let us have another referendum". Then when they lose the next one, the third one in a row, they will say that is not enough, that the people have not spoken, and they want to have another one.

The member has the cheek to come here, paid by federal taxes supplied by people in the maritimes, British Columbia, Alberta and throughout Canada to give him a platform to rain on the federal parade and blame everything under the sun on the federal government.

I spent nine years in the National Assembly of Quebec and I remember the debates. It is almost like a time warp. It is the same old thing. Everything under the sun in Quebec that was going wrong was due to the federal government. If it rained it was federal rain. If it was cloudy it was a federal cloud. Anything that happened was federal. If one was sick it was due to the federal government. If people were not employed it was due to the federal government.

I am sick and tired of this diatribe. What we need in Quebec is another climate to realize that a lot of people want to take their time to accent quality of life and the things that matter to them such as education, social issues and work. If more accent is put on those things in Quebec rather than referendums and the separation of Quebec, we would all be better off.

• (1825)

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** We are down to the last five minutes of Private Members' Business and the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Madawaska—Restigouche, has given the hon. member for St. John's West his last five minutes.

**Mr. Charlie Power (St. John's West, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Madawaska—Restigouche for giving me this five minutes to address an issue which is probably the most serious one that faces the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and probably all of Canada.

The resolution simply asks in a very non-partisan way to allow the House of Commons to assess, to evaluate and to appraise the 250 different programs to help young people get involved in the labour force in Canada.

I congratulate the NDP member for Vancouver East who had some excellent suggestions on how we should go about this. Obviously education is key to what any of us would understand as creating a higher employment rate in Canada.

The member for the Reform is a little misguided and could easily support this resolution. We believe, as does the Reform member, that there are better ways. Probably we could in a non-partisan way find ways to help young people in Canada. The Liberal member obviously thinks that everything they are doing is absolutely perfect. That is just simply not the truth or the reality in Canada today.

There are a lot of good programs. I read a memo from the Minister for Human Resources Development the other day. It mentioned a whole range of programs and some with success ratios that are very high, like the youth internship program. Some 88% of the people who took part in that program are either presently working or are back in studies.

That is a very successful program, but we wonder if all the 250 programs handled by several different departments are as equally successful. We believe a review should be done. The review could be very simple. It could be done by an all party parliamentary committee of the House, or it could be done by an outside person who is non-partisan, just to find out if these programs are getting to the people who really deserve them.

Some of the programs are excellent. There is no question that in St. John's West this summer we had over 1,200 students working in student programs. The Government of Canada saw it as a high priority to make sure there was student employment so that some students could actually save money toward their education.

The training allowances for adults and young adults are very meaningful. In our office in Newfoundland the highest ratio of phone calls that we get is from people trying to get assistance in training and to get back to school. They have come to the



*Adjournment Debate*

realization that without better education there is not much chance of a better job or a better life.

We do not know what is the success rate of all the other programs. We would like to know and the Government of Canada should want to know. If we have 250 programs obviously some might not be as productive and some might not be targeted to the right groups.

Another concern in our caucus is that if there is 250 programs spread over six or seven different government departments, what are the administration costs? If \$2 billion is being spent on 250 programs with several government departments, what are the administrative costs? Is it 10% or \$200 million? Is it 30% or \$600 million? We want a review to find out how much money is spent on administration and to make sure that as much money as possible is directed to the three groups of Canadians the programs are designed for.

When it comes to the labour force basically there are three groups in Canada. The first is young Canadians working within Canada who are contributing to our country, their provinces and their family. Many of these workers were assisted by programs such as the Canada student loans program and training allowances. Many are also so heavily in debt that for many years they cannot contribute fully to the Canadian economy. They will not be able to buy homes and new cars and start their own businesses. Maybe there is a better way to set up the student loan system to allow Canadians to get an education, to work here and not be so heavily in debt.

Another group of young Canadians are those who are working outside the country. Why are they working outside the country? It is because of the lack of opportunities in Canada, the high tax rate and those kinds of problems.

Another group I want to touch on, especially in Newfoundland, is the vast number of young Canadians who are living unemployed in Canada. Often they are undereducated and living on temporary assistance programs from the government which really become permanent assistance programs from their parents and family.

I had a call today from one of my constituents who contributed to the EI surplus and is now on welfare. That EI surplus could be used to help get Canadians back to work, which was the original intent of the EI program.

• (1830)

I am delighted to be able to second this motion to ask for a non-partisan evaluation of these 250 government programs and I seek the unanimous consent to make this motion votable.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Is there unanimous consent.

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the order paper.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

### AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

**Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Eastern Shore, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I am very proud, on behalf of my hon. colleague for Halifax West, to speak on behalf of the 223 Volvo workers and their families in Nova Scotia.

The other day in this House the Minister of Industry said the closure of the Volvo plant has nothing to do with Bill C-11, the auto tariff reduction bill, and that the plant is not moving to Mexico. Obviously a memory lapse seems to have happened on the cabinet side.

I want to quote some editorial sections. They are very true. The company plans to assemble S70 and V70 model automobiles, the same automobiles currently built in Halifax, at a plant at its bus division that it recently purchased for \$70 million in the U.S. and Mexico. There is a sense from everybody in Nova Scotia, especially those workers and families, that Ottawa played a key role in sacrificing the Halifax plant's future when it decided in the last round of world trade talks to lower auto tariffs from 18% down to just over 6%.

In the past, the Halifax small plant was valuable to Volvo because it gave the firm the right to import cars to Canada under duty free under the auto pact. Yet Ottawa made no contingency plans for the possible impact of a tariff reduction on a major employer here. All we ask is that someone go down there and assist those workers in that regard.

Volvo states the Halifax plant is too small for the 8,000 car units it builds every year, yet it wants to start up a 1,000 car operation in Mexico. It does not make any sense, but that is what it is doing.

Volvo states that it is going to build buses in Mexico. It just purchased a bus plant. I ask Volvo and I ask the minister what does that do to Prevost Car Inc. and Novabus in Quebec? What happens to the 1,400 workers in Quebec?

Volvo plant workers are very disappointed with the federal and provincial government response to their crisis. Right now the CAW

*Adjournment Debate*

union along with members of the board of commerce and whoever else will go are planning a trip to Sweden to try to get Volvo to change its mind and do something for the workers.

As all Canadians know, after the recent Swissair fatal crash off the coast of Peggy's Cove in Nova Scotia, the world got to know exactly what Nova Scotians are made of. We are compassionate. We are caring. We are giving. We are salt of the earth people, as all Atlantic Canadians are. Why would a profitable company not want to stay here and utilize that valuable workforce to meet its needs?

The workers and I are very disappointed with a memo I received from sources within Volvo about the severance package given to these workers. It says anybody who criticises this measly severance will be terminated from the severance package. They will have no access at all. What kind of a democracy do we live in?

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the 223 great, hardworking workers of Nova Scotia and their families. I only wish that this government would think before it enacts laws that destroy the jobs and the economy of Nova Scotians.

• (1835)

**Mr. Walt Lastewka (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, on September 9 Volvo announced it was shutting down its vehicle assembly plant in Halifax on December 18, 1998.

The federal government is acutely aware of the importance of this plant to Halifax. On October 5 the Minister of Industry wrote to Volvo to express the disappointment and regret of the Government of Canada with its decision and the loss of the 223 jobs.

The closure is part of Volvo's worldwide restructuring strategy and the plant is not being moved to Mexico as the NDP questioner implies. Volvo has acquired a Mexican bus and coach manufacture which will be the primary business. I understand it will also

produce a limited number of vehicles, around 1,000 for the local market.

Volvo's Halifax plant built vehicles for the Canadian market and never sold those vehicles in Mexico. Volvo's plans for Mexico are completely unrelated to the closing of the Halifax plant. Closing of the Volvo plant has absolutely nothing to do with Bill C-11 and obviously the member does not understand what is in C-11.

I wish to point out that the federal government has done its part by ensuring that the business climate in Canada is favourable and conducive to the continued prosperity of the automotive assembly industry. The fact is that Canada remains a very competitive location for vehicle manufacturing.

Volvo itself remains a major transportation company in Canada with \$1.8 billion in annual sales and more than 4,600 employees across the country.

The Government of Canada will continue to work with the local organizations in the Halifax region, with Volvo and with the Canadian Auto Workers, CAW, to find a solution.

Mr. Walter Fitzgerald, the mayor of the Halifax Regional Municipality, has formed a task force which includes the province of Nova Scotia, the Greater Halifax Partnership group, the CAW, and the federal government through ACOA to explore alternative uses for the facility and to ensure that the port of Halifax is in Volvo's future transshipment plans in North America.

We will continue to support all stakeholders seeking a positive solution to this announced closure.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.37 p.m. )



# CONTENTS

Thursday, October 8, 1998

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### Annual Report of Chief of Defence Staff on State of Canadian Armed Forces

Mr. Bertrand ..... 8955

### Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Adams ..... 8955

### Reports of Public Accounts and OSFI

Mr. Williams ..... 8955

### Foreign Publishers Advertising Services Act

Bill C-55. Introduction and first reading ..... 8955

Ms. Copps ..... 8955

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) ..... 8955

### Canada Endangered Species Protection Act

Bill C-441. Introduction and first reading ..... 8955

Mr. Caccia ..... 8955

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) ..... 8955

### Committees of the House

#### Fisheries and Oceans

Motion for concurrence ..... 8956

Mr. Bailey ..... 8956

Mr. Matthews ..... 8956

Mr. Myers ..... 8956

Mr. Matthews ..... 8956

Mr. Easter ..... 8956

Mr. Matthews ..... 8956

Mr. Myers ..... 8957

Mr. Matthews ..... 8957

Mr. Easter ..... 8958

Mr. Matthews ..... 8958

Mr. Easter ..... 8958

Mr. Matthews ..... 8958

Mr. Easter ..... 8958

Mr. Matthews ..... 8958

Mr. Easter ..... 8959

Mr. Easter ..... 8959

Mr. Blaikie ..... 8959

Mr. Easter ..... 8960

Mr. Matthews ..... 8960

Mr. Reynolds ..... 8960

Mr. Matthews ..... 8960

Mr. Adams ..... 8960

Motion ..... 8960

(Motion agreed to) ..... 8961

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Criminal Code

Bill C-51. Second reading ..... 8962

Mr. Bellehumeur ..... 8962

Mr. MacKay ..... 8965

Mr. Stoffer ..... 8968

Mr. MacKay ..... 8968

Mr. Reynolds ..... 8969

Mrs. Gagnon ..... 8972

Mr. Cadman ..... 8975

Mr. Bailey ..... 8977

Mr. Cadman ..... 8977

Mr. Stoffer ..... 8977

Mr. Cadman ..... 8977

(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ... 8977

### Tobacco Act

Bill C-42. Second reading ..... 8977

Mr. Epp ..... 8978

Mr. Epp ..... 8979

Mr. Stoffer ..... 8980

Mr. Epp ..... 8980

Mr. White (North Vancouver) ..... 8980

Mr. Hill (Macleod) ..... 8983

Mr. White (North Vancouver) ..... 8983

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### Pat Singleton

Mr. Perić ..... 8984

### Agriculture

Mr. Penson ..... 8984

### National Family Week

Mrs. Ur ..... 8984

### Family Savings and Credit Union

Mr. Lastewka ..... 8985

### International Plowing Match and Farm Machinery Show

Mr. McCormick ..... 8985

### Forestry

Mr. Duncan ..... 8985

### TV5 International Network

Mrs. Jennings ..... 8985

### Alain Bellerive

Mr. Lefebvre ..... 8985

### Violence Against Women

Mrs. Karetak-Lindell ..... 8986

### Canada Pension Plan

Mr. Ablonczy ..... 8986

### Bloc Quebecois

Mr. Coderre ..... 8986

### Tommy Douglas

Mr. Blaikie ..... 8986

### Community Newspaper Week

Mr. Price ..... 8987

### Mental Illness Awareness Week

Ms. Caplan ..... 8987

### Museums

Mr. Bailey ..... 8987

### Quebec Sovereignty

Mr. Turp ..... 8987

### Agriculture

Mr. Borotsik ..... 8988



**United Nations Security Council**

Mr. Pratt ..... 8988

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****APEC Summit**

Miss Grey ..... 8988

Mr. Gray ..... 8988

Miss Grey ..... 8988

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8988

Miss Grey ..... 8988

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8989

Mr. Reynolds ..... 8989

Mr. Gray ..... 8989

Mr. Reynolds ..... 8989

Mr. Gray ..... 8989

Mr. Duceppe ..... 8989

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8989

Mr. Duceppe ..... 8989

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8989

Mr. Marceau ..... 8989

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8990

Mr. Marceau ..... 8990

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8990

Mr. Proctor ..... 8990

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8990

Mr. Proctor ..... 8990

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8990

Mrs. Wayne ..... 8990

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8990

Mrs. Wayne ..... 8990

Mr. Gray ..... 8990

Mr. Strahl ..... 8991

Mr. Gray ..... 8991

Mr. Strahl ..... 8991

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8991

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8991

Mr. Gauthier ..... 8991

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8991

Mr. Gauthier ..... 8991

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8991

Mr. Jaffer ..... 8991

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8991

Mr. Hill (MacLeod) ..... 8991

Mr. Gray ..... 8992

Mrs. Tremblay ..... 8992

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8992

Mrs. Tremblay ..... 8992

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8992

Mr. Mark ..... 8992

Mr. Gray ..... 8992

Mr. Schmidt ..... 8992

Mr. Gray ..... 8992

Mr. Bergeron ..... 8992

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8992

**Government of Ontario**

Mr. McKay ..... 8992

Ms. McLellan ..... 8993

**APEC Summit**

Mr. Hilstrom ..... 8993

Mr. Gray ..... 8993

Mr. Penson ..... 8993

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8993

Mr. Blaikie ..... 8993

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8993

Mr. Blaikie ..... 8993

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8993

Mr. MacKay ..... 8993

Mr. Gray ..... 8993

Mr. MacKay ..... 8994

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8994

**Foreign Affairs**

Mr. Assadourian ..... 8994

Mr. Reed ..... 8994

**APEC Summit**

Mr. Hanger ..... 8994

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8994

Mrs. Lalonde ..... 8994

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8994

Mr. Blaikie ..... 8994

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8994

Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) ..... 8994

Mr. Scott (Fredericton) ..... 8994

**Foreign Affairs**

Mr. Assadourian ..... 8995

Mr. Reed ..... 8995

**Presence in the Gallery**

The Speaker ..... 8995

**Business of the House**

Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) ..... 8995

Mr. Boudria ..... 8995

**Points of Order****Member for Bourassa**

Mrs. Tremblay ..... 8995

The Speaker ..... 8995

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****Ways and Means****Notice of motion**

Mr. Peterson ..... 8995

Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) ..... 8995

**Tobacco Act**

Bill C-42. Second reading ..... 8996

Mr. Bailey ..... 8996

Mr. Benoit ..... 8997

Mr. Bailey ..... 8997

Mr. Benoit ..... 8997

Mr. Bailey ..... 8998

Mr. Rock ..... 8998

Mr. Bailey ..... 8998

Mr. Rock ..... 8998

Mr. Bailey ..... 8998

Mr. Casson ..... 8999

Mr. Epp ..... 9000

Mr. Casson ..... 9000

Mr. McNally ..... 9000

Mr. Casson ..... 9000

Ms. Caplan ..... 9000

Mr. Casson ..... 9001

Mr. Bailey ..... 9001

Mr. Casson ..... 9001

Mr. Hilstrom ..... 9001



**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.**