



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 197 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, March 16, 1999

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

Tuesday, March 16, 1999

The House met at 10 a.m.

[English]

Prayers

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)

[English]

WAYS AND MEANS

NOTICE OF MOTION

Hon. David Kilgour (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83(1) I wish to table the notice of ways and means motion to amend the Excise Tax Act, and I ask that an order of the day be designated for consideration of the motion.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to 12 petitions.

* * *

• (1005)

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 24th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on chapter 27 of the December 1998 report by the Auditor General of Canada, on subsidies and contributions and certain programs of Industry Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, the committee requests the government to table a comprehensive response to this report.

NATIONAL PARKS ACT

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-70, an act respecting national parks.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table today on behalf of the Minister of Canadian Heritage a bill entitled an act respecting national parks. It will strengthen the protection of nationally significant heritage resources, facilitate the completion of the national parks system and control commercial development in park communities.

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

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1999

Hon. David Kilgour (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-71, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in parliament on February 16, 1999.

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

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

Hon. David Kilgour (for the Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-72, an act to amend the Income Tax Act, to implement measures that are consequential on changes to the Canada-U.S. Tax Convention (1980) and to amend the Income Tax Conventions Interpretation Act, the Old Age Security Act, the War Veterans Allowance Act and certain acts related to the Income Tax Act.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

IRAQ

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from people in Peterborough who are concerned about the people of Iraq.

Routine Proceedings

Whereas ongoing UN sanctions against Iraq regarded as the most stringent ever imposed by the United Nations have devastated the Iraq economy and resulted in the deaths of over one million civilians, many of them children, and whereas article 2 of the United Nations charter states that "all member states shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security, and justice, are not endangered", the petitioners call upon the Parliament of Canada to strongly appeal to the United Nations, to the United States and to Britain for a rejection of any further military action against Iraq.

They call for a serious attempt at peace negotiation with Iraq and its neighbours. Further, in order to build a stable and sustainable society in Iraq, excluding an embargo on military materials, they request that all other sanctions be lifted.

• (1010)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present under Standing Order 36 a petition signed by a number of Canadians including some from my own riding of Mississauga South on the subject of human rights. The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that human rights abuses continue around the world in countries such as Indonesia.

The petitioners also point out that Canada continues to enjoy the recognition internationally as being the champion of internationally recognized human rights. They therefore call upon parliament and indeed the Government of Canada to continue to condemn those who perpetrate human rights abuses and to seek to bring to justice those responsible for such abuses.

TRADE

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36 on behalf of a number of constituents from the great city of Kamloops.

They point out a number of concerns they have with the fact that the Government of Canada signs international trade agreements which lock the hands of future governments in terms of making decisions on behalf of a variety of issues.

I will not elaborate but the petition goes on at some length in terms of what these concerns are. Essentially they are asking parliament to look into the matter.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will respond today to Questions Nos. 170 and 172.

[Text]

Question No. 170—**Mr. Guy St-Julien:**

Concerning children who have contracted the hepatitis C virus from blood transfusions at birth, what provisions does the federal government intend to make in order to: (a) ensure a decent future for these children; (b) ensure that required medical services can be obtained in a province other than the child's province of residence; and (c) reimburse travel expenditures incurred to obtain these medical services since the blood transfusion?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Canada's health system provides high quality health care services in every jurisdiction to adults and children alike. Children who were infected with hepatitis C through the blood system will continue to have access to these services no matter where they live in Canada.

On September 18, 1998, the federal Minister of Health proposed to provinces and territories, a comprehensive set of hepatitis C initiatives. Recognizing that the provision of health care, including travel arrangements, falls within the jurisdiction of provinces and territories, this proposal included an offer of up to \$300 million in transfers over 20 years to help provinces and territories pay for needed medical care so that people who were infected with hepatitis C through the blood system are ensured access to the treatments they need.

Question No. 172—**Mr. Howard Hilstrom:**

With respect to the Canadian Lama and Alpaca Association, which has been incorporated under the Animal Pedigree Act in respect of a distinct breed, entitling it to issue certificates of registration: what actions, if any, has the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food taken to ensure that the association is not issuing, and has not issued, certificates of identification, which can only be issued by an association incorporated in respect of an evolving breed?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): The Canadian Lama and Alpaca Association, CLAA, was incorporated in 1989 under the Animal Pedigree Act in respect of lama and alpaca as distinct breeds. The act establishes that a certificate of registration is the correct document to be issued for distinct breeds.

As a result of questions raised by a member of the CLAA, the animal registration officer looked into which types of certificates were being issued. The association was notified in writing on December 17, 1997 that they should be issuing certificates of registration on all future animals registered with the association.

The department was informed in a letter dated April 6, 1998 that the CLAA board of directors had agreed to change the certificates and was proceeding with redesigning them.

The animal registration officer met with the CLAA president and general manager in Calgary on June 30, 1998 to discuss this and related matters.

The animal registration officer obtained a draft version of the new certificate on December 9, 1998. The registration officer has noted that changes to the draft are required and is following up the association.

[Translation]

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

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY DEBATE

GRAIN HANDLING

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has an application for an emergency debate from the hon. member for Selkirk—Interlake.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility and the duty of all elected MPs in this great country of Canada to debate and discuss issues of national importance.

It is particularly important that we debate and discuss issues where serious financial harm is happening and where that financial harm leads to dysfunctional families, to harm to children going to school, and these sorts of things.

The emergency debate I am asking for today involves the stoppage of the grain movements out of the port of Vancouver due to strike action and the unwillingness of other employees on the docks to cross those picket lines.

The seriousness of the situation is compounded due to the serious financial situation that many farmers find themselves in due to no fault of their own. I speak here of foreign subsidies that drive commodity prices down.

As a result, it is of paramount importance that members of the House express what is happening in their ridings and give the government an opportunity to speak to the situation and reassure Canadians and farmers that in fact we in this elected House are doing our job and taking care of their well-being.

I would ask under Standing Order 52 that I be granted permission to have this emergency debate tonight immediately following the normal business of the House.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the application for an emergency debate.

The Deputy Speaker: No. I am afraid that the rules provide that the member who has asked for the emergency debate is entitled to

Supply

say a few words and that is it. The Chair then is expected to rule on whether or not there will be an emergency debate.

In the circumstances the Chair has considered the hon. member's request. While the hon. member raises certain points that are valid, in the Chair's opinion the request does not meet the exigencies of the standing order at this time and accordingly the request is denied.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1015)

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government has failed to deliver criminal justice programs and laws that reflect the will and concerns of the majority of Canadians, including issues like child pornography, young offenders, impaired driving, conditional sentencing, drug trafficking, home invasions, police funding, consecutive sentencing, corrections facilities and illegal immigration, and as a consequence, have put individual safety, and in some cases national security, in jeopardy.

The Deputy Speaker: Since today is the final allotted day for the supply period ending March 26, 1999, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the supply bills later this day. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bills be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With the exception of the mover of the motion, the member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, all other members of the Reform Party will be dividing their time during today's debate.

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to introduce this motion on behalf of the Reform Party, Her Majesty's Official Opposition, and to lead off debate on an issue that concerns and even scares a lot of Canadians, the current state of our criminal justice system.

In a recent publication by a University of Ottawa law professor, the chief assertion of the work was that Canada's system of criminal justice is undergoing a public credibility crisis of dangerous proportions. That was stated by a law professor who is well respected in Canada. It is not the Reform Party saying that. This is a law professor who has spent his life in this work.

Supply

This should not come as a surprise to the government. Maybe today after this debate and the sharing of information which should take place we can expect some change. I say that in all sincerity, but after watching this government I really wonder.

Today members will have an opportunity to hear from colleagues on our side of the House who are involved in the justice area, from members of other parties and from the government. We can only hope that the government will have a change of heart and start looking seriously at the criminal justice system.

Canada's criminal justice system has become a series of technicalities, plea bargains, defence by psychologists, law by judges and outright misrepresentation by lawyers and the courts of the consequences of a sentence. We all know by now that a ten year sentence really means three years. Why not say it and quit adding to the cynicism that already exists in the Canadian public.

Each day newspaper headlines scream out another example of a criminal justice system out of control. Headlines like "Legal System Getting Away with Murder", "Child Porn Flooding into British Columbia", "B.C. Justice Strikes Down Law Against Child Porn", "Conditional Sentence Granted in Murder of Husband", "Man Who Killed Mother is Free to Go", "Canada Fertile Land for the Mob", "RCMP Budget will Undermine Its Work" and "Fewer Police Today Per Capita Than 20 Years Ago" are appearing in our newspapers.

I think members get the picture. It is a litany of articles and stories contrary to what we might expect in this country. We have to ask ourselves: Are we protecting our citizens and meting out justice or protecting the guilty and providing injustice?

Today the Reform Party motion will identify the concerns and fears of many Canadians.

Today the House will hear about the legality of child pornography in British Columbia.

We will hear about the release of pedophiles into the community because of the insensitive if not bizarre Shaw ruling. We will hear how these individuals are free to prey on our children with the blessing of the court.

We will hear about the new youth criminal justice bill which refuses to acknowledge what is fundamentally wrong with youth justice.

We will hear about what are known as conditional sentences; that is, where murderers, rapists and other perpetrators of violent crime spend their sentences in the community rather than in prison. It is a novel idea. They put a bullet in the head of their sleeping husband and they get to move to British Columbia to enjoy the mountains and the scenery. It is like winning the lottery.

We will also hear about people who live in fear of home invasion and hostage taking.

We will hear about impaired drivers and the carnage they are leaving in their wake. There is no compelling initiative in the Criminal Code to deal with them.

We will hear about cutbacks in RCMP funding, of the closing of the training centre and what this means to our personal safety.

We will hear about our borders, the gateway for every crook and terrorist who wants a place to ply their trade. Speakers from our side will tell the House how these illegals look upon Canada as the promised land.

We will also hear of the intransigence of the Liberal government and its failure to deal with consecutive sentencing, despite a private member's bill by one of its own MPs calling for change.

● (1020)

We will hear about drug trafficking and the inability to police it due to cutbacks in resources.

We will hear about the state of our correctional facilities and how, if one pulls the right strings, they can bring their polo pony or play a leisurely 18 holes of golf. I hasten to add that one first has to bludgeon and shoot his wife to death for this type of royal treatment. Petty criminals need not apply. This is reserved for the truly heinous.

As members can see, this is a smorgasbord of crime and supposed punishment. It is a litany of indignity, abuse of the system and no retribution.

Allow me to begin with the issue of child pornography.

Following the B.C. supreme court ruling by Justice Duncan Shaw striking down section 163.14 of the Criminal Code, concerning child pornography, as unconstitutional because the rights of freedom of expression of John Robin Sharpe were violated and, as the ruling states "a person's possessions are an expression of a person's thoughts and essential self", I kept asking myself the same question, when is infringement of these charter rights—

Mr. Paul Szabo: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I need some clarification from you, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the issue of speaking on topic. The motion before the House has to do with the defence of provocation. We are now talking about child pornography. I think we need clarification because it could influence the debate for the rest of the House.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry, but the motion before the House today lists a string of matters of legal concern. The hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast is discussing matters relating to our legal system. Anyone is going to be hard-pressed to call him on a question of relevance given the wording of the motion before the House today. There is a long list of legal items in it and I think the hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast is not straying too far from the topic at the moment.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that. It is amazing that the member opposite would rise on a point of order if he had looked at the motion. Possibly he has not read it. It states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government has failed to deliver criminal justice programs and laws that reflect the will and concerns of the majority of Canadians, including issues like child pornography. . .

That is what I am speaking about right now and it is what I will continue to speak about. It may be very painful for members on the other side to listen to these things, but Canadians are concerned about them and that is why my party is debating these issues today.

In the case of Shaw, the justice determined that the essential self of John Robin Sharpe was invaded. Shaw determined that the right to privacy is so profound that it is not outweighed by the limited beneficial effects of the prohibition of child pornography. Some may argue that the judgment may not always mean justice. This crucible we employ to render determination is fallible and sometimes so arcane that any scintilla of common sense seems lacking.

When Justice Shaw spoke of essential self I would take it to mean the worth, dignity and intrinsic value we place on our being and that of others. I would take it to mean our right to peace, security and self-determination. I would take it to mean our right to live without fear of reprisal and that any harm brought upon us, particularly by those in a position to manipulate or destroy that vulnerable human spirit that is present in the young, would be met with condemnation and swift justice.

That is why so many Canadians view the Shaw decision as a failure in rendering justice that protects individuals least able to protect themselves.

Mr. Derek Lee: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not dealing with relevance. I just want to bring to the attention of the House that this House has for many years followed closely the provisions of what we call the sub judice rule. The matter that the hon. member is discussing now is a matter involving the criminal law, an individual who has been charged and the matter is still at process.

I urge upon the House to have regard for the provisions of the sub judice convention so that the ability of the courts to deal with this matter fairly and properly and the rights of the individual involved before the courts are not prejudiced by the public debate here.

I ask our Chair to direct his attention to that.

• (1025)

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair cannot know all the cases that are before the courts in this country and which ones members are commenting on.

What is clear is that there is a rule which requires that members refrain from comment on cases that are before the courts,

Supply

particularly criminal cases, where comments might be ones that tend to prejudice the outcome of the legal proceedings.

This is a discussion today in the House on matters of criminal law primarily, if I can lump the various items of discussion together, and using that word without in any way prejudicing the discussion or limiting the terms of the motion that the opposition has put before the House today.

I would urge hon. members to have a look at Beauchesne's, at the sub judice rule as stated in that work, and bear it in mind in the course of their comments today.

I know that hon. members would not want to prejudice the outcome of legal proceedings in our courts. I know that in their debate today they will exercise the usual temperance and prudence as befits members of the House. I thank the hon. member for Scarborough—Rouge River for drawing the rule to our attention. I know the hon. member will be careful in what he says and I hope that we will be able to carry on that way all day.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You just referred to temperance. I noted that the member for Prince George—Peace River, who has since left the house, was using intemperate language. He referred to our country, Canada, as this bloody country.

I would ask him to withdraw that remark and to refrain from using such intemperate language in the House.

The Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member were here, perhaps I would be able to do something like that. He seems to have disappeared for the moment. Here he is.

Perhaps the hon. member would refrain from using such intemperate language in the House. I did not hear the remark, but I know that no hon. member would want to speak that way.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, it is quite interesting when we get on this topic how sensitive the government is.

The member knows that what I am talking about is a case that has already been before the court. There is an appeal going on. I am not trying to influence it. I am talking about a case that happened and he knows that. It is quite legitimate.

To hear the other member complain about my colleague saying something about Canada when yesterday government members were calling us "not Canadians" because of the way we voted is shameful. They have no shame left at all. They are so arrogant and they will probably keep on interrupting me throughout my whole speech because of that arrogance.

Let me continue. Those parents, and for that matter anyone with any degree of compassion for the sanctity of the human spirit and

Supply

life, cannot be faulted in concluding that some individuals with bizarre lifestyles and values want more acknowledgement by the courts as opposed to those who fall within the mainstream of values and lifestyles. Some, it appears, have more right to freedom of conscience than others.

As in the case of any court decision, let alone a controversial one like the Shaw decision, there are ramifications. Decisions are not made to go into a void. There is a fallout and there are long term consequences.

In British Columbia there have been two very real consequences. Because of the Shaw decision two other individuals charged with possession of child pornography have had their cases dismissed. Some 36 other cases are pending and the lower courts hearing these cases have no alternative but to throw them out.

Shaw's decision guarantees the legality of the possession of child pornography until the court of appeal rules in late April. For now British Columbia is the only province where the possession of child pornography is legal, and that is not right.

The assertion by the federal Minister of Justice that things are under control and prosecutions for possession are continuing is simply not true. For now it is open season for pedophiles in British Columbia.

Five days following the Shaw decision a group of 63 Liberal MPs and six Liberal senators began a campaign of protest against the Shaw decision. The 69 signatories to an open letter to their leader, the Prime Minister, called child pornography a product of crime. They called it sexual abuse of children and the work of pedophiles. They stated that the federal government has no greater responsibility than the protection of children by those who prey on their innocence and their inability to protect themselves. They even went so far, in closing a paragraph in their missive to the Prime Minister, as to call for new child pornography legislation and for the Prime Minister to consider using the notwithstanding clause to ensure the charter will never again be used to defend the sexual abuse of Canada's children. A very realistic view of the situation and a reasonable request of the Prime Minister. Unfortunately, empty in honour and resolve and a cruel hoax on children as events would prove themselves 13 days later.

● (1030)

On February 2 these same Liberal MPs were asked to stand in the House and give a meaning of support to their previous protestations. They were asked to support a Reform Party motion calling for the reinstatement of child pornography laws in British Columbia, even if it meant using the very clause of the Constitution Act which they implored the PM to use two weeks before.

When push came to shove, 59 of this virtuous group of Liberal MPs abandoned any notice of the vulnerability of children and their victimization at the hands of pedophiles. Four had the resolve and did what they said they would do.

The task assigned our police in the interdiction of child pornography is a mess. That is why the Shaw decision makes it even more frustrating for those charged with policing and reducing the proliferation of child pornography, particularly its dissemination on the Internet.

In British Columbia's case police can intercede and confiscate child pornography but cannot prosecute. The unregulated Internet has become the vehicle of choice and 20% of all traffic is generated by traceable kiddy porn web sites.

In a recently released RCMP intelligence report British Columbia is identified as the only province where child pornography is a serious concern for law enforcement agencies. Is that not a cruel irony in light of the Shaw decision and its concern for essential person rights for pedophiles?

Those individuals involved in this pernicious behaviour, hiding behind the charter of rights, are attempting to systematically normalize sexual immorality and the Shaw decision gives them that licence.

Herbert London, professor of humanities at the University of New York, said morality is not subjective but is a prerequisite for ordered society. Those who want the transmogrify of value system to which the majority of Canadians subscribe are an anathema to decency and respect.

I will turn now to another tragic example of Liberal government intransigence and dismissal of public concern. Last week we were treated to the long awaited changes to the Young Offenders Act. The new criminal act will be called the youth criminal justice act but despite this high sounding phrase it really will not change things a lot.

There are some glaring omissions and some glaring shortcomings to this act. I will identify some of those. First there is the limitation of the publication of names for certain offences classified as adults.

The bill limits these to five situations: murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, aggravated sexual assault and repeat serious violent offences. This leaves a lot of violent and frightening offences out of the loop.

Second, the Reform Party, and for that matter an all party committee recommendation, called for the lowering of the maximum age of youth offenders from 17 to 15. We did not get this and I am surprised the minister would not address it.

Third, there has been a consistent call from all quarters dealing with young offenders to have the minimum age of offenders lowered to 10 years from 12. Again, the committee of this House and the minister's own justice department years and years ago called for this reduction. So has a private member's bill from one of my colleagues but we have never seen that.

The opting out provisions are also a concern for us. Simply put, there has to be universality in the provisions of the law, period. We also question the federal government's commitment to financial resources to youth justice. The announcement of \$206 million is over a three year period. The federal government has never met its 50:50 cost sharing in the youth justice area and this money will hardly make up for that shortfall.

I go back to the point of the 10 to 12 year olds because I was never so shocked, the day that bill was introduced, to see the Minister of Justice talking about Reformers wanting to put 10 and 11 year old children in jail.

An hon. member: That's true.

Mr. John Reynolds: The parliamentary secretary said it is true. I will tell her it is an absolute lie. Nobody in this party has ever said we want to put a 10 or 11 year old in jail.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member will not want to start using that word. I think he knows it tends to disorder in the House and I invite him to refrain from such use. I do not think he was accusing any hon. member of lying from what I heard but I would prefer he not use the word.

• (1035)

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I would never impute another member with telling a lie but I would tell anyone listening that anyone who says the Reform Party wants to put 10 and 11 year olds in jail is not telling the truth. This party and the justice committee want to see 10 and 11 year olds in the system where they can be looked after to make sure they do not become young offenders and get involved in the system. That is what everybody wants. We want them in the system. The provinces want them in the system so they can get the funding from the federal government which it does not want to put in. That is what this system is about in terms of 10 and 11 year olds.

This government wants to put no money into it. It does not want to help the provinces help these poor 10 and 11 year olds who are in this system. That is what it is all about and that is why the Liberals throw out the false claims about who wants to put who in jail. I have never in my life seen anything so low for a justice minister. I hope they will withdraw what they are saying in that area.

An hon. member: You want to cane us.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, we hear someone from across yelling that we want to cane them. What a sad day in Canada when we have members here talking about caning and putting people in jail when we are trying to get a system that works. This government, which will not fund the Young Offenders Act properly, has

Supply

not done it properly. That is why we have problems in this country. It is just like the health program. It is supposed to be funded 50% by this government but it is doing 20% and 14%. It has made a mess of it and it tries to blame it on the opposition.

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think my hon. friend has made an error in his comment. He was suggesting that funding for health care was 50:50. Is he suggesting that the government is not holding up its end?

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid the hon. member knows that is not a point of order.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, if the member took it from me to say that the government was funding at 50:50 I apologize to him and to Canadians. I was saying it should be funding at 50:50 and it is not doing it. In my province it is about 14%. In Ontario it is even less. It has messed up the health care system which gets these 10 and 11 year olds into crime, and it cannot stand that. It cannot take the heat.

Mr. Peter Adams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I thought the hon. member was the critic for justice, not the critic for health. I thought the topic today was justice.

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid that with these points of order that are not points of order we are getting into some difficulty. The hon. member was discussing the motion before we started getting some spurious points of order. The hon. member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast I know will want to return to the topic.

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I hope they will stop making these serious interruptions. I hope you are not taking this out of my time.

The Deputy Speaker: It will be added on.

Mr. John Reynolds: Thank you very much, I appreciate it. Maybe now that they know that they will not get up as often.

Let me now tell them about the attorney general in Ontario. They love the Ontario government on that side of the House and they will love it even less when it wins a re-election in Ontario with a big majority. This is what the attorney general of Ontario has to say about the Young Offenders Act:

Ontario is concerned that under the new federal bill 16 and 17 year olds who commit adult crimes are not automatically tried as adults.

That is a serious issue that most Canadians think of. Most justice ministers across Canada have asked this government to address this issue but it has not addressed it:

Even for murder, aggravated sexual assault, manslaughter and attempted murder there is no guarantee that youths will be sentenced as an adult. Even on the third rape charge, there is no guarantee of an adult sentence.

Supply

That is the kind of change we are trying to make in this bill.

Most serious violent offences still require the prosecutor to prove an adult sentence is necessary; jail sentences have been reduced; youths sentenced as adults for murder are still subject to more lenient periods of parole ineligibility than adults sentenced for murder; mandatory jail time is not required for youths convicted of an offence involving a weapon.

This could result in a 17 year old who commits first degree murder or other violent crimes still being treated as a child.

“Under this new act, a three time rapist could still be treated as a child. Rape, drug trafficking, guns—these are adult crimes and have to be treated as such. In the youth criminal justice act, there are no guarantees that serious violent crime will be treated as adult crime”, stated Mr. Harnick.

“What the people of Ontario have been asking for is legislation that will better protect our children and our communities, that will send a message to young people that they will be held accountable for their actions and would deter youth crime. Instead, the federal Liberal government has released a bill that has little regard for public safety and even less regard for providing meaningful consequences for criminal behaviour such as sexual assault, drug trafficking and use of a weapon”, said solicitor general and minister of correctional services, Bob Runciman.

“Many police officers and citizens across Ontario are frustrated with the Young Offenders Act because it seems primarily concerned with the rights of offenders”, explained York regional police Chief Julian Fantino.

“It’s disappointing that the federal government won’t take the opportunity to right this wrong and introduce a much tougher law to serve as an effective deterrent to youth crime”.

● (1040)

An hon. member: Another friend of yours.

Mr. John Reynolds: I hear the parliamentary secretary complaining about this police chief.

She did not complain about the stooge they had standing up at their press conference saying what the government wanted them to say. They do not all agree. There is a blatant disagreement out there about what is happening in the Young Offenders Act. They bring the people to it.

An hon. member: Very respectable.

Mr. John Reynolds: The people I am talking about are respectable. They do not like this bill. It is a bad bill and should be changed. Hopefully we will do that in committee.

“This new legislation is not only overdue, but also fails once again to protect society from dangerous and violent offenders”, said Garry Rosenfeldt, executive director of Victims of Violence.

“Criminal behaviour of 16 and 17 year old youth will still remain in youth court, irrespective of their crime. Thus one of the most profound and controversial loopholes within the justice system remains”.

“In the new bill, the definition of serious violent offence is so vague that it is also almost useless. Poll after poll has shown that 80% of Canadians have little or no

confidence in the federal Young Offenders Act. The new youth criminal justice act will do nothing to improve that. It’s a shame Ottawa refused to listen”.

This is the Ontario government. It sure loves this bill, the one this government is bragging about, when it has done very little to help Canadians.

There is another issue in our criminal justice system that raises Canadian cynicism to new levels, the use of conditional sentencing. I could go on for long. It seems I have been interrupted so many times I am not getting this whole exercise in. Conditional sentencing is a serious issue and needs to be addressed. One of my colleagues will talk in more detail about it.

The whole issue in the justice system today is that this government is not listening. It wants to blame the Reform Party, the NDP, the Bloc and the Conservatives for all the problems in the country.

The Liberals have had two elections since the Tories were defeated to straighten things out. They still have not done it. They still do not have health care where it should be. The justice system is nowhere near what it should be and this is the government that has done that. It has served its time.

What do those members do now? They get arrogant. If they present a bill, we are not good Canadians if we do not like it. If we hammer the justice bill, we are against all the good things that should happen in this country.

I have seven children and seven grandchildren. I know what is happening in this country as much as any Liberal on that side with young people. We need some changes in this law and we need them now.

I hope the government will listen when we get to committee, listen to what is happening in this debate today on the issues that are before us and make some serious changes in the areas of justice. We need them and we need them bad.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the member opened by saying he would deal with an issue that scares a lot of people. Then he went on to build a whole case and to fuel the very point he was just making by trying to scare people in a very systematic and point by point way, painting the worst case situation in every possible point of view.

One of the quotes, which I would like the member to add substance to, was “put a bullet in the head of your husband and you get a reward by moving to beautiful B.C. to enjoy the mountains and the oceans”. I have to ask him, after I am finished my remarks, to comment on that and to flesh that out a little because it does not make any sense to me.

The whole issue of criminal justice and inner city safety is something I deal with every day. I represent a riding in the inner

city of Winnipeg that is rife with many of the problems touched on by the member.

What strikes me is how there can be the same set of circumstances and two completely different views of how to deal with it. We have heard Reform over the years, even prior to my coming here, on caning in Singapore. That was one of my favourites. Spanky and his gang was the term going around at that time. I understand he is an expert on the subject. He even had a book on caning in Singapore.

• (1045)

During the 1997 election campaign when I was walking along the streets I could always tell when I was following the Reform candidate because people would be asking me about boot camps that would be introduced based on the American model. Reform is still advocating and promoting the whole idea of boot camps. This is unbelievable.

And longer prison sentences. All conventional wisdom dealing with criminal justice has indicated that longer prison sentences do not do anything to deter the incidence of crime. Reform members are dealing with an obsolete concept and fueling the fearmongering.

In the United States a whole generation of young black males were locked up because they were a nuisance. Yes, they got them off the streets and the Americans are showing a decrease in crime. I would argue that there is no connection between those two things. The reason there is a decrease in violent crime in many of the inner city communities is that they have the lowest unemployment rate since the second world war. That is a way to slow down property crimes. Crimes of that nature are a predictable consequence of poverty and unemployment and all of the other things we need to look at. There are two different views for the same set of circumstances. The NDP would rather deal with the root causes of crime.

What does the member mean by stating that by putting a bullet in the head of her husband the woman gets rewarded by moving to beautiful British Columbia, which again is a subject of opinion, and enjoying the mountains and the ocean?

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I have lived in Winnipeg and it is a wonderful city, but if I had a choice I would rather be in British Columbia.

On the question regarding putting a bullet in his head and going to British Columbia, I do not have the newspaper clippings here but I will make sure they are delivered to the member's office very shortly. There was a woman in Ottawa whose husband who worked for the RCMP was lying in bed; she put two bullets in his head and obviously killed him. She also killed the dog. She received a

Supply

conditional sentence and went to British Columbia where her children are. That was her sentence. A conditional sentence.

That is why I put the motion before the committee. I will give the minister credit. I have been asking for this to go to committee for quite a while. The committee has not handled the problem.

Violent crimes of this type should not be given conditional sentences. I think the woman would have received more time in jail had she been charged with just killing the dog. The SPCA would have created a big furore about it. But she killed her husband and she is now in British Columbia. There are many cases like that. I was going to get into this when I talked about conditional sentencing but I ran out of time.

Two gentlemen in Montreal were convicted of a brutal rape. Both men were given conditional sentences because the judge felt they did not quite understand our justice system because it is not the same as the one where they were born. They both have lived in Canada, one for nine years and the other for eleven years.

That is what is wrong with conditional sentencing in this country. The committee knows that. There has been no movement by this government to get it into committee, speed it up and start to do something about that. The parliamentary secretary gets very mad when I talk about these things, but that is our job. We are the opposition. We point out the faults. The system is not totally wrong, but there are some serious faults in the system and they have to be corrected.

My friend from the NDP talked about boot camps. I do not know if he has been to the one in Ontario but a lot of parents who have had kids go to this boot camp have written the government saying it was a great idea. It certainly beats the Liberal idea of throwing them in jail. The Liberals want to throw them all in jail. Why not have a boot camp where they can get some education instead of putting people in jail. The Liberals want to put young people in jail. We want to put them in a facility where they can get an education and learn what it is like in society, not throw them in the present jail system which is underfunded and does not work properly because of this government and the government before it.

There have been two parliamentary reports on penitentiaries in this country. One was done in 1972, chaired by Mark MacGuigan, of which I was a member and which made recommendations. The other was done in 1987. Both the Tory government and the Liberal government have done nothing about those reports.

We still have a rotten system and it is not working. Boot camps might have a place in our system. I suggest that the member visit the one in Ontario.

In my speech I did not get the chance to talk about prevention. There is no prevention. We want to look at prevention to make sure these things do not happen. That includes looking at poverty and

Supply

unemployment about which the member talks. I agree with him. They are serious issues. We are not going to solve the other justice problems without solving unemployment and poverty issues. We want to look at those issues too.

• (1050)

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the member focused all his attention on the 10% plus of violent offenders and that aspect of the new legislation. We know that at the moment, sadly, we incarcerate 25,000 young people a year. Some of those of course are not in for the entire year, but putting a young person in some sort of confinement certainly is going to mark them for life. That is four or five times the rate at which we incarcerate adults in this country.

The member talked about British Columbia and we have heard some discussion about Manitoba. One of the lowest rates of incarceration I understand is in the province of New Brunswick. It has very successfully involved the community in sentencing, with pre-court handling of young offenders and more family involvement in dealing with young offenders.

I understand that the province of New Brunswick has actually closed five or six prisons recently. Imagine the financial saving on the one hand, but also imagine the improvement in the people who are going through the justice system as a result of not spending unnecessary time in prison.

Will the member give some time now to discussing the 85% or 90% non-violent offenders who are the main people we are dealing with, who are the majority of these 25,000 young people we are putting into some sort of confinement every year? Would he comment on the New Brunswick example as a model for the rest of the country?

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to talk about that. I also suggest to my colleague that he look at Alberta, British Columbia and Quebec which have the three best records in Canada for young offenders.

I also find it very strange that the government side is getting up saying that we have 25,000 people in jail. Who put them there? The Liberals did. They have had the chance to change the rules. They have not done it. That is the whole point and they do not understand. The system we have right now came from the Liberals and the Tories.

We are talking about a system that works with young people in the system. Put some money into prevention. There is no money from the government for prevention. The government is supposed to fund the Young Offenders Act 50:50. It is not doing it. It is funding it 30%. There is no money for prevention. There is no money from these Liberals.

The Liberals will try to have us believe that it was the Reformers who put 25,000 people in jail. The hon. member mentions 10%.

I wish the parliamentary secretary would not use the word lie but she keeps on using it on that side.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: I apologize.

Mr. John Reynolds: She apologizes. I will accept her apology.

The Liberals are the government. I have been on the government side where we can make laws. They can make laws. They are not making them. They are talking about them. They try to blame their faults on the opposition. In this area it is not the opposition's fault. We have been offering good solutions. We want to offer prevention. We think the money should be going into prevention. It is not going there.

We will be bringing that out in the very near future with details on how we can prevent a lot of these crimes in Canada. Then we will see how serious the Liberals are about spending money on the real problems in this country.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my formal remarks, I would like to talk about the type of visual reality of the justice system that would happen in this country if, God forbid, there ever was a Reform government. It would be a justice system based on the law of the jungle, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, vigilante justice. Call it what you may, Mr. Speaker, but that is exactly what the hon. member just indicated to us when he spoke in this House.

The motion itself is reflective of that. It does not matter what crime is committed in this country, let us get rid of the judges, let us get rid of due process of law, let us get rid of the lawyers, let us get rid of anything that comes between the irresponsible and fearmongering policy makers on the other side of the House and a justice system that has shown that it is one of the best in the world. Let us forget of course about the fact that they want to criminalize, maybe not throw them in jail, but criminalize 10-year olds contrary to what the hon. member said. Let us look at what is the worst in society as the rule rather than the exception.

That is what Reform members have been saying in this House for the year and a half that I have been parliamentary secretary.

• (1055)

They talk about fearmongering and—I will not say lies—misinformation where irresponsible policy makers want to create a society where everyone has a gun and everyone shoots whenever anyone gets in the way. That is exactly the type of society they want to promote.

Supply

There is no such thing except the exception to the rule, continuously the exception to the rule to what happened.

I believe Canadians do not share that vision of our justice system. Canadians do not have a wild west vigilante mentality in terms of this country's justice system. I do not believe that the type of justice system being promoted by Her Majesty's Official Opposition is the type of system Canadians in general want to have.

I believe Canadians believe in the due process of law. They believe in an individual having the right to a hearing before a judge and jury of his or her peers. They believe our youth have to be given the help they need whenever they need it. They also believe that their money should not be spent in creating more jails or incarcerating more people but by investing in rehabilitation. I also believe Canadians believe in compassion and in the respect of individual rights and freedoms.

Those are all the things this side of the House also believes in. The fact that Canadians have given us a second mandate is indicative also that most Canadians do not believe the system the Reform Party is promoting is the type of justice system they want in this country.

Today I would like to deal with one aspect of the motion. The motion itself was a smorgasbord of whatever Reform has been discussing in this House over the last six years that I have been a parliamentarian. I would like to deal with the youth criminal justice act which we recently introduced in this House and the government's broader strategy to renew the youth justice system.

We believe the bill responds to the extensive consultations on the strategy for the renewal of youth justice which was released by the government on May 12, 1998 with concerned citizens, governments at all levels and other partners who want improvements to the youth justice system. Canadians want to change the youth justice system and they want programs and resources to support those changes. We propose to give them exactly that, despite what the hon. member said in this House.

The government's strategy for the renewal of youth justice recognizes that the foremost objective is public protection. It distinguishes legislation and programs appropriate to a small group of violent young offenders and those appropriate for the vast majority of non-violent young offenders. It takes a much broader, more integrated approach than the simplistic approach that is emphasized by the members in the opposition. It also emphasizes prevention and rehabilitation. The strategy is based on three key directions that work together to better protect the public.

First is prevention. The best way to protect the public, victims, families and youth, is to prevent crime in the first place. I think we all agree on that. On June 2, 1998 the government launched a \$32 million a year community based crime prevention initiative that includes children and youth as priorities. Programs proposed by communities from one end of this country to the other are currently being funded to prevent youth crimes.

Meaningful consequences is the number two priority. Youth crime will be met with meaningful consequences. But what is meaningful? It depends on the seriousness of the offence and the circumstances of the offender, something the opposition would like us not to take into account of course.

Rehabilitation and reintegration. A fundamental principle of Canada's youth justice system is that young offenders with guidance and support are more likely than adults to be rehabilitated and become law-abiding citizens. We on this side of the House truly believe and some members on the other side of the House also believe in programs that help to rehabilitate young offenders, protect the public, prevent further crimes and reflect society's commitment to youth.

[*Translation*]

I want to begin with what we plan to do to prevent youth from committing crimes. This, in our opinion, is the best way to protect society, and to help youth at the same time, as we wish to.

The way to accomplish this is to address the very causes of crime. We must use every means at our disposal to battle poverty and child abuse, which are known to frequently lead to youth crime.

• (1100)

We cannot wage this battle alone, however. If we are to have a long term strategy addressing the causes of youth crime, we are aware that many others must be included: individuals, organizations, and in particular the provincial governments, which are involved in crime prevention, child welfare, mental health, education, social services, and employment.

Families, communities and victims will also have a role to play in this battle against youth crime, waged within the framework of the national community safety and crime prevention strategy.

The government is spending \$32 million a year to help Canadian communities set up the necessary programs and crime-prevention partnerships.

The Youth Criminal Justice Act will be the foundation for a renewed system of youth justice, but it is only one piece of the puzzle. We all know that legislation, however harsh, will not stop young people from committing crimes and innocent people from becoming victims.

This is why we have included rehabilitation and reintegration into society in our bill.

[*English*]

The legislation is an important element of a broader strategy for addressing the complex problem of youth crime. The legislation provides an effective and flexible framework for youth justice and

Supply

distinguishes approaches for violent offenders and the majority of less serious offenders.

It includes overarching principles and sentencing principles which emphasize that the penalty must be proportionate to the seriousness of the offence. It provides for greater protections of the rights of young accused while attending flexibility and streamlining procedures for the administrators of the system.

It includes a broader range of sentencing options, many of which reinforce important social values like requiring the youth to repair the harm caused by the offence. It addresses flaws in the previous system and provides a balanced approach to the complex problem of youth crime, not the simplistic approach of the Reform.

We know however that legislation alone will not reorient the justice system. It needs to be supported by programs, trained professionals and committed partners.

The February 16, 1999 budget recognized the need for additional resources to support the new legislation and renew the youth justice system. Some \$206 million was allocated for the first three years and a total of about \$400 million in additional resources would be available for the six year implementation period. This is a significant addition that will lead to the renewal of the youth justice system.

[*Translation*]

Canada as a whole continues to incarcerate a higher percentage of young offenders than most countries. This is a concern. Although international comparisons continue to be difficult because of the differences between systems, Canada apparently incarcerates a relatively higher percentage of young people than even the United States.

In addition, the rates of incarceration vary considerably across the country, ranging from 9% to 32% per 10,000 adolescents depending on the province.

It is sad that the great majority of young people in custody are there for non-violent offences for which community approaches will do a much better job of promoting social values such as responsibility and accountability.

[*English*]

Contrary to the assertion of the opposition, the government is addressing the youth justice concerns of Canadians with new laws and supporting programs that will prevent crime and ensure meaningful consequences for those who do commit crimes—

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry but the hon. parliamentary secretary's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I usually agree with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice on issues of criminal justice, particularly very important ones such as this one. We usually agree on the major thrusts and on the implementation of the Criminal Code.

However, in this debate on the motion put forward by the Reform Party, which is obviously motivated by the recent amendments proposed to the Young Offenders Act by the Department of Justice, I have a hard time reconciling the speech made this morning by the secretary parliamentary with the new thrust of the Young Offenders Act, with the new way of implementing the youth justice system in Canada.

• (1105)

Clearly, and even with the virtual agreement of two parties, it is in response to the pressure exerted by western Canada and the Reform Party that the Liberals reviewed the Young Offenders Act to strengthen it and to provide for stiffer penalties.

How can we reconcile the speech of the parliamentary secretary on rehabilitation and social reintegration with the possibility of having 14 and 15-year old kids being imprisoned and having their names published in newspapers, which would mark them for life? How can we reconcile these two things with the parents' responsibility?

I therefore ask the parliamentary secretary if she thinks that her speech is credible with regard to that issue?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe my speech is very consistent in this regard. As the hon. member is well aware, we have made our bill flexible precisely so that the system that is already working in the province of Quebec can continue to operate. We have, however, given attorneys general and ministers of justice everywhere in the county the right to reflect their communities' values.

It may be that Quebec's view is not one shared by all parts of Canada. It is our hope that the \$206 million we have allocated to rehabilitation and to social reintegration of youth will help to create rehabilitation programs.

I would point out at the same time that we were not pressured in any way. We have made a collective decision, which is how the Liberal party operates, and it is one that reflects all views of this country.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Coquitlam—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is typical of the government side to create a

Supply

false picture and then rail against it. It is rather a phony, hollow play.

When we on this side talk about personal responsibility, government members call it fearmongering. When we talk about victim concerns rather than being too offender focused, they call it rather simplistic. Obviously we can hear today how touchy they are because there is a big problem out there in the community for which the government is responsible. They are accountable.

Just to be reasonable and to deal with facts, not false notions, we can do a lot better in the justice system. When we perform our official opposition role of pointing out inadequacies, what we ask from the government is simply to fix the problem and not get into an esoteric debate.

There is a lot of boasting today about the new young offenders bill before parliament. Will the government be prepared to accept amendments to the bill based on consultation with the community rather than continue to boast about how good the proposed bill is?

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House have never dealt with anything except the facts. Unfortunately that is not the case on the other side of the House. Yes, we know there are inadequacies and, yes, we are addressing them on this side of the House.

As far as victims are concerned, I remind the hon. member that we have dealt with victims as a priority in the justice system, including in the new legislation that we tabled last week.

As far as making any comments on consultation, I do not think there has been any piece of legislation which has had as much consultation as this piece of legislation that we have introduced in the House.

A justice committee did a consultation. The ministers of justice across the country have been consulted. A number of organizations and a number of Canadians have been consulted. There has been extensive consultation as far as this piece of legislation is concerned. There will be further consultation according to the process we have established as a parliament.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a good thing go back to the motion itself, which reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government has failed to deliver criminal justice programs and laws that reflect the will and concerns of the majority of Canadians, including issues like child pornography, young offenders, impaired driving, conditional sentencing, drug trafficking, home invasions, police funding, consecutive sentencing, corrections facilities and illegal immigration, and as a consequence, have put individual safety, and in some cases national security, in jeopardy.

• (1110)

One is forced to conclude that this motion was prompted, as I said earlier, by amendments to the Young Offenders Act, among other things, but that it is also a reaction to the shocking case in British Columbia relating to child pornography.

I have some misgivings about the misconceptions this implies. The motion is based solely on perceptions, on emotions, on exceptions, and on the misinformation the Reform Party has been involved with ever since 1993, as justification for its desire to make some extremely significant changes, to the Young Offenders Act in particular.

I am not saying today that everything is rosy and wonderful and that we have the best system in the world. That is not the case. All systems need to be modernized and improved. There are areas where the government does not perform and should. There are vitally important areas where the Liberal government does nothing and should do something.

More dollars are laundered in this country than anywhere else in the world. What is the federal government doing about it? Absolutely nothing. We are proud to be the country laundering the most dollars. It would be easy to intervene. The government could simply outlaw the use of \$1,000 bills, as the Bloc Quebecois member for Charlesbourg has been suggesting for a while now. Nothing is happening.

Epic battles had to be waged here to get the Liberal government to pass minor legislation on gangs. It does not go as far as we would like. It is not right for criminal gangs to call the shots as they are doing across the country without any intervention and the heads of the gangs being caught.

Certain laws protecting public security contain weaknesses. In terms of police services funding, the government could certainly put more money into prevention. Then there is the victims element.

There must be compliance with the Canadian Constitution as well. Odd to hear this from the mouth of a Bloc member, but there is a Canadian Constitution, and the people in this House do not appear to really know what it is about. It sets out responsibilities. But, as the Bloc member pointed out, not even the government complies with the Constitution, intervening in provincial areas of jurisdiction. Perhaps it should set an example.

The bottom line is that there is room for improvement in the system, but perhaps we should not expect to amend the Criminal Code or the Young Offenders Act by debating this kind of motion, or by citing specific cases that have made the headlines.

The Young Offenders Act is something I take a great interest in. I am familiar with the Young Offenders Act because a consensus was reached in Quebec. Efforts to address youth crime have been going

Supply

on for 25 or 30 years. Lawyers, criminologists and specialists fought just as hard with the Government of Quebec of 25 or 30 years ago as they did with the federal government to bring about the structure we have today, and all stakeholders are proud of their achievement.

Members will surely understand my mistrust with respect to any sort of amendment to a bill that could undermine Quebec's approach to youth crime.

When I see this sort of à la carte legislation being proposed, when I see legislation purporting to be very flexible, according to the Minister of Justice and her parliamentary secretary, legislation that each province could enforce as it saw fit, I wonder. Why does the federal government want a Young Offenders Act then? Why does it not withdraw completely and leave the provinces with full jurisdiction over youth crime?

• (1115)

Quebec would immediately praise such a move on the part of the Minister of Justice, if she had the courage to make it. But I am afraid this is not about to happen. The whole thing is a smokescreen. It is not true that the new way of doing things with regard to criminal justice is as flexible as the government would have us believe to get Quebec to shut up, as federalists often try to do.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: I hope that the members from Quebec who are here are listening and will ask me questions. I will be pleased to answer them.

The Minister of Justice, and even Reformers, rely on statistics that do not demonstrate any need to make amendments to the Young Offenders Act.

I will quote the figures mentioned by the minister herself when she introduced her amendments. They are from Statistics Canada, which means they should be precise numbers. The crime rate among young people has dropped 23%, even for violent crimes. That is those crimes targeted by the minister's proposed amendment, those that prompted her act and propose changes. There has even been a 3.2% drop since 1995.

Contrary to what a Liberal member said, juvenile crimes do not account for 10% of all crimes, but for less than that. One should look at the actual figures before saying things that make no sense.

That is why, given the statistics quoted by the minister, we must arrive at the conclusion that she is blindly amending an act that is good.

I attended the meetings of the Standing Committee on Justice, which examined this issue. I heard all the stakeholders, including some from western Canada, British Columbia and Ontario, and

they said the problem was not really the act itself but the related funding.

In Quebec, people said "It is not the act that presents a problem, but the financing. Please do not change the Young Offenders Act. Maintain the status quo".

Some 25 or 30 years ago, we in Quebec decided to invest in rehabilitation and social reintegration instead of in bricks and mortar for jails in which to keep young people locked up, so that they come out at age 25 or 30 with a fine education in how to commit crime, and an inability to do anything else. What we do instead is to invest in the individual, to focus on the heart of the problem. We have excellent success rates for rehabilitation and reintegration into society.

Of course it does not make the front page headlines when a young person who committed a murder at age 15 and was placed in rehabilitation now, 10 or 12 years later, having been rehabilitated, becomes an anonymous member of society, marries and starts a family, has a job, and is not dependent on society. This does not make the front page, of course, but it is a situation we see daily as a result of the way we apply the Young Offenders Act.

Members will understand, therefore, that it is impossible for me not to react when I hear inaccurate statistics and information given in this House. I will speak out as strongly as possible against any such attempt by either the Reform Party or the Liberal Party, who seem to get along very well when a detour to the right is necessary. I will be quick to stand up and defend my point of view, which is a point of view shared by all Quebecers, and we know what we are talking about.

Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I find the speech by member, colleague and friend from Berthier—Montcalm sad.

If there is a point of consensus on this bill it is the remarks by the head of the Quebec Bar, Jacques Fournier. He said that this bill was not only in line with the philosophy of the Quebec Bar, but that the government had once again demonstrated that it is flexible and that it is following up on the extraordinary work done by the legal community on this issue in Quebec.

• (1120)

I understand that the opposition has to oppose. It is very frustrating for a colleague like the member for Berthier—Montcalm, whose voice revealed in a way that he was trying to defend the indefensible. I would ask him, however, what he wants exactly, given that we are being flexible and especially that we are providing the funding, because I am interested in this matter. The Centre Mariebourg in my riding helps prevent crime in its way and works with young people.

Is the role of the member for Berthier—Montcalm to defend the indefensible and to come up with all sorts of ways to promote his

Supply

own political cause? Should he not, in any case—and we are all familiar with his intellectual honesty in this regard—applaud the work of the minister and the flexibility of this government, which works? What wears him out in the end is that the system can work within Canada, is it not?

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the member for Bourassa takes this approach, because I have tried to avoid petty politics when it comes to the very important topic of crime. If the member had followed the proceedings of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, he would know that on several occasions I set aside partisan politics in order to raise extremely important points for the betterment of the law, which I hold very dear.

In this case, I am being told what Quebec's president of the bar said. Quebec's president of the bar represents his peers. I am a member of the bar, and therefore he must represent me. He is also supposed to represent his committee, which has examined the issue. Other members of this committee include Ms. Toutan, Me Bois and Me Trépanier. Although I have not discussed the issue with them, I have heard what they have to say and they are squarely against the president of the bar's comments. They will apparently sort this out among themselves. Quebec's president of the bar did not inform any of them that he would be attending a press conference with the Minister of Justice, and, in particular, none of them was aware of his new view of the Young Offenders Act in this great land, Canada.

I will leave the Quebec bar to sort this out among themselves. Things will undoubtedly be said to which we will not be privy, but I am certain that there is still a consensus in Quebec and that it is opposed to the amendments the minister is proposing.

If the minister, her parliamentary secretary, or even the Liberal member for Bourassa were convinced that the Quebec approach is the best one, how can it be that they, as federalists who want only the best for Canada, have not been successful in selling this idea in English Canada? How can it be that, in order to put Quebec in its place, they are creating national standards and then telling Quebec "If you want any money, you'd better put up and shut up". Yet, when it comes to what will be implemented in western Canada, flexibility will be allowed, a flexibility that is not part of the law.

Today, there are some reflex reactions that did exist previously, and that will eventually have an impact on how young offenders will be handled in Quebec, and this I cannot allow. If the Liberal members from Quebec can, they will have to bear the responsibility for their actions. I, as a lawyer and an MP who is doing a serious and professional job here, cannot accept the minister's approach.

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the rest of the day and this very scintillating debate. I am pleased to be participating in this debate.

• (1125)

I appreciate the fact that my colleagues have brought forward this motion to deal with the criminal justice system, to deal with the way laws are interpreted by the judiciary and to look into issues like child pornography, young offenders, home invasions, impaired driving, conditional sentencing, consecutive sentencing, correctional facilities, illegal immigration and a number of others.

I do not think we, and particularly members on the government side, should feel defensive. We will not suggest they are responsible for every aspect of our criminal justice system and its interpretation. We also will not suggest any party has the corner on truth when it comes to dealing with these issues.

However, it is important to share our points of view in hopes that some changes will occur. I do not expect a single member of parliament, if they were honest in terms of representing the views of their constituents, would say there not improvements to be made to the system.

The government has recently introduced changes to the Young Offenders Act which, on a personal basis, I believe is a step in the right direction as changes are obviously required. I think there are improvements that can be made to the bill. My friend from Quebec who just spoke pointed out some of his concerns. The Liberal member reflected the fact that we are being flexible so that communities in different parts of the country can be reflected in the way the Young Offenders Act is interpreted and used.

Perhaps it is a strength to acknowledge that parts of the country such as the province of Quebec have had incredible successes dealing with the young offender issue provincial jurisdictions much more than some other jurisdictions. We can therefore learn from them.

On the other hand, we have to be concerned that we will have a number of systems dealing with young offenders across the country that reflect these realities in parts of the country. Do we really want to have a justice system that is different in one part of Canada for some Canadians than in another part? There is a national standard when it comes to interpreting the Criminal Code. These are issues we have to discuss and consider.

My friend spent some time talking about the Shaw decision surrounding the issue of child pornography. I think I reflect all our views when I say we share a deep concern the moment it is legal to have child pornography in one's possession for personal use. One would have to ask what other use there would be. Building material? I doubt that. It is obviously for personal use.

In British Columbia a judge has said that it is okay to have child pornography in one's possession as long as one is using it for one's personal use. That is a terrible situation. I think MPs from all parties would say that is not right and that we will take steps to ensure that is changed. Every time there is an individual with child pornography of some sort in their home it means that some young

Supply

people have been abused and taken advantage of in a most degrading circumstance.

This is obviously an issue of concern because we are hearing it today. The parliamentary secretary ought not to take these criticisms personally. We are simply putting them on the table and saying these are issues that must be dealt with in whatever form it might take. If it is a change to the Constitution by using the notwithstanding clause, so be it. If it requires new legislation, so be it.

There is also the issue of impaired driving. I think we are all concerned when we listen to our local divisions of Mothers Against Drunk Driving and others and read their literature about the carnage on our highways that is attached to those people who, for whatever set of reasons, choose to drink and drive. Perhaps we need to get a little tougher on them.

I think it was the state of New York that announced a change in policy where if someone is found to be driving his or her vehicle and drinking, the vehicle is impounded and sold. The driver does not get it back under any circumstances. That will slow people down and make people think twice. It is hard to say whether that is a solution but we have to look at all aspects.

On a personal basis, there is the issue of illegal immigration. This is a huge topic and deserves a full day of debate in the House of Commons. There are a lot of people who work hard to enter Canada in legal ways by going through all the proper channels in time consuming processes and so on. We also see people who short-circuit the system and then go underground. There are thousands of people who abuse our immigration laws in that way and therefore wreck it for those who are legitimate applicants. This is something we have to take more seriously.

In the last few days I think we all had visits by police forces across the country, the RCMP and others. They visited almost every member of parliament, pointing out their incredible frustration with working hard to nail some drug dealer only to see the drug dealer getting off in court on some bloody technicality and being out there hours later selling drugs on the street to young people. There are all kinds of abuses. I do not know how police officers can stand it.

• (1130)

An hon. member: They do not make enough money.

Mr. Nelson Riis: They do not make enough money. I do not think we could pay police officers enough for the work they do on our behalf.

They were here the other day pointing out the frustration they experience in attempting to uphold the laws. We are probably not short of laws but it is the way the laws are being interpreted, the

way they are being administered, and the way the judicial branch is dealing with the laws.

I will go back to the Shaw decision in British Columbia. We would be remiss today if we did not mention one of the more unfortunate issues relating to our corrections system, that is the large number of aboriginal inmates in our jails. A large number of first nations men and women are incarcerated in Canada by and large because they often cannot afford a good lawyer to argue their case. As a result of living in conditions that can only be akin to poverty and being unable to get the legal advice and support they require, they end up serving time in jail, which as someone said earlier is really a crime college.

If a young offender who is in some difficulty wants to become a full time criminal, there is no better place to learn the art of crime than in jail. If a young offender breaks the law in some form we have to be very cautious and see jail as a last resort. Steps need to be taken in an attempt to break the cycle of crime as opposed to sending the young person off to crime college, as I call it.

If we are to make our streets and neighbourhoods safe, we cannot rely on the police to do it. We cannot rely on the judicial system itself to do it. We all have to be part of the solution. In other words, communities have to buy into the fact that they too have to be part of the security.

I am thinking of the various protection plans which exist in neighbourhoods, the neighbourhood watch approach. People look out for one another. If they see a suspicious character they call the police. If someone is breaking down someone's back door, he is probably not an uncle trying to get in.

This brings me back to the whole issue of adequate funding for our police forces. I do not think there is a single jurisdiction in Canada or a single taxpayer in Canada that would not wilfully add a few cents to the tax load if it was going into better policing for neighbourhoods and safeguarding streets and communities across the country. I think we all admit that government funding when it comes to security, particularly in terms of funding our police forces, has not been sufficient. As a result Canada's security has suffered to a certain extent.

We have to send a signal, which I think this debate today will help to do, to the judicial aspect of our system in Canada. Many people have suggested that we have a good legal system but there is not much justice in it. Often we see justice being set aside for all kinds of spurious reasons. I hope the judges, particularly the ones that have made some terribly goofy decisions in the last little while, will take note of our discussions today.

I want to make an appeal in my closing comments. While we are dealing with crime and how to deal with those who break the law or have been alleged to have broken the law, we need to spend some

time looking at the causes of crime. Why do people break laws? Why do people decide to do something they know is illegal?

I suspect there are two fundamental causes. One is people do goofy things. I am thinking particularly of many young offenders who do something as a result of youthful exuberance or a moment of misjudgment. They are not criminals; they just do something stupid. I suspect an odd one of us in this room has probably been in that category at one time or another.

• (1135)

Second, let us admit that a fundamental cause of crime is extremely dysfunctional families that have become dysfunctional often because of some element of poverty.

I am not linking poverty and crime. I am saying that high levels of poverty, excessive levels of poverty, often lead to very dysfunctional families and result in dysfunctional behaviour in society and consequently to crime. Let us spend some time on the causes of crime, not only on crime itself.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member from Kamloops. I heard him make reference to the rate of incarceration of our aboriginal peoples. He also made reference to looking at the front end, trying to look at prevention and so on.

I have often thought about two statistics that are not normally linked. I wonder if the member has some independent thoughts on them. I would like him to share them with the viewers and listeners. They relate to what we all know so sadly as fetal alcohol syndrome which affects the aboriginal population in a statistically high way. We also know that victims of fetal alcohol syndrome have traditionally and statistically provable high rates of incarceration.

If we look at those two statistics independently in the broad population there is a definite linkage. If we look at them specifically in the aboriginal population, it would be very interesting to know what the link is. We are possibly understating the true impact of fetal alcohol syndrome and how it is ravaging the population, particularly in terms of the rate of incarceration of aboriginal peoples.

I have never actually seen a study that links those two statistics. Does the member from Kamloops want to make any comments in that regard?

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the inquiry by my friend from Vancouver Island North because he has identified one of the very serious issues confronting our society as a whole but particularly concentrated in some aboriginal communities, the whole issue of fetal alcohol syndrome and the victims of it.

Supply

It is fair to say that any individual suffering from the results of fetal alcohol syndrome will have a difficulty functioning well in society. People who have difficulty functioning in society often tend to be marginalized, tend to get into situations where there is very little hope in terms of having a successful future, and therefore often turn in desperation to acts of violent crime. Particularly they get caught up in substance abuse issues in their own communities or homes and violent crimes.

The member has done the debate a great deal of service by flagging an issue that is not only of concern to us all but probably ought to be much more of a concern: the ramifications of substance abuse generally in our communities. I thank my friend from Vancouver Island North. That is a positive aspect of this debate. We are all putting items on the table for consideration in the hopes that somebody somewhere is listening.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I noticed that all of those who spoke today referred to child pornography in B.C. Anyone involved in child pornography is sick. We have to take necessary steps. We all have to come together, fast track and do whatever has to be done to correct this situation in B.C., because we do not want anyone else across the country doing it. We have to think about those little children.

• (1140)

The Prime Minister told me that in 1972 he received pictures of little girls and at that time he was trying to do something to straighten it out.

What steps does my colleague from the NDP think all of us collectively should take to straighten out this matter immediately?

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, as always I appreciate a question from the hon. member for Saint John. In her emotional question she reflects the view on this issue of every member of parliament representing every Canadian. We have to take whatever steps are necessary to obliterate any use of child pornography.

Arising from our earlier discussions, if new legislation is required to send a very clear signal to our judiciary, so be it. We will pass that expeditiously. I am sure all parties would move on that. If it requires the use of the notwithstanding clause of our Constitution, we will suggest that we use that.

Essentially this behaviour is unacceptable by any clear thinking individual in society. We as a parliament will take whatever step is necessary to obliterate this blight as quickly as possible.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and always an honour to rise in the House to debate issues of such substance. I commend the

Supply

hon. member who brought the multifaceted issue before the House for debate. It touches on a number of very important subject areas.

Many criminal justice debates that take place in the House are done on what one might describe as a visceral level. It is fair to say that issues such as child pornography, sentencing or truth in sentencing certainly conjure up very strong emotions for individuals throughout the country, particularly those who are most affected. I am speaking of victims.

It is fair to say that significant steps have been made in the past number of years to address the inadequacies and the injustices that exist with respect to the treatment of victims in our criminal justice system. I would even go so far as to praise the justice minister for having recognized this.

I would also take the opportunity to praise the late Shaughnessy Cohen for her work on the justice committee as chair and in heading up a round table discussion in Ottawa that included many stakeholders in our justice system as it pertained to victims rights.

I will speak more specifically to some of the elements of the motion before the House today. When we speak to issues such as the recent decision out of British Columbia in the case of the Queen v Shaw that talks of the ability of a person to possess child pornography, it certainly conjures up a statement made by a law professor, Victor Goldberg in Nova Scotia, at Dalhousie University, when he said that bad facts make for bad law.

Often times we tend to get caught up in an individual case and hold it out as the standard or as an example of how the law should change. Often times that is a useful exercise, but we have to be very careful because proportionality and a measured response are implicitly important in the criminal justice system.

That is not to say that I or members of the Progressive Conservative Party in any way, shape or form condone the decision that was made with respect to child pornography. The suggestion that we brought forward was that it was an instance where there should have been direct intervention from the justice minister. There should have been an immediate response.

In cases such as that one the public perception is very important. For justice to be done it must be seen to be done. This is an old legal maxim from the myths of antiquity. Having practised law, Mr. Speaker, you would understand the importance of responding quickly but proportionately.

What should have happened and what we respectfully submit should have taken place in this instance was that the justice minister had an opportunity to refer it immediately to the top court to have the Supreme Court of Canada issue a ruling on the case immediately so that there would be clarification for law enforcement agents. There would be clarification for judges, in particular in the province of British Columbia, but right across the land.

There would be a renewed sense of confidence in our justice system that is so sorely lacking these days.

• (1145)

I want to touch briefly on the changes that have been brought forward through this new legislation, the youth criminal justice bill, which was tabled last week in the House. Again I cannot help but feel some sense of regret and a sense that it was a missed opportunity by the Minister of Justice to bring forward perhaps more meaningful legislation that would resonate across the country and restore the sense of justice.

It is fair to say that over the past number of years there has been a constant disintegration and erosion of our confidence as it pertains in particular to the way our laws apply to young people in this country.

The law itself is not all bad. The philosophy of the Young Offenders Act I think is one that we all agree with and one which we all embrace, and that is that young people do in fact have to be held to a different standard than an adult, a mature person. However, this particular legislation, rightly or wrongly, has been perceived as something that was set up to protect a young person as opposed to protecting society. At the end of the day, what justice in this country is all about is ensuring that those who choose to live within the ambit of the laws that have been formulated over the years and put in place through precedent and legislation are protected. Those laws are there to protect people who choose to live that life.

There are those who step outside those laws. They choose to do so for a reason. There are all sorts of philosophies about how criminal behaviour stems from poverty and many social ills, mental illness and others. However, at the end of the day the public has a right to be protected from those individuals, whatever the cause. They have the right to feel safe in their homes. They have the right to feel safe walking down the streets of their communities. They have the right to feel that when their children leave the house in the morning they will return home safe and sound.

What we have to do is ensure that those laws are not only properly in place but properly upheld and interpreted.

There has been much to do and much talk in recent days and months of judicial activism and the accountability level of our judges in this country. It is a very slippery slope when we begin to openly criticize our judiciary. They are entrusted with perhaps one of the most important jobs that can be performed in this country. In fact I would go so far as to say that judges, in the day to day carrying out of their duties, the individual discretion which they can exercise in a courtroom is perhaps one of the most powerful, most compelling employment situations that we see, perhaps even more so than an elected official, perhaps even more so than the Prime Minister.

Supply

It is vitally important that those judges are given the tools and the laws to enforce what they feel is appropriate in the circumstances.

The young offenders legislation I suggest was a missed opportunity to perhaps give those judges greater tools, with respect specifically to lowering the age of accountability. Members opposite have made a great deal of this situation, saying that members of the opposition are advocating a very strict hammering approach that would see young people, 10 or 11 years old, thrown in jail. That is not the suggestion and I have not heard anyone espouse that position.

We are talking about a mechanism that would put in place the ability to trigger some form of social reaction that would bring a young person into the system at the earliest possible instance. Early intervention is what it is all about, the pre-emptive strike, this approach that has been so vociferously advocated by the government and yet it is overlooking an opportunity to do this. It was from its own justice officials that this idea came forward. I believe there is a failing in that regard.

With respect to the resources that have been allotted to this initiative, this legislative change that is to occur for our young offenders, it is fair to say that there are scarce resources under the existing system of the Young Offenders Act and even with the injection of money that has been proposed this will not adequately compensate those in the social services, those in child welfare, who are going to be utilized even more so under this particular legislation.

It is once again a very tricky shell game that has been brought forward, much like we saw with the budget itself and the suggestion that greater resources were going to be put into health care. It does not compensate for the amount of money that was taken out.

• (1150)

The same can be said of our justice system. Over the past number of years, particularly since 1993, we have seen drastic cuts to our policing services and our social welfare services that work so closely with law enforcement and our judiciary. Mr. Clark, the leader of our party, has made this a priority. He very recently held a press conference to point out the inadequacies with respect to the funding that has been allotted in particular to our national police force, the RCMP.

We are very glad to see that the decision has been made to reopen the RCMP cadet college in Regina, but there is the obvious question: Who closed it? Who made that priority decision to stop training police officers in this country?

It comes down to political decisions and political will to change the law. There is an ever present opportunity on behalf of the

government to respond with laws that are not only appropriate but which address the problems being brought to light by members of the opposition and by members of the government.

As we speak, there is a bill at the justice committee to increase the discretion of a judge to allow for consecutive sentences for the worst of all possible crimes, the most heinous crimes perpetrated in today's world, such as sexual assault and murder. This bill came from a government member, yet the resources and the effort being made by her own party are extremely discouraging when one considers the effect which the adoption and imposition of this bill could bring at the end of the day.

I am very pleased to have an opportunity to discuss these most important issues. We are in the process of bringing about, hopefully, much needed change to impaired driving legislation. This has been itemized as something of great priority in this country. The issue of drug trafficking and organized crime has also been given a keynote appearance in this debate. We hope there will be further debate on these very important issues. We in the Progressive Conservative Party embrace the opportunity to participate in this debate.

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to my colleague from Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough. He made some comments about the RCMP training centre. This is a very significant issue that sends a very strong signal about where the government is coming from when it comes to supporting our police forces.

My understanding is that the RCMP anticipates that it is going to have a 50% attrition rate over the next five-plus years. That is a very high rate of attrition. The bubble is going through in terms of the high percentage of people approaching retirement. In order to replace that natural rate of attrition a certain number of recruits must be going through the system. It would be a challenge under the very best of circumstances if that training centre were open today, but it is not and it has not been. We do not know where the government is going with all this.

What on earth can be going on in the mind of the government that would allow this to happen? Sure, it will not affect major things in six months or twelve months, but there are downstream ramifications for our national police force, which is one of the most important symbols of this country and one of the most important practical organizations we have, although it is receiving no support from over there.

I wonder if the member could elaborate on that and maybe shed some new light on the subject.

Mr. Peter MacKay: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. I know he has a personal interest in such matters.

Supply

• (1155)

The short, flippant answer to what is going on in the government's mind would be, not very much. However, to delve into this situation and to put it into perspective, the cadet training college has been closed for upwards of four months now. Yes, that may be a short term saving for the government in terms of its bottom line which, as we know, is what is driving the finance minister these days. However, the bottom line is also that the short term gain is going to result in very long term pain.

As the hon. member has pointed out, much like the nursing shortage that is going to emerge in this country in years hence, the same could be said of policing.

The RCMP is a very proud institution with a great deal of history, but officers need proper training. Even with the reopening of the facility, there is talk about shortening the actual training period.

This comes down to a very shocking decision with respect to priorities on the part of the current government. Why it would do so is beyond me. Most individuals with whom I have talked in the policing community or in law enforcement find that this is simply a staggeringly shortsighted decision.

I commend the government for at least having recognized that it was a mistake in the first place and for reopening it; however, I cannot help but make the analogy with the current budget. The government is basically coming in the back door, taking out the furniture and the television, and wheeling an old rocking chair in the front door. It is taking out more than there was in the system in the first place.

I thank the hon. member for the question. I hope that greater emphasis and greater priority will be placed on criminal justice and on the training of officers so that in the years and months to come we will have a sufficient police force, a sufficient pool of trained officers to draw from so that Canadian communities will once again receive and enjoy a level of protection. There is a thin red line of protection—and I use red because we are talking about police scarlet letters—that exists between the policing community and the community itself, and the protection which it has come to respect and deserve from the criminal element.

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today. Regrettably, we have to rise to demand that this government make changes to the justice system which reflect the views of the vast majority of Canadians.

Regrettably, it is we in the opposition who have to remind the government constantly of its responsibility to react to what Canadians are saying, rather than reacting to its own philosophies when it comes to criminal justice.

I am going to talk about the criminal justice system as it relates to impaired driving today. Before I do, I want to take this opportunity to relate something which was very disturbing to me.

On Thursday, March 4, I read in the paper that a 57 year old woman, a grandmother, had just been released from prison after spending six months in incarceration. On Saturday, March 6, I read in the paper that another person had been sentenced to six months in prison.

The second person, on March 6, was sentenced for the act of child abuse, sexually molesting a child. This person, according to the report, was unrepentant. He saw nothing wrong with what he did. He received a sentence of six months, of which he will serve probably two and a half months under the Liberal justice system.

Let us return to Thursday, March 4, when this 57 year old lady was let out of prison. She served six months in prison because she dared to cross into a bubble zone around an abortion clinic to kneel and pray.

• (1200)

If anybody in the House, anybody in the Liberal government, could show me some sense of justice in the relationship between those sentences and crimes I would be very surprised. Imagine, an unrelenting, unrepentant child molester sentenced to six months and someone who dares to cross a bubble zone at an abortion clinic to kneel to pray receives the same sentence. It is unbelievable how our justice system serves up so much injustice. It is so out of whack.

I mention that because it shocked me. Even though there is no reaction I am sure it is shocking members of the Liberal government to hear that. If they do not believe what I am saying I suggest they dig up those two issues and read them for themselves.

Impaired driving is a very serious crime. It kills in the neighbourhood of 1,400 people every single year. It injures over 60,000 every year. As a matter of fact, impaired driving is the number one cause of criminal death in this country, more than three times higher than homicide. In the last five years it has cost our health care system. The property and causality claims are billions of dollars. In over 10 years nothing substantial has been done to arrest this very serious problem.

Over the last month and a half we have seen witnesses come before the justice committee to present their opinions on how we should address this very serious crime of impaired driving and how we can cut the senseless deaths. Now the justice committee is charged with reviewing all the testimony, taking into consideration all the recommendations and to bring back before the House by May 15 a bill that will take some very serious and positive steps to cutting the incidence of impaired driving, cutting deaths, injuries and cutting the cost to our health care.

Supply

I have to tell members at this time that I have some very serious doubts as to whether these Liberals, who talk the talk about wanting to cut the carnage on our highways, cut the incidence of death and injuries and the billions of dollars of cost, are serious. I have seen no indication that these Liberal members who sit on the justice committee and others who well over a year ago unanimously sent to the justice committee a supply day motion by the Reform Party that called for action are serious in any way about addressing the very serious crime of impaired driving.

Millions of Canadians have cried out for the federal government to take some leadership on this crime and do something that would reflect a zero tolerance attitude toward impaired driving. The victims of impaired driving deserve no less.

• (1205)

I am sad to say I am not confident at this time, having been involved in the justice committee hearings and the subsequent meetings going on right now, the government is serious despite what it has said.

There are a number of steps we can take. I guess the most appropriate one would be to look at the level of blood alcohol content in the driver of a vehicle once the reading on the breathalyzer is determined. There is much testimony to support the lowering of this level to .05 from .08, which I support. We also have a very serious problem with the court system that has not been addressed by this or previous governments.

In cases where people are charged with impaired driving we have heard testimony from prosecutors and policing officials that the judiciary automatically tends to accept the evidence of the person who is charged rather than the evidence of the crown prosecutor and the police force that has laid the charge. Something is wrong with that picture.

Something is wrong when a prosecutor can walk into a court, present certificate evidence from very high tech instruments to detect the level of BAC, where the margin of error is so small that it is almost insignificant, and the judge will tend to believe evidence contrary to those proven certificates of evidence.

I really hope, for the sake of the victims of impaired drivers, for the families left behind and for the sake of our health care system, that this government for once since 1993, since I have been in parliament, will do something positive to take some steps in the justice system that will be of benefit to Canadians. Here is an opportunity for it to do that. I hope it does not let Canadians down once again.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague from Prince George.

I would like to ask the member about the problem of break and enter which is becoming quite prevalent in Canada. In light of the fact that the revised Young Offenders Act was presented, I would like to have his opinion on why he thinks this was left out.

Mr. Richard M. Harris: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will not attempt to speak for the members of the Liberal government. Lord knows some of the steps they take or do not take are quite puzzling.

Yes, in British Columbia in particular the incidence of home invasions is at a very serious epidemic stage right now. It is incumbent on this Liberal government and members who represent British Columbians to respond to the call from residents of British Columbia to bring in some very tough and specific guidelines on how we treat offenders who do this very serious crime of home invasion.

Let us remember that the victims in almost every case are frail and elderly people who cannot defend themselves from home invasions by these thugs who would take advantage of them. Nothing less than serious jail time is appropriate in that case.

• (1210)

I live in a city that a few years ago won the distinction of being the highest B and E city in western Canada, Prince George, B.C. It was something we were not very proud of.

These were done mainly by young offenders and so many of them were repeat offenders because they were receiving nothing but a slap on the wrist when they appeared before the judge the first time and a slap on the wrist the second time.

I like what a judge from New York said about two weeks ago: "When a young offender comes before my bench on his first offence, I want it to be the worst experience of his life. Why? Because I don't want to see him back here again". I congratulate that judge.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to my hon. colleague's speech very carefully about impaired driving and the problems it is creating on an ongoing basis.

One of the proactive things I did as an independent member of parliament was to put forward a private member's bill dealing with the use of interlock devices for repeat offenders of impaired driving. Unfortunately I have not been lucky enough to have my name drawn so that we could debate that bill.

Can my hon. colleague talk a bit about the interlock device and whether he sees some merit in having that as part of a complete package that does adequately address the very serious concern of impaired driving in Canada?

Supply

Mr. Richard M. Harris: Mr. Speaker, the testimony and evidence we heard before the justice committee by people from Guardian Interlock gave us a good insight into what such a valuable tool this device would be, particularly in the case of people who were repeat offenders or who were stopped with a high level of alcohol.

Let it be clear that the Guardian Interlock system should not be used in place of any serious penalties that should be given to people who drive while impaired. It should be used in addition. It is not to take the place of a penalty. It is an additional part of it.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say it is a pleasure for me to rise to address these very serious concerns the Reform Party has brought forward today.

Unfortunately like so many Canadians, probably millions across the land, I am suffering a little from a cold and it is not very pleasurable to try to make a speech. If my voice fails me at some point during the speech members will understand why. Over the weekend I lost my voice completely. Some people would say that would be a good thing, in particular some members across the way who do not like to hear what I have to say from time to time in this place. It is bad news for a politician not to have a voice because it is the one essential tool of the trade, so to speak.

Today in the short time I have I will be addressing the issue of conditional sentencing. I should explain for viewers at home and those in the gallery what conditional sentencing is.

Conditional sentencing should not be confused with parole and conditional release. Conditional sentencing allows judges a tool whereby rather than sending a convicted or confessed criminal to jail or prison, they can divert that individual to conditional sentencing, to serving their time in the community or at home in many cases under certain conditions. Thus the term conditional sentencing. There are certain conditions imposed on that individual.

Conditional sentencing was established under legislation of Bill C-41 in the first session of the 35th parliament. That is the parliament immediately preceding the one that is under way at present. This bill made sweeping changes to Canada's sentencing laws, but in each case neglected to reflect the interests of Canadians. The majority of the debate when Bill C-41 was before the House was focused on classifying murder.

• (1215)

According to the Liberals, killing only one person is not so bad as long as you do not kill more than one, or murder out of hate. If either of those cases were prevalent in a particular conviction, either a multiple murder or a so-called hate crime, then the individual might have to serve their entire lenient sentence.

But I am digressing from my main point today which is conditional sentencing which was also contained in Bill C-41.

As far back as March 1995 the Reform Party has been pleading with this government to change the law to exclude violent crimes, but so far our cries have fallen on deaf ears. It has been four years since we first raised this very serious issue. It is some two and a half years now since this law has been put into force. On September 3, 1996 conditional sentencing actually came into place and began to be utilized by judges across the land.

In 1995 the Reform member for Crowfoot moved several amendments to Bill C-41 in committee which would have disqualified violent offences from conditional sentencing. It would have ensured that the sentences were to deter the offender and others from committing offences and that the sentences were to provide compensation to the victims and/or their families.

The Canadian Police Association and Victims of Violence echoed the concerns expressed by the member for Crowfoot, yet the Liberals did not support any of those measures. I find it ironic in light of that fact that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice rose in her place about an hour ago in questions and comments following her speech and said that she or her government would be willing to look at amendments to the newly announced changes to the young offenders legislation. Some of us on this side of the House and indeed all Canadians might be just a bit sceptical of how sincere she was. We might even have some reason to be cynical about it.

Conditional sentencing was meant to cut costs. Although it can be argued that some financial costs have been cut, the human costs of the victims of crime are mounting. The trauma one feels from an unjust sentence is immeasurable. I am sure one feels victimized all over again. The societal costs of conditional sentencing are mounting. Rapists, killers, child and spousal abusers and drug dealers are set free without deterrents or consequence. It is my firm belief that without proper punishment there is no deterrent.

Bill C-41 allows convicted criminals to serve their sentences at home in the community rather than in jail. It is my belief and the belief of many MPs including the justice minister that it was not parliament's intent that conditional sentencing be used in the cases of violent or sexual offences. In January 1998 the justice minister publicly stated that. She said, "There have been some circumstances in which I believe conditional sentences were used when it was not the intention of parliament to have them and those should be appealed". The minister added that conditional sentencing was never intended to apply to violent or sexual offenders.

I am going to relate to the viewing public a few of the cases where I believe conditional sentencing was applied inappropriately.

In Montreal three men were given 18 month conditional sentences after raping a 16 year old pregnant woman and holding her

upside down from a balcony. The judge thought that this was part of their culture.

In Winnipeg a youth previously convicted of theft and seven armed robberies and on temporary leave from a Manitoba youth centre received a one year conditional sentence and three year probation for the drive-by shooting death of a 13 year old.

In Nanaimo a 28 year old man received a one year conditional sentence for shooting his girlfriend with a crossbow.

In Edmonton a 57 year old man who swung a machete at a 21 year old male cutting his face and cutting a third of his ear off got 240 hours of community service and a curfew.

• (1220)

I raised this particularly appalling case during question period just last week. In Ottawa, Paul Gervais confessed to sexually assaulting nine boys, yet he got two years conditional sentence and a curfew. That is absolutely appalling. I think the general public has every reason to be outraged at these types of sentences.

Also in Ottawa, Robert Turcotte strangled his mother to death. He received a two year conditional sentence, 100 hours of community service and a midnight curfew.

Pay close attention to this one. In Vancouver, a person out on conditional sentence for two counts of theft and dangerous driving has been accused of killing an 83 year old woman during a home invasion.

While the justice minister prefers to allow the appeal courts to address the inappropriate use of conditional sentencing, the courts have indicated the opposite. The issue of conditional sentencing continues to become more and more of an ambiguous matter within the courts.

Despite the minister's belief about the intention of conditional sentencing, in August 1997 the B.C. Court of Appeal ruled that violent offenders are entitled to serve time in the community under conditional sentences. The B.C. appeal court ruling stated: "If parliament had intended to exclude certain offences from consideration under section 742.1, it could have done so in clear language".

It is my contention that Canadian courts are already bogged down. We should not be using the courts to appeal these types of sentences. Indeed the general public is waking up to this more and more and is becoming justifiably outraged at some of these sentences.

Since the minister has not responded to this public outcry or to her own criticisms of the law, I have submitted two private member's motions, Motion No. 383 and Motion No. 577, to rectify the situation. Motion No. 577 is currently on the Order Paper and reads:

Supply

That in the opinion of this House, the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights be instructed, in accordance with Standing Order 68(4)(b), to prepare and bring in a bill to prevent the use of conditional sentencing in cases where someone is convicted of a dangerous crime including: murder, manslaughter, armed robbery, kidnapping, drug trafficking, sexual assault, and all other classifications of assault including child and spousal abuse.

If the government would act on a motion similar to that and bring forward amendments to this section of the Criminal Code, it would certainly stand itself well with the general public. It would address a serious inadequacy in our present law.

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what I find more offensive, the sanctimony of Reform Party members or their contradictions. If I were to use something more precise like the word hypocrisy, I would be declared unparliamentary so I will not use that word.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I realize that the hon. member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia would not use it, but he will not use it through the back door if he cannot bring it in the front door either.

Mr. John Harvard: Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the contradictions.

The member for Prince George—Peace River has found conditional sentencing wanting. He is basically saying that judges and all the officials of the courts cannot be trusted with this tool of flexibility. According to the Reform Party member, since the courts cannot be trusted, the judges cannot be trusted, the prosecutors cannot be trusted, the defence lawyers cannot be trusted, this matter has to be returned to the legislators in Ottawa.

According to the Reform Party member, it is up to the legislators who will have the responsibility of getting it right. But, and this is where I get to the contradiction, who is more denigrated by the Reform Party? Who is more mistrusted by the Reform Party than legislators?

We cannot win with the Reform Party. The Reform Party does not trust the judges. It does not trust the prosecutors. It does not trust the defence lawyers. It does not trust the law makers. It does not trust the politicians.

• (1225)

It might be worthy to ask this particular Reform Party member whom do the Reform members trust? Whom will they turn to? In all their presentations they denigrate everyone in every part of the chain. They denigrate everyone. It does not matter what one does in this country, they will denigrate, they will show their absolute disdain for officers of any political institution.

Canadians understand this talk from the Reform Party. It really is grating on members of the governing party. We have a responsibility not only to the justice system, but to the whole country. Yet all

Supply

we hear from the Reform Party is let us see if we can denigrate one more Canadian citizen.

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not fail us again did he? He can always be counted upon to get up and launch into some outrageous diatribe instead of addressing the questions that we have today.

Mr. John Harvard: Why does the hon. member not address the question?

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, now he is intent on heckling when I try to address his ridiculous comments.

Yes, we do not trust certain legislators. We do not trust this Liberal government. That is obvious.

In this particular case we do not trust the judges to use conditional sentencing properly because they have proven themselves time and time again unworthy of that trust. That is part of the reason our justice system is falling into such serious disrepute with the general public.

If the hon. member would care to get out of this hallowed hall and go to where he is supposed to be, out west trying to rebuild the shattered shreds of his party's support in western Canada, he certainly would find out what the general public is thinking about the justice system.

Mr. John Harvard: Who do you trust?

Mr. Jay Hill: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member keeps hollering at the top of his lungs "Who do you trust?" We trust the wisdom of the general public, because they know that the justice system is failing.

I very calmly tried to bring forward during this debate today the very important issue of conditional sentencing and the abuse by the courts in the cases of applying it to violent offenders.

One statement the hon. member made which I will agree with, is he said that my comments were grating, that comments of Reformers were grating on him. We are the official opposition. I would hope that our comments are grating on the Liberal government. We are trying our very best on behalf of the Canadian public to hold this bloody government accountable.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Just before we get to the hon. secretary of state, we remind all hon. members to keep the tone of the debate respectful to the institution of parliament.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel (Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time.

When this government was re-elected nearly two years ago, we pledged as elected officials "to work tirelessly to ensure Canada remains a place where Canadians feel secure in their homes and on the streets of their communities". We will protect the right of all

Canadians to live in healthy, safe communities. We have kept this commitment and continue every single day to keep it in co-operation with our partners, the provinces, the territories and the communities.

A number of people have forgotten that the federal government enacts laws. It is the provinces and the territories with their communities and the various programs that administer and indeed enforce those laws.

Perhaps during the day there will be a focus on some of the exchange that has occurred here. Are we saying that the laws are all wrong, or are we saying that there is a need to improve a number of aspects of the system?

• (1230)

The focus thus far has been on the federal government. The federal government is not alone. It has partners. My colleague mentioned the courts, the judges, the prosecutors, the officials of the court, the police officers. Is the Reform Party actually saying that the only problem is the laws the Government of Canada enacts?

I would like Reformers to get up from their chairs and confirm that. Are they saying other things? I am not sure they are clear. I think they are trying to frighten people, to suggest that all of the malaise for those who commit crimes rests with the federal government. If that is the case, what nonsense. It simplifies the shallow thinking that often goes into these kinds of debates. There is no thinking it through. It is a little more complex than laws.

[Translation]

The government fully understands the importance of providing Canadians with an environment in which they feel safe. We have taken steps to improve the system and will continue to work toward enhancing the quality of life of all Canadians. The following are but a few examples of the initiatives we have taken to that end.

[English]

Just yesterday the solicitor general introduced reforms to the Criminal Records Act that will make the criminal records of pardoned sex offenders available for background checks by agencies serving children and other vulnerable groups. This change is about children and we have to be particularly sensitive to it. We are committed to protecting them. I hear heckling on that point. I take it there is disagreement from the Reform Party.

[Translation]

Last week, the Minister of Justice tabled an in-depth review of the criminal justice system for youth, the most detailed one in 15 years, I might add.

[English]

The Minister of Justice introduced a balanced package, a comprehensive overhaul of the youth justice system that meets the

needs of Canadians by clearly distinguishing between violent and non-violent crime and by ensuring meaningful consequences for both. As one part of this broad strategy for renewal of youth justice in Canada, the new criminal youth justice act will replace the Young Offenders Act.

Another initiative to help communities prevent crime in the first place is \$32 million a year for the national strategy on community safety and crime prevention. To improve the situation of Canadians who unfortunately become victims of crime this government has taken action.

[*Translation*]

In the ten 10 minutes I have, I could not do justice to all of this government's initiatives.

[*English*]

Let me highlight a few. The Government of Canada is committed to combating organized crime.

[*Translation*]

Organized crime is not a new phenomenon, but it can take a number of forms. That is why this government has been vigilant in changing the tools needed by the forces of order in the fight against this scourge.

The present government has given those bodies responsible for enforcing the law easier access to electronic surveillance in order to catch the leaders of organized crime.

Canadians have seen the scope of the violence caused by organized crime, which strikes indiscriminately. The present government has established new offences making involvement in criminal organizations a crime.

One of the main ways of attacking this type of crime is to ensure that the crimes involved do not pay. While criminal organizations cannot be imprisoned, as we all know, they do have a character vital to their existence. This character is reflected in their collective wealth.

• (1235)

When we go after the wealth of an organization, we also go after the ties that bind its members to it. Let us seize the proceeds of crime and all organized crime is destabilized.

[*English*]

Experience has demonstrated that co-ordinated enforcement efforts are the best way to achieve this goal. It has expanded its integrated proceeds of crime units in the past two years from three units to thirteen units in every part of the country.

These units bring together under one roof the talents of all those involved in the law enforcement continuum, including the RCMP

Supply

and provincial police, forensic accounting experts, customs officers and federal justice lawyers.

The efforts made by the government do not stop at our borders but include working closely with our foreign partners for the purpose of dealing with organized crime in a comprehensive fashion.

Let me now speak about victims of crime. Since 1999 this government has undertaken countless legislative initiatives that improve the justice system to benefit victims of crime directly and indirectly.

These include the enactment of provisions to enhance the protection of children victimized by sexual abuse, provisions to facilitate the provision of testimony by young victims, elimination of the defence of intoxication in crimes of violence such as assault and sexual assault, and provisions to restrict the production of personal records of sexual offence victims to the accused.

We all know that is not enough. In its recent report, the Commons justice committee confirmed that victims of crime are not asking for tough laws, tough penalties, for vengeance or for rights to be taken away from the accused. They want a voice, respect, information and help to participate in an often demanding criminal justice system. We will give them just that. In the next few weeks the Minister of Justice will table a series of Criminal Code amendments.

[*Translation*]

The amendments the minister will introduce in the coming weeks will ensure a source of information for victims.

[*English*]

These will ensure that victims receive more information about their role in the criminal justice system, services available and about the case in which they are involved.

[*Translation*]

I will conclude with these comments.

[*English*]

What have the results been thus far? The Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics reports that in 1997 the rate of police reported crime decreased for the sixth year in a row, falling 5%. The rate of violent crimes declined for the fifth consecutive year, down 1.1% in 1997.

Rates decreased for almost all violent offences, including sexual assault, robbery and homicide. The strength of the justice system is its ability to constantly evolve and to improve. We are looking at measures in which we must do that.

I simply want to encourage all colleagues to address the issues in a comprehensive way. It is not sufficient to say the laws are inadequate. Some are, no doubt. Some need to be changed, but

Supply

clearly there are other components of the system we need to study and where changes are required.

To simply say the federal government is responsible for all this is an irresponsible statement.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I listened very closely to the remarks of the hon. member. He has quite correctly pointed out that this is not about simplistic approaches. He listed some of the beneficial changes that have occurred under this government's administration.

There should not be the usual sanctimonious tone that we are becoming so accustomed to in suggesting this Liberal government is the only government that has ever enacted anything positive to the Criminal Code or anything that had a beneficial impact on Canadians.

• (1240)

With respect to one element of his speech concerning organized crime, organized crime is becoming a growing problem on the streets and in the communities throughout the country, particularly in coastal areas in places like Nova Scotia where I come from which has a very vulnerable coast line with contraband material and drugs coming into the country.

The hon. member is being a bit economical with the truth when he suggested this government has somehow done a great deal to combat organized crime considering the \$74 million that was taken out of last year's organized crime budget.

I would like to hear a little more detail as to what is actually being done by this Liberal government to combat increasing organized crime in Canada.

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is no sanctimony on my part nor have I heard sanctimony on the part of my colleagues. We acknowledge that other governments have made contributions. Clearly what we have today is as a result of this government, previous governments and provincial and territorial governments. We have no difficulty in saying that.

My colleagues and I believe that if people put their minds to it, whether they be from my party or another, we can improve a law, a process and a number of other initiatives that might be undertaken. I guess my plea was to do exactly that, not to simply batter the government for the sake of doing it.

I appreciate that my colleague from the other side has indicated that there have been serious and responsible initiatives undertaken by this government that have been implemented. I applaud that because we do not often hear that. We hear selective picking here

and there to try to pretend that particular incident can be generalized to the whole of Canada. We know that is nonsense, that is not accurate and it is not the way to conduct oneself.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the member said earlier, I was not heckling. I was just trying to make a point. The member speaks in such glowing terms of the legislation put forward by the solicitor general dealing with pedophiles and pardons, which I agree has to come forward because we need it. I might remind the House that the hon. member for Calgary Centre has private member's Bill C-284 in front of a committee right now which is virtually identical to what the solicitor general is proposing.

I was wondering if he would care to give the hon. member for Calgary Centre a bit of credit for this. Could he also explain why his government does not deal with the private member's bill and bring it in rather than bringing in its own legislation?

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: Mr. Speaker, that is my point. Does it really matter, if a good piece of legislation comes forth, who brought it forth? Is it not intended to benefit Canadians? Should that not be the first goal or is my colleague simply asking for an acknowledgement of his colleague? We will bring forth good, strong legislation. It will respond to the needs of Canadians.

My goal is not to say I did it, you did it. My goal is to bring forth and support legislation that will be useful, significant, sensitive and helpful to Canadians.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, coming from the same place as the hon. secretary of state, the province of Manitoba, I know he will agree that one of the biggest shortcomings that we see in the criminal justice system is its treatment of aboriginal people.

I read an alarming statistic that in 1969-70 the percentage of aboriginal people in the women's penitentiary in Kingston was 100%. To this day it is hugely disproportional to the rest of the population.

Having gone through and watched the aboriginal justice inquiry in Manitoba and given the recommendations of the royal commission on aboriginal people, would the member care to elaborate on how the justice system can better serve the aboriginal population, especially in the province of Manitoba?

Hon. Ronald J. Duhamel: Mr. Speaker, clearly there is a disproportionately large number of aboriginal peoples in our prisons which begs the question why. Is it because the laws do not favour them? Is it because police officers treat them differently? Is it because the judges or prosecutors treat them differently? I do not

have an answer to that question. It is a question that needs to be studied in a responsible way. It is not a simple answer that is required.

• (1245)

Because of a number of variables such as poverty, people coming to the cities unprepared to make the integration and sometimes getting into what one might call slight difficulties, the situation has become more serious and more and more people have been incarcerated. There has been a repeat way of approaching aboriginal peoples in many instances which does a disservice to the aboriginal population. It does not deal with them well. In fact it deals with them inappropriately.

It is something we ought to debate in the House. It is something that should be corrected and needs to be corrected. It uses too many resources inappropriately. Obviously those who commit serious crimes need to be treated as any other Canadian citizen is.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against the opposition motion.

[*English*]

First and foremost we have a very broad sweeping motion which would have us believe that no initiative has ever been taken in the past few years, not only by this government but by governments that went before, which has made a difference to many initiatives that reflect on the justice system or that deal with the issues of justice. That is what that sweeping motion would have us believe.

Let us look at some facts. In 1997 Canada's police reported crimes dropped 5%. In fact the police reported crimes dropped 19% over six years. In 1997 it was the lowest rate since 1980. The rates for all violent crimes were down this year. There were 54 fewer homicides than in the previous year.

Why am putting forward these statistics? I do not mean to say that we have nothing to worry about. What I am saying is that when we cry chicken little we better make sure the sky is indeed falling. I want to be clear that this tendency to create anxiety and a sense of fear in the public is what is at the root of this kind of opposition motion.

Anyone who understands the issue of justice and the issue of creating a safe and secure society knows that creating a safe and security society, or creating any kind of society where there is social cohesion and where everyone has a sense of belonging, is not only done by legislation. It is not only done by enforcement.

We need to look at the root causes of all societal problems. We need preventive measures to deal with those root causes. We need to look at the fact that poverty, alienation, and anger at the lack of

Supply

ability to become a participant in society, to get a sense of belonging in society, are at the root of some of the reasons persons commit crimes. That same political party, by not recognizing this, has said that if it had its way it would take \$2.5 billion out of transfers to provinces for social assistance. That same opposition party said that if it had the opportunity it would cut aboriginal community programs by \$800 million.

We want to talk about crime and we want to talk about justice, and that political party is not even interested in dealing with the root causes of crime.

The hon. member for Prince George—Peace River talked about how much he cared about impaired driving and about how concerned he was with the carnage that it creates. In the blue sheets of 1998 it was the Reform Party that said it would cut funding for all special interest groups. This is a wonderful word that political party likes to use. Community organizations that are seeking to partner with government to change society from the very bottom level are considered special interest groups.

If we cut funding for all special interest groups, what would happen to MADD, a significant organization in helping to deal with and bringing forward to governments policy initiatives and concerns about drinking and driving?

• (1250)

That party mentioned one of the things it was concerned about was drug trafficking. Let us talk about the fact that legislation enforcement is not all that is needed to deal with the issue. That party said that it would cut from fisheries and oceans \$640 million. Our coast guard is there to ensure that illegal drug shipments are not passed along our coast and into the country. There is an issue of prevention. There is an issue of ensuring that safety and enforcement of our shores is carefully taken care of.

The member for St. Albert called it waste in volume 1, issue 4, of the blue sheets when the Canadian government decided to fund the United Nations fund for drug abuse controls. Let us not do that.

Am I to believe what we are talking about here is that the only way to deal with justice is to lock up offenders, throw away the key, hang them high and hang them long? Am I to believe that we should simply deal with punishment and enforcement and not look at the reality of people's lives?

Everyone who understands societal problems and the way to deal with them would be able to look at prevention, which I just spoke about; at good legislation; at enforcement of that legislation; and at the fact that many criminals can be rehabilitated, especially young offenders. How do we rehabilitate young offenders? How do we assist them to re-enter society so that they can contribute as good citizens to societal growth in all its social, political, economic and cultural ways?

Supply

That does not factor into anything I have heard across the House today. We are talking about isolationist policy here and just talking about legislation. So let us just talk about legislation.

The issue of child pornography was raised by hon. members opposite. That political party would have us use the notwithstanding clause to deal with the issue of child pornography when there is a process in place. I think one of my colleagues on this side of the House mentioned that the group across the way does not trust anyone and anything. The case is being taken by the Attorney General of British Columbia to the Supreme Court of Canada. That is part of the process. That is part of our legal system. That is how it works.

The Canadian government and the Minister of Justice are assisting the Attorney General of British Columbia in taking this case to the supreme court. Let us see what the supreme court says. If the supreme court says that existing laws dealing with possession of child pornography are in contravention of the charter then the House, which is a band of legislators, can do its job. It can look at the legislation. It can find the faults and the loopholes. It can amend it, deal with it, not believe that we must ignore the judges of the land and make this political place define what judges must do.

This is not what the country is about. It is not about political interference in the courts. It is about allowing the court to do its work and allowing legislators to do what they are meant to do if our legislation does not work.

On another component of child pornography, it is as if suddenly a month ago that political party woke up one day and realized there was such a thing called child pornography. I had never heard members of that party speak about it for all the while they sat in the House over the last five years. It was not something that concerned them. It was not something they discussed. Yet all of us know it is an issue that this government and governments before have been trying to deal with.

In 1996 we brought a bill to the House in which we increased the penalty to a maximum of five years for any pimp who in fact commercially exploits children. The very first world conference on the commercial sexual exploitation of children occurred in Sweden in September 1996. Prior to that the government had not only brought about a change in the laws to deal with pimps and to increase the minimum sentence to five years. It had also brought about some changes that would ensure that Canadians who go abroad to indulge in exploiting children in other countries would be tried in this country just as if they did it here.

At the same time we allowed for young people who were being commercially sexually exploited to be able to tell their story in court about their pimps and the people who were exploiting them, and to do so with the safety of being behind a screen so that they could not be identified.

• (1255)

The Department of Status of Women Canada is now working in partnership with a special interest group called Kids Friendly that is very concerned about the issue of commercial exploitation of children and with the tourism industry to start a pilot project in British Columbia and to educate Canadians to know that commercial sexual exploitation of children occurs in this country. We must be aware of it and do something about it. This is what good policy is all about. This is what a good justice system does. It looks at prevention, public education, legislation and enforcement.

A great deal of selective caring goes on across the floor of the House in the Reform Party. That party said it cares but it voted against gun control legislation, which is one of the major causes of violence, especially violence against women. I guess women are also considered to be a special interest group by the members across the way, so they would not care about violence against women. Does it really matter who that group trusts?

That group would only trust the laws it makes and those laws would not take into consideration justice. Many of the initiatives it voted against in the House were initiatives dealing with strengthening the justice system, and that party voted no.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my colleague across the floor. Before I ask her a question I would say that we agree with the concept there has to be rehabilitation, and that is where the government cut money.

We also understand that a message has to be sent. The government has had tons of opportunity to bring forward good legislation. Even the Minister of Justice has said that the Young Offenders Act was legislation in need of an overhaul, and it took a long time.

You talk about special interest groups and you talk about giving—

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will please address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr. Deepak Obhrai: Mr. Speaker, I agree that some of the interest groups to which she has been giving money are fine, but she has also been wasting money on other interest groups like EGALE.

My question is quite simple. We agree with her that there has to be rehabilitation. The justice committee said that under the new act the age should be reduced to 10. Why did her government ignore that?

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would have me believe that if there was good legislation they would have voted for it. Bill C-55, an act to amend the Criminal Code, high risk offenders, implements new measures to toughen sentencing and—

Supply

Mr. John Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since I was interrupted so many times by the government about being in order, Bill C-55 has nothing to do with this bill whatsoever.

The Deputy Speaker: I think the hon. minister was referring to Bill C-55 in a previous parliament from the sound of the title, but perhaps the minister can clear that matter up when she resumes the floor.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, in a previous parliament. I was trying to say that bill was a good bill because it included the introduction of indeterminate sentencing for dangerous offenders, up to 10 years of community supervision for sex offenders following their release from prison, and an extension of the earliest date for dangerous offenders initial full parole review. The party across the way voted against it.

The hon. member further told me that he thought I wasted money by funding certain interest groups like EGALE. I know members across the way tend to moralize about the groups they would support and not support. EGALE's questionnaire had to do with the amount of hate crime against gays in the country, which we know is increasing, but I guess violence against gays is not of interest to the hon. member across the House.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in this debate we have to recognize that there is perception of reality and evidence based reality that Canadians will look at. Canadians have a great understanding.

• (1300)

I look at this motion and the only justice issue that seems to be absent from it is gun control. I would put to the minister that maybe this is finally an admission by the Reform Party that gun control is supported by the majority of Canadians. I think of the number of lines of print and speeches made in this House that centred against this particular piece of legislation when it was introduced by the government, even though public opinion polls supported it. Of particular interest would be the issues respecting women surrounding the issue, but that is one of the areas in this hodgepodge motion that seems to be missing.

Perhaps I should be applauding this as it may be a recognition finally that gun control is supported by members of the opposition. If that is the case, I am certainly very happy.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for her comments. I think she raises a very important point. We see nothing in the motion from the hon. member across the way that deals with the issue of violence against women or hate crimes. Why should it? In the last session that party voted against legislation which would increase sentencing for crimes committed because of hate, because of sexual orientation, religion and so on, and which

would increase sentencing for persons who abuse authority or power to commit violence against women.

I have to wonder if this is not of interest to that group because it is selective about the people it cares about in our society.

Mr. John Reynolds (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about being selective. It was her party which voted against our motion that would have changed the pedophile situation in British Columbia. If we want to be selective, we can do that.

When the bill was originally introduced the government was supposed to fund 50% of the Young Offenders Act. It has never funded more than 30%. It has underfunded the prevention aspect of crime ever since it took office. The Liberals promised to do it in the red book and they have never done it. Prevention is underfunded. Only 30% of the YOA has been funded. When are they—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister of State for the Status of Women for a very short response.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to look at the fact that there has recently been a crime prevention initiative which is a partnership initiative that works with communities, municipalities and other groups. There will be \$32 million per year over five years to deal with the issues of crime prevention.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the last speaker that I consider one victim of crime just as important as the next victim of crime, regardless of who they are.

I am pleased to speak to the Reform Party supply day motion, which can be referred to as justice day. There has been precious little in the way of justice coming from the government. I will be speaking primarily in the area of young offenders.

The young offenders legislation is a prime example of misplaced priorities by this government. In June of 1997, almost two years ago, the Minister of Justice made amending the Young Offenders Act one of her top priorities. She is on record as acknowledging that the Young Offenders Act is easily the most unpopular piece of legislation.

One would think that recognition of this sort would impress upon the government the importance of bringing forth proper legislation without delay. But did this government appreciate the demands of Canadians? No, it did not.

We all have vivid memories of the minister's continued promises, week by week and month by month, that legislation was coming. She continued to promise that it would come in a timely manner, that she was dealing with it in a timely fashion, that the legislation was complicated and should not be brought forward

Supply

with a simplistic answer just to appease the citizens of this country. It was painfully obvious that the minister was just making excuses for not having the legislation ready.

We have seen how disorganized the government has been with the new youth criminal justice legislation. We have seen how the government pretends to listen to Canadians but then proceeds in the same manner as it always has. We have seen how the government continues to believe that it knows best about what Canadians should have.

I will not be dealing very extensively with the legislation introduced last week by the Minister of Justice. I anticipate that we will have sufficient opportunity to debate the failings of that legislation, hopefully in the near future. Today we are talking about the failures of this government in a whole host of justice issues.

I would like to provide a little history to the long overdue amendments to our young offenders legislation.

In 1996 the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights conducted an extensive review of the Young Offenders Act. Nearly \$500,000 was spent. Meetings were held right across the country. The provinces had ample opportunity for input. The message as to what changes were necessary was absolutely clear.

The standing committee submitted an extensive report with a number of recommendations. The Bloc submitted a dissenting report. My hon. colleague from Crowfoot attempted to submit an extensive report in dissent. Instead of receiving his report and studying it to determine whether there was anything left out or anything of value from another perspective, this government played a purely political game and refused to accept his report. It said that it was too long.

● (1305)

The member for Crowfoot participated in the committee hearings as much as anyone. He handled almost the entire workload on the young offenders legislation for the Reform Party. He took the effort to properly critique the legislation and propose practical and positive changes for the benefit of all Canadians, but the government refused to accept his contribution. Only in Canada.

The hon. member for Crowfoot is a very determined individual. He did not give up. He instead introduced private member's Bill C-210 in which he proposed formalizing the power of police officers to use discretion in resolving minor incidents without laying charges. He personally knew about this problem in the legislation as he is a former police officer. He listened to what the witnesses had to say in this regard. He proposed that the legislation differentiate between non-violent and violent crimes.

He understood the value of dealing with first time non-violent young offenders in a more informal manner. He understood that

there is neither necessity nor practicality in sending these minor offenders to court and possibly to jail.

He was not playing the political game; he was doing what was right on behalf of Canadians. Of course, he had the full support of the Reform Party with his initiative. However, the government refused to listen to him. It refused to even allow him to submit his report. Unfortunately, his private member's bill was never drawn for debate.

In my previous comments I mentioned that the minister continually promised to bring forth the youth legislation in a timely fashion. She spoke of having to consult with her provincial counterparts. They had ample opportunity to present their views and concerns to the justice committee. They clearly indicated their interest.

One example was in the area of funding. It was made known that the federal government was shortchanging the provinces in the area of funding for youth justice. The funding formula was to be on the basis of 50% federal dollars and 50% from the provinces. Things were getting so bad that Manitoba was threatening to withdraw from the administration of youth justice because its costs were too high and because the federal government was not holding up its end of the bargain. Remember, this was back in 1997.

Did the minister even attempt to restore funding for youth justice in the 1998 budget? No, she did not. Were funds available in that budget? Of course they were. We will remember that the government spent \$2.5 billion on the millennium scholarship fund in that budget. The whole \$2.5 billion was written off as an expense, even though the funds were not to be spent until future years. It was just a way for the government to claim that it had a balanced budget and that there was no surplus for other things. It just shows the misplaced priorities of the government. It just shows how the minister was unable or unwilling to deal with youth justice legislation on a priority basis. The wheels of justice were grinding slowly.

The government was not even on track. I believe the government was hoping the controversy over the Young Offenders Act would go away. It is to the credit of Canadians that they did not let this happen. They kept up the pressure for change, but the procrastination continued and the excuses for delays continued. The minister kept promising that the legislation would be introduced last fall, but then she realized that she did not have the necessary funding. She had to wait until the February budget. She said that her delays were because the legislation was so complex, that it would not be a simplistic approach.

Last week Canadians finally saw the long awaited legislation. What did they get? They got a new name for the young offenders legislation. It is now to be called the youth criminal justice act. What else did they get? They got legislation that promises to

Supply

introduce a different system of justice from province to province to province. They got a system whereby very violent young offenders will continue to be protected from identification in many situations. They got a system whereby these violent young offenders will continue to be returned to our communities, where citizens will be unaware of their background and the potential danger some of them may pose. They got a system whereby violent and repeat young offenders will be subject to what the government calls extra-judicial measures, but what is in effect nothing more than conditional sentencing.

The government continues to believe that it and only it knows what is best for Canadians. The justice committee of the last parliament, a committee dominated by Liberals, a committee chaired by our late colleague Shaughnessy Cohen, on the testimony of its own expert witness, recommended that 10 and 11 year old violent offenders be subject to criminal proceedings, and the government refused to listen.

Instead, government members portray members on this side of the House as being monsters who would jail children. The minister claims that child welfare and mental illness programs will look after these unfortunate children. She refuses to acknowledge that those programs are already failing.

• (1310)

These young people are not properly dealt with. They are merely accommodated, when in fact they require immediate assistance to reform and rehabilitate before they venture into more violent and dangerous activities.

The government does these 10 and 11 year olds a serious disservice by merely ignoring them and hoping that other less practical measures can handle the problem. It is just more offloading on to the provinces.

As I have stated, the government is not to be admired when it comes to its handling of the youth justice platform. It has delayed, broken promises and made excuses. It has refused to listen to Canadians and to fellow members of parliament. It has let the provinces down. It does not have an enviable record.

In the upcoming debates on the new legislation we will see many further instances of the failures of the government in the area of youth justice.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I noted with some interest the way in which there were sections of legislation that were of some concern to my colleague in the Reform Party that were taken by the justice minister when she came forward with the new Young Offenders Act. However, I am sure he must have noticed yesterday the solicitor general deciding that he was going to come forward with legislation, amendments to

the Criminal Code, which would red flag people who have received pardons for their offences if those pardons related to sexual offences.

I would imagine hon. members also probably noted that our Reform colleague from Calgary Centre has already had that legislation in its basic form go through the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, there is an argument to be made that the legislation by my colleague from Calgary Centre, in its own way, in many details is superior to the legislation that the solicitor general brought forward yesterday.

It strikes me as being strange, and I ask him if it also strikes him as being strange, that we have legislation that has gone through second reading in the House and which will be before the justice committee this week. Any amendments that the government wants to make to get it into a form that is more to its liking—although the similarities are so close that I can only imagine some tinkering around the edges—could be made and this bill could be reported back to the House of Commons for third reading and passed by the will of the people who represent Canadians in the House.

I wondered if my colleague has any idea why in the world the solicitor general would have simply lifted the Reform Party private member's legislation and put it into the situation where it will likely be delayed. The reporting requirement of sexual offenders who have received pardons will again be delayed, so that Big Brothers, Scouts and other organizations like that will not have this legislation. I wonder if he has any insight into why in the world the Liberals would be ripping off Reform legislation and, in effect, delaying its ability to be passed.

Mr. Chuck Cadman: Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his question. I was wondering about that myself yesterday when I heard the legislation come forward.

I refer to my own private member's bill which is before the House now and which deals with parental accountability under the Young Offenders Act. The minister saw fit to include my ideas, word for word, into the new legislation. For that I am grateful because I firmly believe that if there is a good idea that comes from this place, then it deserves to be implemented, regardless of where it comes from.

I certainly have questions about the issue that the hon. member raised. The member for Calgary Centre has Bill C-284 before the committee right now. It is a lot further along in the system than that which was proposed by the solicitor general. For the life of me, I cannot figure out why the government would not just go ahead and deal with the bill of the hon. member for Calgary Centre and amend it if requires amending.

It is quite possible that the solicitor general's image needs a bit of a boost right now. Maybe that is why the government is doing it. That could be my only answer.

Supply

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to my hon. friend's presentation and found it to be, as usual, thoughtful. It provided a number of useful suggestions.

• (1315)

One of the areas which I believe is currently being pursued by members from all parties in this House is the whole issue of consecutive sentencing for people who have committed a number of multiple crimes like murder, rape and violent assault. Is my friend one of the people supporting this initiative? Does he believe this is a step in the right direction in terms of sending a signal that there are people which society needs to be protected from, that in no way ought we ever to consider people who have committed a number of terrible crimes be released into the general public again?

Mr. Chuck Cadman: Mr. Speaker, yes, I firmly support consecutive sentencing, especially in the area of serious violent offences and multiple violent offences. I would remind the hon. member that it is available now for judges to use at their discretion but it is never used. It is due time for this place to mandate its use in certain cases.

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise very proudly as a member of the Reform Party because it seems as though we are the one party in Canada that keeps on forcing the issue on making streets safe for Canadians and for all of the people in Canada who are concerned—

Mr. Nelson Riis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I realize this looks a little funny since I am standing right beside the person making the presentation, but it is the only way I can make an intervention. I know my friend did not mean to be misrepresentative when he said that the Reform Party is the only party in the House of Commons that is concerned about safety in the streets. I wonder if I could ask my friend to clarify that for me.

The Deputy Speaker: This clearly is not a point of order.

Mr. Jim Abbott: Mr. Speaker, I say again that the Reform Party is very proud of being at the forefront of bringing these issues to the House of Commons.

We start with the police officer on the street. The RCMP cover most areas of Canada, with the exception of Newfoundland, Quebec and Ontario. The RCMP budget is \$1.9 billion. Even in those other jurisdictions I just mentioned they have some jurisdiction which relates to national policing interests.

The government has trimmed \$174 million from the budget in which there was no fat in the first place. We believe that spending must be prioritized to ensure only those operations proven effective in fighting the war on crime continue to receive funding. My point

was that it had already reached that point when the government chose to cut a further \$174 million.

The RCMP fundamentally are handcuffed at a time of fiscal restraint. It had a tremendously devastating effect not only on the morale of the RCMP officers in the province of British Columbia but also particularly on their ability to get their job done.

There were assignments shut down last fall, assignments where there had already been time and resources invested, particularly overtime. Believe it or not, it reached a point where undercover operators were told they could not even use their cell phones. There were patrol vehicles that did not have tires to get out on the highway. There were other patrol vehicles for which there was not even gasoline.

What kind of planning is this? What kind of priority is it that this Liberal government has that it would permit a situation, not just in British Columbia but very acutely in British Columbia, where even the police on the street are not given the tools to be on the street.

Reform agrees that the RCMP and all governments must be accountable. However, there cannot be this gratuitous cutting every time it runs into a situation. I have been told that in many situations the RCMP are no longer able to provide an adequate level of service to the public.

I have already released to the public a confidential RCMP report. It was originally released by the RCMP. It calls B.C. a major centre for the importation of child porn.

• (1320)

We know as a result of the inaction on the part of this government that British Columbia is the only jurisdiction where the simple possession of child pornography is a statute that currently cannot be enforced. It is going through a long process, as one of the junior ministers said earlier. It is going through a long process but in the meantime the clock is ticking for people who are caught in this web. The clock is ticking, their cases are being put off and we are going to reach a point where the justice system is going to say their cases have been put off for too long.

On the RCMP commercial crime unit, in December 1998 a consulting firm recommended doubling the economic crime branch's budget to \$100 million because the RCMP white collar crime branch was unable to do its job.

It is the Liberal government which is tying the hands by constraining the resources available to the police on the street to be able to get their job done.

We have had promises, promises and promises. Ever since I was elected in 1993 I can recall promises about money laundering.

Supply

When there is illegal and illicit activity, particularly as it relates to prostitution, drugs or any of those illegal efforts, they have to find some way of getting the money they get in from that effort back into the system so that they can reclaim it so the money is of some value. The key to organized crime is to have effective workable money laundering legislation.

The person who is currently the Deputy Prime Minister was the solicitor general. The member for Fredericton was the solicitor general. Now the member from Prince Edward Island is the solicitor general. Again he is promising on behalf of this government that we are going to have money laundering legislation. Promises, promises, promises.

The head of criminal intelligence at Interpol has said that police are losing the fight against criminals in cyberspace and will have to take giant strides to catch up on the information highway. He stated: "Drug traffickers, pedophiles and money launderers have found the Internet to be an increasingly effective tool as the number of users hits 100 million". In my office I have an intelligence report to the RCMP about information technology and just how far ahead of the RCMP and other law enforcement agencies are those who use the system illegally and illicitly for their own purposes.

The government also saw fit to see the Regina training centre for new police officers temporarily closed. What happened to the people who were in the system, to the men and women who had decided they were going to join the RCMP and were already in the system and then boom they were out the door? That is the end of them. Now there is a fresh start.

Meanwhile a tremendous number of people in the RCMP, because of this lack of funding and the lack of ability to get the job done, are becoming increasingly frustrated. They are also reaching a voluntary retirement age.

What was the government doing in permitting the Regina training centre to be shut down? Of course it did not permit it; it simply squeezed off the resources so that the Regina training centre could not be funded.

I have been involved with the APEC inquiry by the public complaints commission in Vancouver. To date it has spent \$1.3 million. That is just the money for the public complaints commission, let alone all of the lawyers who are there to protect the Prime Minister's interests. Millions and millions of dollars will go into the APEC inquiry. If the Prime Minister would simply agree to turn up and tell his version of the story, we would save millions of dollars just for that one event alone.

One other issue of particular interest to me is the Canadian Police Information Centre, CPIC. It is operated through a national police service. CPIC allows the police forces across the country to have access to criminal records.

• (1325)

The Canadian Police Association says "This priceless tool is in desperate need of resources to update the system". It points out that CPIC is a 20 year old technology. The sharing of information back and forth across the country by police forces as they roll up behind a vehicle or as they accost an individual is absolutely invaluable, yet CPIC is on the verge of total collapse.

CPIC is completely bulging at the seams with information. It needs approximately \$200 million to upgrade the system. Where have I heard \$200 million before? I remember, \$200 million is the amount of money the government is spending registering the guns of law-abiding gun owners. The irony in this is that if the government in its meagre effort were to put that information into CPIC, it would destroy CPIC by overloading it.

What is better? Do we spend \$200 million to go after law-abiding citizens to register their weapons, or do we spend \$200 million on a system that will track vehicles, track AWOL prisoners, track people with criminal records, track all sorts of criminal elements? Where is the best place to spend resources? Considering the way in which this government strangles the ability of our police forces to do their jobs, I suggest that the \$200 million could be more intelligently reallocated.

Mrs. Brenda Chamberlain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too met with the RCMP and the railway police when they were here last week.

It is important to note that Reform members do not have a monopoly on justice in Canada. They do not have a monopoly on being sympathetic with the police when Reform says the police need more money. Let me also say there is hardly a group that does not come here that in their opinion does not need or require more money. It is very difficult as a government.

My father-in-law often said to me that it is easy to be in opposition. Opposition members can say anything. They do not have to prove anything. They simply open their mouths and anything can come out and when it does, they never have to prove it. To a degree and in fairness, the opposition's job is to try to poke holes.

I sometimes get saddened that we do not talk about the good things in Canada. We do have a low crime rate. There is no doubt about it. Reform members want Canada to be like the U.S. with a gun behind every door. They want to have health care like in the U.S. The reality is that is not what Canadians want. This government has put money into health care and education. Yes, it has tried to put money toward tax cuts. Yes, it has a zero deficit. Yes, it has started to pay down the debt. We have done a lot of good things.

When I met with the police officers last week, they told me they understood and accepted that. And yes, they said they required

Supply

more money and I believe they probably do. One of the things they pointed out was that if they had more money, particularly for some of the special projects, and perhaps this is what my hon. colleague across the way was referring to, they would be able to have those proceeds go into the community. The Liberals were the ones who allowed that to happen.

I support more money in that direction also, but in correlation and in a rational and responsible way with everything else we have to do.

My hon. colleague did not make any mention of the fact that our colleague from Kamloops talked about poverty being a major cause of crime. Could my hon. colleague talk about poverty within the nation?

Mr. Jim Abbott: Mr. Speaker, I would sooner speak about the fact that this government has decided one way it can save money is to go to a 50:50 release program by Correctional Services Canada and the National Parole Board.

● (1330)

The statistics are these. There are 14,000 inmates incarcerated in federal institutions. There are 8,000 federal offenders on conditional release, 753 of whom are now missing. That is 1 in 10, not too good a statistic. Forty five convicted rapists remain missing. Fifty per cent have been missing for more than a year. Now the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada has a quota system asking for the elimination of 50% of the inmates who are presently incarcerated. That is a good way to cut down on expenses but all the more need for us to have a CPIC system that would work and be able to keep track of the people they are deciding to shoo out the door presumably to cut down on their costs.

Mr. Lynn Myers (Waterloo—Wellington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Mississauga South.

I am pleased to enter this debate today on behalf of the people of my riding of Waterloo—Wellington who feel strongly about our criminal justice system. Certainly as the former chairman of the Waterloo regional police, I too have a strong and keen interest in justice matters as they relate to Canada.

I note with great dismay that the opposition motion is proposing to criticize the government for, among other things, failing to deliver youth justice programs and legislation that reflect the concern of Canadians.

Let me remind the House that our government launched a strategy for the renewal of youth justice on May 12, 1998 that will be effective in dealing with the complex problem of youth crime. I point out that it is complex and not a simplistic matter as the Reform Party would paint it.

Moreover, last week this government tabled a bill that is a key component of the youth justice strategy, the youth criminal justice act. The recent federal budget included \$206 million over the next three years to ensure that programs are put in place to help achieve the objectives of the legislation. This is but a recent example of a long list of initiatives we as a government have undertaken over the years to protect Canadians wherever they may live in this great land of ours.

The government's strategy for the renewal of youth justice recognizes the foremost objectives of public protection. It distinguishes between legislation and programs appropriate for the small group of violent young offenders and those appropriate for the vast majority of non-violent young offenders. It takes a much broader, more integrated approach and emphasizes prevention and rehabilitation. This is precisely what Canadians want us to do.

The issue facing us and those interested in the youth justice system is not whether the system should be tough or lenient but whether to be made to deal with crime in a sensible way. The proposals as outlined indicate clearly that youth crime should be met with meaningful consequences. What is meaningful depends in large part on what the young offender has done.

For example, most of us believe that youths who commit minor thefts or who are found to be in possession of stolen property should be held accountable for their actions. Last year we sent 4,355 of them into custody where the most serious offence was one of minor property offences. Another 4,332 youths were put in custody for the offence of failure to comply with a disposition, typically violating a term of probation order.

These are both offences and those who are found to have committed these offences should be held accountable. We know that and we think that is appropriate. These two groups of offences constitute over one-third of the custodial sentences handed down to youth last year. Being the lead jailer of children in the western world is surely not a preferred answer to our problems with youth crime.

The median custodial sentence for youth is 45 days. This will cost us as taxpayers as much as \$9,000. Let me be clear here. No one is saying these youths should not be held accountable for their actions. They should and they will. Their offences should result in meaningful consequences. We must ask ourselves whether taking these youths to court and sending them to prison is invariably the best way to accomplish this. We need to ask ourselves whether it makes more sense to spend \$9,000 locking up a minor thief or someone who has violated curfew or if there are other ways to spend that money.

The choice is not one of doing nothing or putting a young person in prison. There are programs in all parts of Canada for holding young people accountable for what they have done so they do not involve courts and jails but which do involve the victims.

Supply

• (1335)

The youth criminal justice act recognizes extrajudicial non-court measures as being important and the most effective way to deal with less serious youth crime. The act supports the use of such measures wherever they would be capable of holding the young person accountable, and this we must do.

The act clearly provides that these measures should encourage the repair of harm caused to the victim and to the community. They should also promote the involvement of families, victims and the community in ensuring an appropriate meaningful consequence for that young person. In order to encourage the use of creative and effective consequences for our young people, the act supports the appropriate exercise of discretion by police officers and prosecutors. The act recognizes a range of approaches that can provide meaningful consequences, including police warnings, formal cautions, referrals to community programs, cautions by prosecutors and other sanctions.

When the formal court process is required many sentences other than custody can provide meaningful consequences for youth crime. Community based alternatives are often more effective than custody and they are encouraged by this new legislation, particularly for low risk, non-violent offenders. Alternatives that require young people to repay victims and society for the harm done teach responsibility and respect for others and reinforce our shared social values. When these front end measures and non-custodial sentences are used effectively the provinces can reinvest the money that is saved into crime prevention strategies that will address the legitimate concerns Canadians have about crime.

As part of its strategy for the renewal of youth justice, the federal government has committed itself to a wide range of prevention programs, which is important.

In this context I was not surprised to learn recently that public opinion polls show that over 85% of Ontario residents would prefer money to be invested in crime prevention, which is much more than would want additional prisons for youth. This reflects the thinking of the residents of Waterloo—Wellington. Almost as many people, 79%, would prefer us to invest in alternatives to prison for youth rather than in prison construction. That is very telling and underscores the commitment of Canadians in this very important area.

The other side of the coin is that by dealing sensibly with minor crime we can refocus the system on the serious crime Canadians have legitimate concerns about. The new act's sentencing principles make it very clear that youth sentences should reflect the seriousness of the offence and the degree of responsibility of the young person. Custody will be targeted to youth who commit violent and serious repeat offences.

In the new legislation judges will be required to impose a period of supervision in the community following custody that is equal to half the period of the custody. This will allow authorities to closely monitor and control the young person and to ensure he or she receives the necessary treatment and programs to return successfully to the community. The period of supervision administered by the provinces will include stringent mandatory and optional conditions tailored to the individual.

If a youth's sentence is not adequate to hold the young person accountable, the court may impose an adult sentence. The new legislation will make it easier to impose adult sentences for the most serious violent offenders. We are expanding both the list of offences and lowering the age at which youth can receive an adult sentence. When the legislation is passed, youth 14 and older who are convicted of murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, aggravated sexual assault, et cetera, will receive an adult sentence unless a judge can be persuaded otherwise.

We are creating a fifth presumptive category for repeat violent offenders where young offenders 14 and older who demonstrate a pattern of violent behaviour will receive an adult sentence unless a judge can be persuaded otherwise. This repeat offender presumption is in addition to the fact that even one serious offence can result in an adult sentence if the prosecutor requests it and the court is satisfied it is appropriate.

The proposed legislation provides for a new sentencing option for the most violent high risk young offenders. The intensive rehabilitative custody and supervision order provides greater control and guaranteed treatment to address the causes of the young person's violent behaviour. An individualized plan of treatment and intensive supervision must be approved by the court. Additional federal resources have been allocated for the costs of this new sentencing option.

Accomplishing the objectives of the new legislation will not be easy. Clearly much of the work needs to be done by the provinces which administer Canada's criminal law. We know that.

• (1340)

Thus it is important that there be adequate time for discussion and implementation planning with the provinces and others involved in the administration of our youth justice system in order to ensure that we have the best possible youth justice system that can respond appropriately to the wide range of problems brought to it.

Youth crime cannot be legislated away. We can, however, deal with it more appropriately than we are doing at the moment. We can set up effective programs outside the youth justice system and custodial and non-custodial rehabilitation programs within it that

Supply

will reduce crime. I think it is important that we move in that manner.

The government has and will continue to deliver on criminal justice programs. The youth criminal justice act is the most recent example of our ability to deal effectively and compassionately with these kinds of very complex issues. As a result we have enhanced the safety and security of Canadians no matter where they live in this great country. All Canadians are well served by the actions of our government when it comes to these kinds of matters.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his speech. It was a very statesman-like speech and he addressed the issues, I thought, in a commendable way.

He mentioned there are too many young offenders who are incarcerated and who ought not to be, non-violent offenders. It is his government that has been here for six years and it is his government that has the power to change that.

At least a year and a half ago I introduced a private member's bill that would address that very issue as well as a number of others. The contents of that private member's bill which is still sitting to be drawn yet, flow directly from the testimony placed before the standing committee as we went about this country on the 10 year review of the Young Offenders Act.

I wonder if the member has read that private member's bill. I am sure he must have, showing his interest as he has today on that topic, as the majority of his speech was based on the young offenders situation, which I find commendable. If he has, he can see there is support for those principles, certainly within the official opposition.

It is quite clear the hon. member has no greater power than we in moving the government forward in a timely fashion to rectify some of the weaknesses within the justice system that he has recognized place young people in custody who ought not to be there. There are better ways of dealing with them.

I wonder if the hon. member would comment as to whether he is aware of the expression of support for those very principles by the official opposition as contained within my private member's bill still sitting to be drawn. I wonder if he recognizes that awareness, that there is support for these kinds of initiatives. Yet it is his government that has taken six years and we still have not seen the type of legislative initiative that would correct these matters.

It is an anomaly I would certainly like the hon. member to touch on because, as I said earlier, he seems to have a sincere interest in this area.

Mr. Lynn Myers: Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for the question.

Certainly in terms of young offenders and the fact that we have a number of people in jail right now, there are other ways to treat them and deal with them in a more effective manner. I think it is certainly a strong point and one that needs to be recognized.

I am aware of the private member's bill to which the hon. member refers. We as a government with our recent legislation have acted in a very meaningful way in this whole area with the youth criminal justice act.

It underscores the ability of the government to recognize a strong movement in this area. It underscores the commitment of the government to move in a way that is consistent with the thinking of Canadians in this all important youth justice area. It underscores our commitment on this side of the House to do something that we know is in the best interest of Canadians wherever they live.

• (1345)

The government has moved in very meaningful and very purposeful ways that will in fact correct these problems and will assist in making communities safe and secure for all Canadians and by extension for the country as a whole.

Mr. Chuck Cadman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I commend the member on his speech and his thoughtful consideration.

I have a short question on the presumptive transfer aspects. Could the member provide some rationale as to why we have a presumptive transfer for murder, manslaughter, aggravated sexual assault and attempted murder, and yet nowhere do we see anything on the presumptive transfer side for sexual assault with a weapon or any firearms related offences which are very serious crimes? Would the member care to comment on the rationale for not including those more serious offences?

Mr. Lynn Myers: Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that we on the government side gave careful consideration to all those factors. At the end of the day it was determined that we should proceed in the manner that has been outlined, knowing that it is the best way in which to proceed in the interest of safety and security for all Canadians.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering an opposition motion to the effect that the government has failed to deliver criminal justice programs and laws which reflect the will and concerns of the majority of Canadians and as a consequence has put individual safety and in some case cases national security in jeopardy.

This is a useful and constructive motion to put before the House. It provides an opportunity for all sides to comment on various aspects of the criminal justice system. Some referred to specific

cases where they felt the laws had allowed certain judgments to occur which were not in the best interest of Canadians, and others highlighted some of the initiatives taken on behalf of the Government of Canada and on behalf of the Parliament of Canada to continue to be vigilant with regard to issues related to criminal justice and to strengthening it over time.

Many issues have been raised by members. I want to concentrate my comments on the issue of child pornography which seized the House not so long ago with regard to a B.C. court decision. The case against the defendant involving the possession of child pornography was not successful and the judge ruled in favour of the defendant.

That issue is one of the reasons we continue to hear statements or phrases like judge-made law. Members will know that decision affected the laws of Canada as they apply in B.C. It is a decision, however, that the House unanimously concurs was a bad decision. The possession of child pornography and child pornography in its essence are wrong because they must involve child abuse to exist. There was no disagreement in this place.

The debate had to do with how the Government of Canada approaches situations like this one. The opposition put forth a motion in which it suggested that the government should initiate legislation which would reinstate the law. In essence that is what Canadians want. They wanted that decision to be reversed and for the law to be in place and unaffected by that decision.

One critical issue has to do with the mechanisms or the means by which reinstating the law would be effected. The opposition motion suggested a legislative process including enacting section 33(1) of the charter, the so-called notwithstanding clause.

I am not a lawyer. I am not on the justice committee. Therefore I have to rely on others for briefings on information relevant to issues before the House. I had a specific question with regard to the notwithstanding clause which was very important to me in terms of the way I dealt with the issue with my constituents and how I voted in the House.

• (1350)

The media had spun the story that the government basically voted not to do anything. It was alarming to Canadians that somehow the government would not take action when in fact the government did do something.

The options available to the government certainly were to invoke the notwithstanding clause, and there is a debate on when it should be invoked. There was also the option of appealing it directly to the Supreme Court of Canada. Another option was that the government could appeal it to the appeal court of B.C.

When I asked about some of these options it became very clear to me that the notwithstanding clause was not available to be

Supply

applied retroactively. That was very important for me. If we invoked the notwithstanding clause it would mean that the case which gave rise to the debate in the first place would be unaffected by the decision of parliament. I was concerned that we had this powerful tool but it would not deal with that case, and I assume other cases that were before the courts, and therefore people would slip through the cracks.

The issue of going to the Supreme Court of Canada was another option, which is generally the approach that the Government of Canada through the Parliament of Canada would take.

From discussions I had with the Minister of Justice I understood the supreme court docket had been filled up for some six months and that it would take more than six months at a minimum before the matter could even be considered by that court. To me that would not be swift and strong action on the part of the government.

One thing I asked about, which ultimately came to pass, was the Attorney General of B.C. appealing that decision. The Government of Canada, in a very rare show of support and I guess action, actually announced that it would join in that appeal. Not only was it to join in that appeal in B.C. It was to co-operate in terms of seeking adjournments of any other cases before the courts. It was to continue to support the police in terms of continuing their investigations and the laying of charges as if that decision had not taken place. It was also to support the request that the appeal with regard to the Sharpe case would be heard on a very timely basis.

Canadians should know, if they have not read about it, that the appeal is being heard on April 26 and April 27. It is my view that because of the swiftness in the judicial system it will be dealt with in an appropriate fashion.

With regard to the decision that was made, it concerned me a bit that the defendant went before the trial division and represented himself without a lawyer and won the case against the Attorney General of B.C. I inquired of the people who were in a position to know about how such a thing could happen how the force of the laws of Canada and the strength of our laws with regard to protecting the rights of children could fail when someone is simply defending his right to possess child pornography. It just did not make sense.

It was quite clear to me that somehow or other the case provided on behalf of the office of the attorney general was clearly flawed in some way. The judgment of the court has to be based on the evidence provided to the judge. Although there was some latitude, it would appear that the case was not well argued. For that reason alone it is extremely important to go right back to the appeal of that original case.

As a result of this process I believe the outcome will be that the ruling will be overturned, that Sharpe will be found guilty of possession of child pornography, and that not one case will have slipped through the cracks.

S. O. 31

I wanted to raise that case because from the information I got from my constituents and the media reports on what actually happened in the House of Commons in the debate and in the government actions did not fairly reflect the reality that the notwithstanding clause is not retroactively applied and could not have dealt with the situation.

I also want to touch very briefly on two other issues. The first issue concerning impaired driving has been raised by many members. I have long worked with Mothers Against Drunk Driving. It has done an excellent job on behalf of Canadians in terms of raising awareness of this very serious situation in Canada. I fully support its changes with regard to initiatives such as lowering the blood alcohol threshold.

• (1355)

The other issue concerns consecutive sentencing. My colleague and neighbour in Mississauga, the member for Mississauga East, has worked very diligently on a file to do with consecutive sentencing. It is a very controversial issue for some, but when looking at the cases and the circumstances it becomes very clear that the issue about whether or not Canada should be considering something like consecutive sentencing as opposed to concurrent sentencing becomes a very relevant and valid debate for this place. I hope this place will have the opportunity to fully deal with the issue. It is an issue Canadians would like to see dealt with in this place.

I have had many conversations with constituents on the Young Offenders Act. I am very pleased that the justice minister brought forward, after extensive consultation with Canadians, more information and proposals for this place to consider. It is an important area for us to deal with. I am very confident that parliament through the House and its committees, et cetera, will ensure that we make the necessary changes to that law to ensure it is an appropriate law for all Canadians.

The Speaker: Ordinarily we would go into questions and comments, but seeing that it is almost 2 o'clock the hon. member will be recognized at 3 o'clock for five minutes to receive questions and comments.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Gerry Ritz (Battlefords—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, much to the government's embarrassment in the last few days, the issue of unfair taxation has risen in the public conscious-

ness to push over the Liberal's weak agenda and give a voice to 17 million frustrated Canadian taxpayers.

While the parties in the House put forward their competing visions and arm themselves with reams of stats, a curious phenomenon appeared. It seems that no one can be completely wrong on this issue. The fact is that the tax system has become so convoluted, archaic, out of touch and incomprehensible that it has become the Liberal government's model for its new firearms registry.

Let us be clear. The best tax system for the country is one that seeks to lighten the burden of all citizens and businesses. That system must be understandable, accountable and neutral, allowing Canadians to make their own choices by keeping the greater part of their earnings.

It is time to reject the Liberal obsession with growing revenues to pay for bigger governments and refocus the government to fit its revenues.

* * *

[Translation]

GRATIEN GÉLINAS

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all of Quebec is saddened by the death of Gratien Gélinas, an actor, author and composer, who gave theatre in Quebec a momentum it has never lost.

Gratien Gélinas had the talent of being a writer and an actor simultaneously. He was particularly careful in anything he wrote or said to maintain a certain standard of French. He leaves behind a legacy we will treasure forever.

We will remember Gratien Gélinas as an energetic man who brought enthusiasm to his artistic endeavours and who was a pillar of theatre in Quebec.

As an author, he will be remembered for *Ti-Coq* and *Bousille et les Justes*, two epic descriptions of Quebec as it was after the war and on the eve of the Quiet Revolution.

We extend our deepest condolences to Mr. Gélinas' family.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL ABORIGINAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARDS

Mr. Raymond Bonin (Nickel Belt, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute today to the recipients of the 1999 National Aboriginal Achievement Awards. The awards program was founded by John Kim Bell in 1993 to recognize extraordinary career achievements by Canadians of first nations, Inuit and Métis ancestry.

S. O. 31

The 14 outstanding achievers of 1999 come from all walks of life and have chosen a variety of different career paths. They are leaders, innovators, educators, scholars, scientists and artisans. The awards recognize them for their ingenuity, creativity and tenacity, and provide positive role models for all Canadians.

These awards serve to remind us of the important contributions that aboriginal people have made to the country.

• (1400)

As John Kim Bell once said, build a bridge of understanding between aboriginal and non-aboriginal communities.

This year's winners received their awards last Friday at a gala ceremony in Regina at the Saskatchewan Centre of the Arts. The event will be televised on a CBC network special later this month. I encourage all the members of this House and all Canadians—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia.

* * *

CANADIAN CURLING CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. John Harvard (Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all Manitobans, I take this opportunity to extend sincere congratulations to Manitoba's very own Jeff Stoughton rink on winning the 1999 Canadian Curling Championship on Sunday. They were crowned Canadian champs after defeating Quebec by a score of 9 to 5 at the Labatt Brier in Edmonton.

The Manitoba rink hails from the Charleswood Curling Club in my riding of Charleswood St. James—Assiniboia. It is composed of skip Jeff Stoughton, third Jonathon Mead, second Gerry Van Den Berghe, lead Doug Armstrong and fifth member Steve Gould.

Not only was this the second Brier victory for Jeff Stoughton, it was also the 26th time that a Manitoba rink has won this prestigious event, far more than any other province. The Stoughton victory again shows that Manitoba is the curling capital of Canada.

All Manitobans are very proud of the accomplishments of Jeff Stoughton and his teammates and wish them the very best in their quest for the world crown in Scotland next month.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Bruce—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is an important day for women's health research in Canada. At a ceremony on Parliament Hill this morning, the first professional clinical research chairs in women's health were announced.

These research chairs, which will be among the most significant clinical research chairs in Canada, will be funded by Wyeth-Ayerst, Canadian universities and the Medical Research Council. A total of \$4.4 million will be invested in women's health over the next five years.

The four researchers chosen by their peers to fill these chairs will be conducting research in such important areas as cardiovascular health, endocrinology and mental health.

On behalf of all members of the House, I extend my congratulations to these successful researchers who truly are at the top of their fields.

This is another tremendous example of this government's commitment to women's health research and working in partnership with the medical research community to improve the health of Canadians.

* * *

CANADIAN POLICE INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay—Columbia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Police Information Centre, CPIC, is operated through the national police service. This system allows police forces across the country to access criminal records. The Canadian Police Association says this priceless tool is in desperate need of resources to update the system. CPIC is 20 year old technology and it is on the verge of collapse.

Sharing information is vital to ensure accurate and complete reports on criminal activity and organized crime.

A revitalized and restored CPIC system would ensure tracking of offenders. An updated national system could include vehicle identification numbers to track stolen vehicles, escaped convicts and parolees gone AWOL.

Last week the Canadian Police Association estimated the cost to upgrade CPIC would be about \$200 million. This government can easily find those dollars with one stroke of a pen.

Cancel the firearms registration program that tracks law-abiding citizens. Transfer the funds saved over to CPIC that will track criminals.

* * *

[Translation]

SOMMET DE LA FRANCOPHONIE

Mr. Denis Paradis (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this being the Semaine de la Francophonie, I would like to remind the House about the Sommet de la Francophonie, an important meeting held every two years and attended by leaders of French speaking countries.

Every two years, they meet for three days of discussions on topical issues.

S. O. 31

Canada plays a key role in the Francophonie. This role underscores its commitment to promoting the French fact both at home and abroad.

As there are over 8.5 million French speaking Canadians, Canada's membership in this organization provides it with an international forum for its national views and an opportunity to promote the French language and culture worldwide.

Long live the Francophonie and long live Canada.

* * *

GRATIEN GÉLINAS

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today Quebec lost a great artist, with the death from Alzheimer's disease of Gratien Gélinas, at the age of 89. With his passing, Quebec has lost a great pioneer of Quebec theater.

The Bloc Québécois wishes to extend its most sincere sympathies to Huguette Oligny, and the rest of his family.

This man of great generosity, and an even greater sense of humour, earned a deserved reputation as a master of his craft. He was the first to gain full recognition for Quebec theatre by creating truly Québécois characters speaking Quebec French.

● (1405)

Many Quebec artists owe their careers to him to this day. His critical view of society was an integral part of all of his work. His characters, Fridolin, Ti-Coq and the like, have left an indelible mark on the history of Quebec.

Yesterday, he made us laugh. Today, his passing makes us weep. We shall never forget him.

Thank you, Mr. Gélinas.

* * *

[English]

BELL UNITED WAY

Ms. Sarmite Bulte (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate three students from my riding of Parkdale—High Park who have been chosen to participate as allocation and advisory panellists for the 1998-99 Bell United Way program.

Aidan Black-Allen, a grade 8 student at Runnymede Junior/Senior Public School, Kit Fairgrieve, a grade 12 student at Humber-side Collegiate, and Ailen Pavumo, an OAC student at Parkdale Collegiate, have been selected to serve as advisers on program operations, reviews and the allocating of funds for project applications as well as assisting with program promotion and public relations.

These three students serve as role models for their peers as they give their time to worthy causes and agencies. Their involvement with the United Way has enabled them to gain solid experience in teamwork, decision making, leadership, organizational and communication skills.

The devotion, support and participation demonstrated by Aidan, Kit and Ailen are very much appreciated by both the United Way and our community. Congratulations and keep up the good work.

* * *

STANDING COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that under our system standing committees have no power and only limited influence. Some of them, especially the Standing Committee on Transport, are becoming totally irrelevant.

The transport committee has not done anything significant since completing its passenger rail study in June. On December 1 it rubber stamped amendments to the Railway Safety Act. Since then it has met five times and done absolutely nothing.

Twice the committee has winnowed through a long wish list to come up with study topics acceptable to a majority of members. Twice that same majority has voted to reverse the previous decisions.

The first change in direction was due to blatant ministerial interference. Opposition members suspect that committee inactivity reflects the minister's wish that nothing controversial ever be addressed. The committee has not met, not even in camera, since March 2.

* * *

[Translation]

GINETTE RENO

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations, and those of all Canadians, to Ginette Reno, who is to be honoured this afternoon at the Rendez-vous de la Francophonie, with a reception hosted by the Minister of Canadian Heritage.

Ginette Reno's career is a good illustration of Canadian cultural richness and diversity. Her success has gone far beyond the borders of Quebec, to English Canada, Europe and the United States. Her recently released album in English has earned her a nomination for the 1999 Juno Awards in the Best Female Vocalist category.

Canada has a number of good reasons to be proud of the exceptional accomplishments of Ginette Reno, and to pay her homage at the Rendez-vous de la Francophonie, this week.

Thank you, Madame Reno.

[English]

OLYMPIC ADVOCATES TOGETHER HONOURABLY

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today in Lausanne, Switzerland, OATH, an organization which stands for Olympic Advocates Together Honourably, was established.

OATH is a global coalition of Olympic athletes and advocates initiated by Canadians committed to restoring and maintaining the Olympic spirit. The coalition was formed in the context of allegations of questionable practices involving the IOC. As trustees of the Olympic spirit, they believe there is a pressing need for systemic reforms.

The basic principles of OATH are that it be an ethical, accountable, transparent, inclusive and democratic organization.

We extend congratulations to Belinda Stronach, Keith Stein, Mark Tweksbury and all the other Olympic athletes and their associates. As Canadians we are proud of them and we salute their initiative.

* * *

POVERTY

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, it gives me no pleasure to note that over 5 million of our fellow Canadians, 1.5 million of them children, are living in poverty.

• (1410)

That means one in six people in the nation is faced daily with circumstances that generally include insufficient nourishment, substandard or non-existent housing and an increased vulnerability to illness.

The PC party of Canada has set up a task force on poverty co-chaired by my colleague from Shefford. Our first set of public hearings will be held in Saint John, New Brunswick on Friday coming. We will be in St. John's, Newfoundland on April 19 as part of a cross-country tour.

There are no easy solutions to this difficult problem. However, it is necessary to tackle the issue and so I encourage individuals and groups to attend our meetings. Together we can make recommendations to government in the hope that policies will be implemented to close the growing gap between the rich and poor.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Mr. Speaker, today the steelworkers and aluminum workers union presented its

S. O. 31

official response to the federal government's defence in its dispute over discrimination against youth and women under the Employment Insurance Act.

What was the government's response? It avoided them saying that the applicants have no public interest in contesting the law.

It said that the surplus in the employment insurance fund does not belong to contributors.

It mocks pregnant women saying that its actions are not discriminatory, because pregnancy is a fact of nature, a contention contrary to the supreme court's decision in 1989. It continues to discriminate against young people.

The opposition to the changes to employment insurance comes from Force Jeunesse, la Coalition action-chômage, the CSN, the Quebec federation of labour, the Canadian Labour Congress and the thousands of workers that I met in my tour across Canada.

The consensus is clear. It is time the government assumed its responsibilities and changed employment insurance.

* * *

GÉRALD LAROSE

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Gérald Larose has announced that he will not be seeking another term as the head of the CSN.

After 25 years of involvement in and devotion to the cause of Quebec workers, including 16 as the president of the CSN, he is and will remain an outstanding figure in Quebec's labour history.

During his long career, he was a part of every struggle for social progress: those of workers, of course, but those too of women, the disadvantaged and society's rejects.

An open and direct man, he always communicated with feeling the faults of a free market society and the need for a more equitable distribution of the collective wealth.

He is also an ardent defender of the idea of a sovereign Quebec, which, for him represents as much the normal democratic and national course of the people of Quebec as social justice.

The Bloc Québécois salutes this great man and wishes him good luck in his next undertaking.

* * *

[English]

IMPAIRED DRIVING

Mr. Richard M. Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, impaired drivers kill over 1,400 Canadians every year and injure over 60,000. The cost to our health care system each year runs in the billions of dollars. Millions of

Oral Questions

Canadians are crying out for us to put a stop to this senseless and 100% preventable crime.

Members of the House unanimously called on the government to put an end to impaired driving by instructing the justice committee to review and amend the Criminal Code to enhance deterrence and ensure the penalties reflect the seriousness of this 100% preventable crime.

For the first time in over a decade we have the opportunity to toughen up impaired driving laws and help stop the carnage on our highways. I urge my colleagues on the justice committee to demonstrate leadership and represent the wishes of millions of Canadians through amendments to the Criminal Code that will truly reflect Canada's zero tolerance attitude to this senseless and 100% preventable crime.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have to speak up and decide if our public broadcaster has a future. Considering the billion dollar expenditure and the historical prominence of this institution, it does not reflect well on us to stand by and watch which limb of the pejoratively named corpse will succumb first.

Lawrence Martin in the Montreal *Gazette* asks why we are ready to go to the wall with Canadian magazines yet falter at supporting the CBC that tells more Canadian stories in a week than magazines do in a year.

Susan Riley in the Ottawa *Citizen* points out the debasement of American television news with its persistent scandal coverage and warns Canadians to beware privatizing the CBC or it too will fall victim to ratings and dollars.

Globe and Mail columnist Jeffrey Simpson wrote that CBC management failed to reshape the corporation after the cuts.

I concur with the Calgary *Herald* that the CBC must stay independent of whatever party happens to be running the government. The CBC is glue to this country.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Burin—St. George's.

* * *

• (1415)

THE EAST COAST FISHERY

Mr. Bill Matthews (Burin—St. George's, PC): Mr. Speaker, thousands of our people have been forced out of work due to our declining groundfish resources. Underwater cameras have uncovered compelling evidence of the destruction of our codfish stocks by the growing seal herds in our bays and off our coasts. Tonnes of

partly eaten codfish have been discovered on the ocean floor in the Bonavista Bay area.

Seals only consume part of the fish, leaving the rest on the ocean floor to decay. It is time the Government of Canada, the custodian and manager of seal herds and our fish stocks, immediately increase the seal harvest to give our groundfish stocks a chance to regenerate.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, first it was the Prime Minister's in-law, Paul Desmarais, who said that high taxes were strangling Canada's economy. Today Doug Young, his former cabinet minister, chaired a whole conference on plummeting Canadian productivity. At the conference the Prime Minister's own pollster admitted that Canadians are upset with our declining standard of living, and the weak dollar proves it.

If top Liberals do not buy the Prime Minister's low dollar-high tax argument, then why should the rest of us?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people are quite happy with the economic policies of this government. The Canadian people are very happy that we have taken unemployment from 11.4% to 7.8%. The Canadian public is quite happy about the fact that we have reduced the Conservative's deficit from \$42 billion to zero and we are still going. The Canadian people are pretty happy to see that the *Financial Times* of London has called Canada the top dog of financial managers.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, under this government's leadership I would say our economy has been a bit of a mongrel. High taxes, low dollar. That is the Prime Minister's plan.

Who else spoke at that conference today? Dr. Sherry Cooper of Nesbitt Burns. She blasted the Prime Minister for the fact that Canada has the worst record of productivity among industrialized nations. The reason? High taxes. What is the proof of this? Our low dollar.

Is the Prime Minister proud that our standard of living is declining? Why does he continue to brag about a 65 cent dollar?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 1.6 million more Canadians are working since we took power. A study mentioned yesterday that Canada ranks number one among G-7 countries in terms of business costs. It stated that Canada has the third lowest corporate income tax rate for manufacturing among the G-7, lower than the United States. It stated that we have the lowest labour costs of the G-7.

Oral Questions

This long list tells everybody that if they want to do good business the best place to go is Canada.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that the Prime Minister just stood in this place to defend the fact that Canadians are willing to work for peanuts. That is the Liberals' whole argument. They somehow think it is a good thing that Canadians have lower wages than those in other countries around the world. Recipients of those low wages can tell the Prime Minister that it is no fun.

When is the Prime Minister going to wake up and understand that a falling standard of living is not a good thing, that it hurts Canadians?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the problem with the Reform Party is that it cannot take good news as news. The only thing it can do is dampen the situation in Canada because we are doing quite well. I understand why Joe Clark does not want to talk with the Reform Party.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this government continues to make light of the fact that our dollar is declining, our standard of living is declining, our productivity is declining relative to other industrialized countries—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. We will hear the hon. member.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Sometimes the truth hurts, Mr. Speaker.

How can government members stand in their place to defend a 65 cent loonie? How can they defend giving Canadians a lower standard of living? When in opposition the finance minister said that the Canadian dollar should be 78 cents. How can he defend a 65 cent dollar when he is in government?

• (1420)

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the facts as cited by the Reform Party are just simply wrong. The fact is that Canada did have declining productivity, which had begun some 20 years ago.

Let us look at the facts. In 1997 Canada's productivity rose 2.9%, the highest since 1984 and twice that of the United States. Those are the facts.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the facts. The OECD says that Canada was the only G-7 country to see a reduction in its productivity between 1979 and 1997. It said that Canada's productivity performance used to place it among the top performers, but now it has fallen significantly.

We are going down while other countries are going up. Our dollar is at 65 cents, giving Canadians a lower standard of living.

How does this finance minister defend a bargain basement priced country when we should be growing and not shrinking our standard of living?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is caught in a time warp. Take a look. He started in 1979. He ought to get with it.

Since 1996-97 our productivity has been on the increase, employment has been on the increase and Canadians have been on the increase. There is only one thing declining now and that is the Reform Party's popularity.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL FORUMS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when it comes to talking about culture internationally, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has made himself very clear: Canada is a sovereign nation and must, in his view, have only one voice. At best, Quebec will play a secondary role in any future delegation.

Would the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs please be a bit clearer and tell us very specifically that, if Quebec wants to play more than just the role of a regional component, the only course open to it is that of sovereignty?

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Quebecers are extremely fortunate to belong to a country that is one of the most influential in the world—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: —and play a major role by sharing in the sovereign country called Canada.

Yesterday, the Premier of Quebec said a very shocking thing. He said that a Canadian government official cannot represent the culture of Quebecers.

I would like to quote something the Premier of Quebec said in February 1996 "I have worked in Ottawa at the highest level. One cannot become an expert in this overnight, and we have not had an opportunity in Quebec City to develop this expertise".

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it would be so much wiser for the minister and so much simpler for everyone if he answered the questions.

Le Petit Robert gives the figurative meaning of potiche as someone given an honorary position but no active role.

Is the role the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs has in mind for the Government of Quebec with respect to its culture the role of a potiche?

Oral Questions

Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us not confuse two different issues.

The first has to do with improving this federation, which is already well advanced compared to others, including in its ability to express its views internationally.

The second concerns how to react to the obviously separatist ploys of the Bouchard government internationally.

I have here a document released two years ago entitled "Plan stratégique de ministère des relations internationales". It contains the following "Actively promote the various facets of Quebec society internationally. . . so as to be able, when the time is right, to count on support in realizing the government's political project".

Let us not confuse these two issues.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same minister.

The latest Statistics Canada figures indicate that the proportion of francophones in Canada dropped from 29% to 24% between 1951 and 1996. Only in Quebec has the proportion remained stable.

• (1425)

How can the federal government claim to be in the best position to represent Quebec culture internationally, when it is not even capable of stopping the erosion of the francophone communities outside Quebec?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one thing is certain, we are not about to leave in the cold the one million francophones outside Quebec who need the support of Canada if they are to safeguard their language and culture.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred an answer to my question rather than the statement the minister has just made.

We are aware of how courageously the francophones outside Quebec are defending themselves against assimilation.

Yet, when we see the federal government's dubious success in supposedly defending Canada's francophones, is it at all surprising that Quebecers do not want Ottawa defending their culture outside Canada?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, the hon. member is claiming a desire to support francophones outside Quebec, while on the other he is leaving them in the cold with a policy which states that there is French only for Quebec, and English for the rest of Canada.

In this party and this country, Canada, we believe in two founding peoples and two official languages. That is why francophones outside Quebec can count on us to support the culture of Canada, the culture of two peoples.

* * *

[English]

BILL C-55

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the heritage minister thinks she now has some wiggle room to negotiate away Canada's cultural sovereignty. Maybe not so much wiggle as shake, as in shakedown.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party may continue.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Mr. Speaker, it is less than 24 hours since the House passed Bill C-55. Will the heritage minister now tell us which Canadian cultural protections are being bargained away as we speak?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the support of 197 members of the House we have every intention of proceeding with Bill C-55.

The hon. member can rest assured that I have no intention of wiggling or shaking.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-55 was supposed to be about Canadian cultural values, but it is looking more and more like a bargaining chip in a dispute with the Americans.

One thing that we have learned about disputes with the Americans is that appeasement will not work.

Will the heritage minister commit to the House today that there will be no appeasement, no backsliding and no cave-in to American pressures on our magazine bill?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yes.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Industry challenged members to produce a negative report on Canada's productivity. I would like to quote findings of such a report.

Over the past 25 years Canada has had the lowest rate of productivity growth in the G-7.

Canada's overall tax burden is 20% higher than our major competitor, the U.S.

Canada is losing foreign investment, causing low productivity that costs jobs and a strong economy.

Oral Questions

The report was given February 18 by the Minister of Industry to the Empire Club in Toronto.

Does the minister stand by his comments about Canada's low productivity?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member from the Reform Party claimed that Canada's productivity had declined, which was patently wrong.

It is true that we have a productivity challenge and the answer comes, in part, from the investment in research and development, and the investment in science and engineering that we have been making, which those parties tend to vote against.

The biggest burden that lies on the back of Canada's productivity is the burden of debt that was built up by over nine years of Progressive Conservative government.

• (1430)

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, the minister's credibility is about as strong as the Canadian dollar. In December he said higher taxes were good for productivity. Then he said he was misquoted. Last month he said Canada's productivity was the worst in the G-7. Now he says Canada has the best. Yesterday the minister avoided questions on the impact of government user fees on the private sector.

I ask the minister a simple question. Why should anyone have confidence in him when he does not know whether he is sucking or blowing? Does he think strong productivity can be brought with a report?

The Speaker: Order. We are getting a little bit close on the language, so please quiet it down. The hon. Minister of Industry.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really must apologize to the hon. member for attempting to raise the debate on productivity to an intellectual level. It seems to have been above him.

What we do have from the KPMG study that was released a couple of days ago is an indication that in factor after factor Canada leads in the G-7. Whether we are talking about the cost of road, sea or air freight, electricity, leases, telecommunications, interest costs, depreciation, property taxes, advantage after advantage is on the side of Canada.

I do not know why the opposition parties feel that they have to run down this country in order to score some political points.

* * *

THE SENATE

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today convicted Senator Eric Bernston was sentenced to a year in jail for fraud. That is on top of Senator Michel Cogger convicted

and sentenced for influence peddling. The Senate is so outdated that the Prime Minister cannot even fire these two.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister, what more evidence does he need for Senate reform and to make that place elected?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would have been very useful to have the Reform Party on side when we decided in the Charlottetown agreement to have an elected Senate. But again, Reformers put their political interests ahead of the interests of the nation and they tried to score political points, so they cannot complain. We wanted to have an elected Senate and they opposed it.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that was seven years ago this year. Number one the Charlottetown accord did not allow for direct Senate elections and he knows it. Number two, 60% of Canadians—

An hon. member: Oh, oh.

Miss Deborah Grey: He is calling names right now because they voted against it.

I would like to ask the Prime Minister, when he hears a senator say, "I am doing my time", does he really believe that that senator is busy in the chamber next door?

The Speaker: I am going to permit the question. The right hon. Prime Minister.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a tradition that we do not comment on the work of the other place here in this House, and especially when a senator is a Conservative senator.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNATIONAL FORUMS

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Canadian Heritage earlier acknowledged something we have not heard for a very long time in federal parliament—the notion of two founding peoples.

Does the fact of recognizing Quebec francophones as one of the two founding peoples of this country end there, or does it not warrant special status in Canadian delegations?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, francophones in Canada are not just from Quebec. There are one million francophones who are part of that people but are not living in Quebec. They count on the federal government to represent them.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

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

Oral Questions

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will have the opportunity to rise again.

I want to ask him if he will not acknowledge that Quebeckers and the Government of Quebec have always played a leadership role in defending the French fact in North America and that, in doing so, they are fully entitled to be heard in international forums like the one in Belgium with the Walloons and the Flemings.

We exist and we want to have the right to say so.

• (1435)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, French Canadians are very well represented here in the House and throughout Canada, in embassies, and their interests are well protected.

I would point out, because these days there is a lot of talk about Catalonia, that the Spanish constitution does not give to the people of Catalonia the same powers as Quebec enjoys here. The Spanish constitution is based on the indissoluble unity of the Spanish nation, the common and indivisible country of all Spaniards.

When we travel in Spain, we can see that the people of Catalonia would like to have the powers that the Canadian Constitution gives the Government of Quebec.

* * *

[English]

JUSTICE

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, a few months ago in this House we strongly endorsed a bill. This bill is now before the justice committee and would give children's organizations a right to know if a convicted child molester applies for a position of trust over children. Yesterday, coincidentally, the solicitor general introduced a bill that proposes the same thing.

I would be willing to take my name off the bill and the solicitor general could put his name on it and we would be a lot further ahead on this whole issue. Will the solicitor general take my bill now so that children can be better protected rather than waiting for another year or more?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what my hon. colleague should do is read Bill C-69. It is more inclusive. It has a flagging system to indicate if anybody was convicted of a sex offence. It is retroactive. This bill is important for public safety. I certainly await my hon. colleague's support for this piece of very important legislation.

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am concerned sometimes when I see power and politics going ahead of

the protection of our Canadian children. My bill is exactly the same as the one the minister has put forward. This week there are witnesses here who are presenting evidence in support of our bill.

Why will the solicitor general not do the right thing and protect Canadian children instead of playing power and politics?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I am doing. It is the right thing. What I am doing is putting a piece of legislation in place that protects the public now. It is also retroactive. It is a piece of legislation that I can only hope my hon. colleague and his party will support.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government says that any surplus in the EI account is part of Canada's consolidated revenue fund and does not belong to contributors.

Can the Minister of Finance explain why his government is appropriating EI fund surpluses when it is not paying one red cent into the plan, when all the money in it comes from workers and employers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member knows very well that the government rolled the EI fund into the government's consolidated revenue fund in 1986 at the request of the auditor general. It was done at his request and we are following his rules.

At the same time, the member is also well aware that the Canadian government guarantees the money in this fund.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, either the EI fund's surpluses belong to contributors, which explains why the government is paying interest on them, or they belong to the government, as the government claims.

If so, why is the minister paying interest on a surplus that he claims belongs to him?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because this was how it was set up at the very beginning.

But I again repeat that the member is well aware that the Canadian government guarantees these payments and, when the fund is in the red, as it has been for 11 of the last 17 years, it is the Canadian government that assumes the load.

Oral Questions

• (1440)

*[English]***CUBA**

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday we saw the effectiveness of this government's soft power foreign policy. Four Cuban dissidents were sentenced to prison after a kangaroo court in Havana found them guilty of subversion.

Given his warm relations with Mr. Castro, why was the foreign affairs minister not able to ensure their right to a fair trial?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in this case the Prime Minister has raised the issue directly with President Castro. I raised the issue myself. We expressed our extreme disappointment that the Cuban government did not react. That in no way questions the importance in the long haul of continuing to try to help change Cuban society to move toward a more democratic open society. That is the Canadian policy.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, that is too little too late.

How can the government deny that its 20 years of soft power policy toward Cuba has been anything but a total failure?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I guess if the member knew the facts then he would draw a different conclusion.

The fact of the matter is that we have made major changes in helping broaden the area of religious freedom in Cuba. Last year a number of political prisoners were released. We have had agreements signed on anti-terrorism and anti-drug matters. We have been able to improve the political space for civil groups. We have been able to help build the capacity in that country to deal with problems of legislation and human rights.

We are making some progress. There is a setback. It is a long road. There are some bumps on the road, but this government continues to be committed to try to bring about democratic change in that country.

* * *

*[Translation]***EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the government claims that women are not being discriminated against by the new eligibility rules for maternity benefits because, by their very nature, only women can get pregnant.

My question is for the Secretary of State for the Status of Women. Since the Minister of Human Resources Development is

insensitive to our objections, what is the reaction of the Secretary of State for the Status of Women to her government's argument that there is be no discrimination, because pregnancy is a natural event?

[English]

Hon. Hedy Fry (Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond by saying yes, pregnancy is a natural course in the lifestyle of a woman. There is no doubt about that.

I do not agree with the hon. member that there is discrimination based on some of the initiatives by Human Resources Development of Canada. We are looking at some of the issues. There is more that can be done to level that playing field. We are working on that. But we cannot make changes immediately, in one day. They are stacked one on top of the other. We have seen this government make changes that are appropriate to the lives of women.

* * *

TRADE

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister for International Trade.

Canada's aerospace industry is vital to our economy and our international competitiveness. The minister has had four days to examine the WTO decision on Brazil's decision to challenge our industry.

Can the minister comment on the fact that the Reform Party was not exactly helpful to Canada's case?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, last July when the leader of the Reform Party travelled to Asia, he publicly and deliberately undermined our interests on trade and investment.

Second, yesterday and today Reform members continue to try to undermine the independent KPMG report that shows that Canada is number one. Now, in the WTO report that was just released on the aircraft dispute between Brazil and Canada, it cites seven different references where the Reform Party has given information to the Brazilian government to help it with its case. This is absolutely shocking and borders on sabotage of our national interests. Which side of the case is the Reform Party on?

* * *

• (1445)

GRAIN

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, because of the strike by 70 PSAC grain weighers the railways are not moving grain. The ports are completely shut down today.

Oral Questions

Another 24 hours have passed. What has the treasury board minister personally done in the past day to ensure that this strike will end?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have negotiated with the blue collar union. We have made it offers that we judge to be extremely generous. We have in fact offered it more than we have offered to 80% of public servants.

I am sorry the union considers at present that it has to carry out these acts. I hope it will come back to the negotiation table, see the light, become reasonable and agree to a settlement.

Mr. Howard Hilstrom (Selkirk—Interlake, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, exports of \$5 million per day are not leaving port. Sixteen vessels are waiting for grain to be loaded, with seven more due this week. Canada's reputation as a reliable supplier is being destroyed.

How long will the treasury board minister let this go on, or does he even care about the situation?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to the last moment to make concessions that would make the strikers go back to work. Unfortunately they are asking for unreasonable demands at present. We are considering all possible options.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, CBC Radio Canada as we know it may go off the air on the Friday.

I was on the picket line this morning with Dean Haywood. His father was a technical director and his brother directed *Hockey Night in Canada* for 15 years. Dean has worked at the parliamentary bureau for 25 years.

Generations of committed public broadcasters have been keeping a dream alive, but it may all fade to black on Friday because government funding cuts have pushed the corporation into crisis.

Will the minister of heritage give assurances to the Haywoods and the millions of Canadians who support public broadcasting that she will find money to prevent the CBC from fading to black on Friday?

Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have good news on the CBC front. The technicians have been meeting with a mediator since last Monday and are still talking. The media guild has now asked for a mediator and one has been provided.

I would ask the hon. member to accept the procedure that is in place. Both parties are speaking and we hope they will go back to

work soon. It is not only a funding issue. There are other issues on the table that are more than just funding.

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we have known the government has been involved with various kinds of interference with the CBC for a long time. There was a \$400 million cut to funding. It has told CBC what logo to have. It censored Terry Milewski for his reporting. It has made CBC interference an art form.

I find it ironic that at this point in time the minister would be saying that they are trying to stay out of this and let business take its course. I think the CBC has to be dealt with quickly and the government has to have some hand in it.

Hon. Claudette Bradshaw (Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is not what I said. I said that there were issues on the table other than funding.

The mediators are speaking to both groups. Let us allow the process to work in the hope that a new collective agreement will be negotiated sooner rather than later.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, it came out during oral question period that the defence budget included some \$600 million in additional unexpected funds.

In the minister's response, he claimed that this was for use in disaster relief operations. Yet the land forces have received \$184 million in additional funding.

Was this additional amount meant to be used to meet the land force's operating budget deficit? Is that why National Defence was unable to pay its bills on time, because it had no more money?

• (1450)

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the defence department pays for its bills. Its procedures have improved over the years to make sure that they are paid on time.

What additional money we do have in the budget this year will go to pay for improvements to the quality of life of our troops. Our troops have given fine dedicated service to the country and they deserve our support in that regard.

[Translation]

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, there seems to have been an increase of approximately \$337 million in the air force budget for this year, without any announcement of this by the minister.

Oral Questions

Can the minister confirm whether any of this \$337 million, which came from provincial transfer payments or military pensions funds, will be used to replace the Sea King helicopter fleet, especially since another one experienced problems this very morning at Shearwater?

[English]

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are no funds relevant to the replacement of the Sea King fleet in this budget, but the government has had a long commitment, going back to the 1994 white paper, to proceed with a change in aircraft from the Sea King to a new helicopter.

A procurement strategy is now in the stages of being finalized and will be brought forward at the earliest opportunity. Meanwhile we will make sure that our Sea King helicopters are safe to fly.

* * *

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are growing labour unrest and work disruptions among federal correctional officers which may put Canadians at risk.

Could the solicitor general assure Canadians that their safety and security will be protected during these labour disruptions?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague for his concern. I can assure my colleague and Canadians that public safety is a number one issue.

Because of public safety, Correctional Service Canada has contingency plans in place but these contingency plans are quite expensive.

* * *

GRAIN

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government has done its very best to convince us that changes made to part 1 of the Canada Labour Code would ensure the unimpeded flow of Canadian grain to port on time. We have had people come before the committee. The Reform Party has said that this will not happen. Now we have a case where we have the grain stopped at port.

What exactly does the Minister of Labour have in mind to do about this problem and when will she fix it?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is more a problem of the picket lines that have been established by the blue collar workers. We are monitoring the effects of their

strikes. We want the movement of grain to be unimpeded because it is in the interest of our farmers in the west.

At present we are taking all the possible measures. We will look at all the options in front of us to settle these strikes.

* * *

[Translation]

INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, when the Department of Industry suddenly cut off its program of internships with export businesses across Canada, it did a real disservice to 14 young Quebeckers, who were dumped, some of whom had given up their jobs, and to 22 businesses in Quebec.

Does the minister intend to compensate the young people and the businesses for the costs incurred in the pilot program?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the program was initiated in April 1997 and was intended to give work experience to young graduates, by twinning them with SMBs in Canada or abroad to support export development.

The alliance of manufacturers managed the implementation of the program. It was cancelled in June 1998 following an independent evaluation and audit, which concluded that the low level of business participation did not justify the continuation of the program. It was a necessary but difficult decision.

* * *

[English]

THE SENATE

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister about his constitutional responsibility to appoint senators.

• (1455)

Later on this afternoon the government will use its majority in the House to approve an 11.7% cost overrun in the Senate's budget. Last week the Prime Minister said that when there was a large consensus on the Senate he would act.

In light of the fact that over 90% of Canadian people do not support the existing Senate in any way at all, I want to ask the Prime Minister whether or not he will acknowledge that consensus, listen to the people, put a freeze on appointments and agree to an all-party committee to look at the whole process of what we do with the Senate.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that to change the rules for the Upper House in Canada we need an amendment to the Canadian Constitution. We have debated this issue for years and years.

Oral Questions

I am reporting to the House that there is no pressure by any government, and every government has an obligation to concur in the changes before we can proceed. I do not think we can do that at this time.

I do not think it would be useful to open debate on the Constitution. I do not think Canadians are ready for it at this time. They have had enough debate on the Constitution over the last 10 years.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. In its ongoing efforts to build a richer government within a poorer country, the government has now decided to deduct employment insurance premiums from volunteer firefighters who receive honorariums.

Volunteer firefighters risk their lives to protect and serve their fellow citizens and they receive small honorariums in return. The government is rewarding their brave service with a cowardly tax grab.

Will the Minister of National Revenue stop this deplorable tax grab now?

Hon. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should have stood and applauded the Minister of Finance who increased the \$500 to \$1,000 for volunteer firefighters in the last budget.

In terms of deductions for the amount paid, this is something I am looking at right now because of the representations made by many of my colleagues. I will report back on what we will do. It is a very important issue and we are reviewing it right now.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board.

Public service retirees and employees are saying that the government wants to use the surplus in the public service, RCMP and National Defence pension funds without being entitled to.

[English]

What makes the Government of Canada think that it has the right to this surplus but the employees and the pensioners do not?

[Translation]

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are two main reasons. The first is that the government guarantees the benefits of employees past and present. The second

is that the government absorbs all the pension fund deficits and takes all the risks.

The retirees association is itself in agreement that, legally the surpluses belong to the government, and I quote their website:

[English]

The association does not believe that it has any legal grounds to pursue a court case. A legal decision would not be in favour of the association since the legal advice provided to the association by independent experts in the pension field has been that the employer can decide on the disposition of the surplus.

* * *

[Translation]

RAIL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

Decision makers in the Haute-Mauricie and Abitibi regions are worried about what the Minister of Transport will decide with respect to the subdivision trunk line between La Tuque and Senneterre.

Can the minister assure us that the decision makers of the Haute-Mauricie and Abitibi regions will be consulted before the minister takes a decision regarding franchises?

Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to make the trip from La Tuque to Senneterre a few months ago and I met many local inhabitants as well as travellers on the VIA Rail train.

As the hon. member well knows, we approved most of the Standing Committee on Transport's recommendations with respect to VIA Rail, including the recommendation to protect remote lines such as those in his riding.

* * *

[English]

GRAIN

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the answer of the President of the Treasury Board. I think farmers will not take any comfort from his remarks.

He can wring his hands and tell us he is working on this, but the fact of the matter is that farmers are strapped for cash. Their bins are full of grain. They have to get this stuff on to the railroad before the road bans come on. What in the world will he do to solve this problem?

● (1500)

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I agree that damage is being caused to the economy and to the farmers by the tactics that are being used by the blue collar

workers. We have negotiated with them. We have offered them whatever we could.

Unfortunately, the union has the right to strike and it is using that right. We are at present considering all the possible options open to us to get them back to work.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Dr. Michael Woods, Minister for the Marine and Natural Resources of Ireland.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, during question period the Minister for International Trade quoted from a document which referred to the relationship between Canada and Brazil and an aerospace ruling of the WTO.

For the benefit of all members, I wonder if he could table a copy of that information so that all members could have access to it.

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, during question period I gave a copy of the excerpts which show eight times in the report that the Reform Party provided information to the Brazilian government.

It is with pleasure that I table this document for the House of Commons.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, during oral question period the Minister for International Trade indicated that the official opposition had no evidence to indicate that Canadian productivity had declined.

I would like to seek unanimous consent to table an annex from an OECD economic outlook, dated December 1998, which indicates that our total productivity factor has decreased by—

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—CRIMINAL JUSTICE

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): When debate suspended for question period there were five minutes left for questions and comments on the speech of the hon. member for Mississauga South.

• (1505)

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when the member for Mississauga South was talking about the Reform opposition day motion he spoke at some length about Justice Shaw's pornography decision in British Columbia on the Sharpe case. I would like to make a few comments about that because I have some information and then I will have a question for the member for Mississauga South.

The member talked about media reports from that trial and he also talked about the fact that Mr. Sharpe was not represented by legal counsel.

There was only one member of the media at the trial, who is a radio reporter from my community. There were several UBC law students at court that day. There were other media who popped in, heard what they thought was a poorly presented case and left because they thought there was no way this individual could win. Why did the law students stay? Because they knew he was going to win. The radio reporter from my community talked to those students and therefore decided to stay.

The member for Mississauga South indicated that he is of the opinion that the case was not well argued. I beg to differ. It was not well presented, but it was well argued.

I do not believe that Justice Shaw made an error in judgment. His judgment was the culmination of a series of earlier decisions by judges because of the way in which our laws are written and earlier jurisprudence on the child pornography issue related to the Constitution.

I will make the same admission as the member for Mississauga South: I am not a lawyer, but this is my belief.

The message that I think I am hearing out of those court proceedings is that under the current legislative framework it does not matter what happens with the appeal. In the short run that may work, but in the long run the current legislative framework will be found lacking and will require a legislative solution or a notwithstanding solution.

Supply

Why is the member so quick to sign a letter to the Prime Minister and so slow to stand in the House of Commons to vote for a motion to support the very same issue?

Mr. Paul Szabo: Mr. Speaker, very quickly, the media reports I was referring to were not the media reports on the hearing. They were, in fact, media reports on the opposition day motion which we voted on in the House. The media reports indicated that government members had decided they were voting to do nothing, and that is not the case.

I am glad the member raised the issue about why I signed a letter to the Prime Minister on behalf of a number of caucus colleagues asking for attention. The reason I signed the letter was because at the time the letter was written—and the case had happened a week earlier—the position of the government was that we would defend the laws of Canada before the Supreme Court of Canada. The letter that I signed, together with a large number of my caucus colleagues, was to ask the Prime Minister and the justice minister to consider stronger, more direct action because of the importance of the issue.

Indeed, to the credit of the caucus members who spoke up in caucus and who signed that letter, the justice minister did announce that the federal government was going to participate in the B.C. appeal hearing along with the attorney general of B.C. to deal with it right then and there, the swiftest, most effective way to deal with a very bad court decision.

I thank the member for his question. I wrote the letter because it was the right thing to do.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my comments in this debate today on our supply day motion to the whole issue of the proliferation of drugs, what it means to organized crime and what it means to our young people.

I attended a conference last weekend in Montreal. The conference title was “Injection Drug Use and Societal Changes”. The primary focus of this convention was on implementing more effective measures to reduce the harm associated with injection drug use, in particular the spread of HIV and AIDS.

• (1510)

A number of speakers recommended the continuation of the needle exchange program. Some recommended allowing for and establishing safe injection houses or sites. Some recommended the medically controlled injection of heroine addicts and some even recommended legalization of drugs.

The conference focused primarily on harm reduction. Therefore, presentations did not provide recommendations or solutions to

prevent our youth from becoming addicts in the first place. There were absolutely no statistics based on comparative studies or experiences such as those in Switzerland demonstrating how, if at all, harm reduction ultimately results in fewer drug addicts.

I did not recognize any other members of this House in attendance at this very worthwhile conference which gathered together many experts in the field of harm reduction.

The most important revelation that emerged from this conference was that we need a balanced approach or what the RCMP spokesperson termed “a whole meal deal in dealing with illegal drugs in this country”.

To date, the war on drugs by this government and previous governments has not been successful as evidenced by the growing number of drug addicts living and using drugs on Canadian streets, particularly in downtown east side Vancouver.

Inspector Richard Barszczewski, the RCMP officer in charge of operations of the drug section and the drug awareness program, began his address at the conference by stating “Canada has no war on drugs”. There is no war on drugs because successive governments have failed to introduce a balanced approach to deal with the issue of illicit drugs.

Inspector Barszczewski revealed that the illicit drug trade remains the principal source of revenue for most organized crime groups. The combined annual supply estimates for all drug types has the potential to generate criminal proceeds in excess of \$4 billion at the wholesale level and \$18 billion at the street level. It is estimated that 15 tonnes of cocaine are smuggled into Canada each year. Additionally, one to two tonnes of heroine are required annually to meet the needs of Canadian heroine users.

One presenter at the conference, Eric Single, a professor with the University of Toronto, estimated that the total cost for illicit drug use for 1992 was \$1.4 billion. This cost included but is not limited to police, courts, corrections, customs and excise and health care.

The RCMP revealed that in B.C. alone there were 310 drug overdose deaths in 1996 and again in 1997. Eighty per cent of all property crimes committed by individuals were directly or indirectly related to substance abuse. I am referring to the province of Alberta now. Fifty per cent of those accused of homicide and thirty-eight per cent of homicide victims were intoxicated or under the influence of illegal drugs or both. Forty per cent of all motor vehicle accident victims were under the influence of drugs.

What are we to do? What would be the ingredients of a balanced approach to the problem we have within Canadian society? There are a number of points I would like to touch on.

Supply

First, we should strengthen social policies and programs as a means of prevention.

Second, there should be more education and drug awareness in schools. My province of Alberta has the DARE program, a very effective program administered by the police forces which operates with schoolchildren. I have been privileged to attend some of the graduation exercises of those groups of young people. It is heartening and hopeful to see this occurring and what it means for the future.

We need stricter law enforcement of trafficking charges and penalties.

We need to extend such programs as the Toronto drug court to divert addicts and street level drug traffickers away from the traditional judicial system, allowing for treatment rather than imprisonment.

We need to increase penalties for high level drug trafficking.

We need better organized crime legislation, including proceeds of crime legislation which would allow the authorities in this country to seize the proceeds of drug crimes and turn them over to the state.

We need to increase substantially the RCMP's budget to allow for the hiring of additional officers to be utilized both domestically and abroad.

There is a need to stop the flow or supply of drugs through better interdiction.

• (1515)

Last, effectively implement means to stop the flow of drugs in prisons in Canada. The hon. Justice William Vancise of the court of appeal for Saskatchewan stated during his presentation at the Montreal conference: "It is easier to get drugs in prison than on the streets. They are only more expensive within prison".

There are numerous flaws in the federal prison service program and for detecting illegal drugs. An 80 page report released by the Quebec provincial ombudsman estimated that between \$40 million and \$60 million in drugs flow through the prisons of that province annually. There is a commercial enterprise of drug dealing within our prisons.

Justice Vancise revealed an appalling fact that many offenders go into prison without a drug problem and come out as drug addicts. That is unacceptable. The government has failed dismally to introduce the whole meal deal or a balanced approach to dealing with illicit drugs and it is our children and grandchildren who will pay the price.

I will touch on the whole business of the government's attitude toward the use of illegal drugs, particularly hard drugs within our prisons and society. If we want to determine the attitude of the government over the last six years toward the drug problem in

Canada, that attitude is best displayed when we examine what is happening within our prisons.

If there is any place that we should be able to reduce if not eliminate the use of drugs, it ought to be within our prisons and yet, as Judge Vancise told us at the Montreal conference, it is as easy to get drugs inside our prisons as it is on the streets. The only difference is that it costs more in our prisons.

The Government of Canada's attitude toward this whole problem is reflected in what is happening within our prisons. It is in complete control of who and what goes into the prison and yet we have this type of unacceptable, reprehensible situation within our prisons where people who are arrested and sent into prison without any type of drug habit are coming out as drug addicts, as the judge said.

We have seen where inmates of our correctional centres have sued the government for various reasons. I predict the day when we will see some inmate suing the government for placing them in an environment that is unsafe because of the uncontrolled trafficking of drugs that occurs within the prison system. It is unacceptable and the government's attitude toward not just the drug situation but crime in general is most vividly reflected in what is happening within our prisons today. It is unacceptable.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague, a former RCMP officer, for his very eloquent dissertation. I have four points to make and I would like my hon. colleague to answer them.

A person convicted for an offence can be eligible for parole after serving only one-sixth of their sentence. This appalled me when I was in jail as a correctional officer and as a physician. I thought it was ridiculous.

Does the hon. member feel that people caught trafficking or using illicit drugs while in jail should actually have more of their sentence to be served in jail rather than being eligible for parole after one-sixth, have that pushed to two-thirds of their sentence which would have a very clear punitive action against those who are wilfully using drugs while in jail?

Persons caught trafficking drugs outside have to pay the price. Does he feel our judicial system right now is enforcing the penalties that are there?

• (1520)

In terms of dealing with hard core drug addicts, the Geneva post-needle park experiment is perhaps the best in the world. Half these drug addicts have become integrated and productive members of society. It is the best model in the world.

There are two ways of dealing with the use of drugs in society. The first is management of the problem and the second is prevention.

Supply

I would like to know how my hon. colleague feels about calling for a national head start program that deals with children in the first eight years of life to make sure they have those basic needs met. It has been proven that it has a profound impact on decreasing child abuse and ensuring that children are in school longer, commit less crime and become integrated members of society. This motion passed in the House last year. I would like to know the member's opinion on those points.

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I hope I have time to get to all the member's questions because each one requires an in-depth analysis. I do not know if I will have the time to do justice to these questions.

As far as serving one-sixth of a sentence, I simply go back to what we have been crying out for, truth in sentencing. We do not have it in this country. I think my hon. colleague has brought this very important matter up and it is on the record. We emphasize again that we do not have truth in sentencing.

We hear some criticism even from our party about the way judges handle things. How in the world can judges do their job when their sentencing is overruled by a parole system that puts the lie to their original assessment of the seriousness of the offence by way of the sentence they imposed?

There is no question that our government should take a serious look at increasing the penalty for the top flight traffickers in this country. They should pay a very serious price. What we heard over and over again at the Montreal forum was that these people do not care what they do to the young people, to the addicts, to the people who get hooked on drugs. They are only worried about profits. That is what we should be looking at. That is what the RCMP was talking about when it said a full meal deal.

Let us take a full, broad, balanced approach to this where we go after the traffickers and start to treat those who have addictions as they are being treated through the drug court in Toronto where there are options for them to receive the treatment and care they need. We must also put in the effort required in order to rehabilitate them.

There is no question the head start program, this kind of education at the earliest age, is extremely important in preventing our young people from getting involved in drugs. There are drugs within the schools throughout the country. What we must do is encourage the government, which we are doing in this debate today, to take a serious look at this and help those young people through a broad and balanced approach to this drug situation in Canada.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the speech I noted that the member mentioned some inmates had sued the government because of their exposure to drugs in the prison system.

I am sure the member is familiar with the fact that in downtown Vancouver and on the Vancouver east side the government is also,

by its actions, exposing its own citizens to this sort of thing through allowing these criminal drug dealing refugees to come into the country. I am sure everyone in the House has heard about the Honduran drug dealing problem in Vancouver. We have it with Iranian and Chinese refugee claimants as well.

There is frustration among the police trying to deal with up to half of the people arrested every night in Vancouver being illegals trafficking drugs. It is a major problem and certainly places the citizens of Canada at risk.

• (1525)

Mr. Jack Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, the RCMP officers at the Montreal forum expressed their dismay over the lack of funding. Their budgets are being cut, particularly in this area.

What we have to do is focus on this very broad question. What my hon. colleague has brought up with regard to the drug issue and immigration is there. It has to be looked at. It has to be dealt with. Otherwise the east side situation in Vancouver will get worse and will spread to other parts of the country.

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in debate on a criminal justice motion placed before the House by the official opposition. It raises the need for greater focus on reform of our criminal justice laws to make Canadians feel safer in their homes and in their neighbourhoods.

At the outset let me say how very disappointed I was to hear the shrill and extreme remarks of the parliamentary secretary to the attorney general. This morning she suggested that if the official opposition had its way Canada would be a country governed by vigilante justice where every individual would own a firearm.

I understand partisan differences and differences of opinions between members of this place. That is what serious democratic deliberation is all about. I find that kind of shrill, extreme demagogic rhetoric from a member beyond the pale of reasonable debate.

The member cackles across. She does herself a gross disservice by engaging in that kind of over the top, demagogic rhetoric by grossly mischaracterizing the legitimate and heartfelt concern of the members of the official opposition and the millions of Canadians we represent when it comes to the need for criminal justice reform.

I can have a disagreement with the parliamentary secretary and members of her party about how to weigh victims rights versus the rights of criminals, due process, sentencing and so forth. We can have legitimate arguments about these matters. That is what this parliament is for. I will not ascribe motives to that member and suggest she does not care about criminal justice. I know she does. I will not castigate this government as not caring about victims. I know it does. We have different approaches about how to defend the rights of victims. I will not countenance any member from any

Supply

side of the House using that kind of extremist and shrill rhetoric we heard from that member this morning.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do believe using the word shrill is unparliamentary.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. That is a point of debate depending on your perspective.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I guess she resembles that comment. I rise because, unlike the noisy and gutter raking, guttersniping parliamentary secretary opposite—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Shrill was not but guttersniping is. I ask the hon. member for Calgary Southeast to withdraw those words.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any unparliamentary remarks. I hope members across will try to engage in a more serious and substantive debate.

I recall, running in the last election in my constituency, that one of the most obvious concerns of my constituents, as I went door to door to thousands of homes in the southeast part of Calgary, was crime, particularly violent crime by young offenders. One issue raised with me frequently was the growing trend in home invasions. It is something I would like to address.

When I look at the overall statistics that Statistics Canada reported in 1995, 27% of urban residents of Canada had been victims of crime. About one quarter of Canadians were afraid to walk alone after hours in their neighbourhoods.

• (1530)

It is a shame that in what we often regard as such a peaceful country, so many of our fellow citizens should feel afraid to walk in their own neighbourhoods at night. We cannot rest as legislators as long as the kind of fear founded on crime disturbs the normal and peaceable lives of Canadian citizens.

I look at the situation in an otherwise stable and peaceful suburb of my constituency, the Sundance community. There was a gang fight in September 1997. A 17 year old whose name has been withheld by virtue of the Young Offenders Act stabbed and assaulted three 16 year olds. One of them had lost 10 litres of blood. He was stabbed in the heart, coronary artery and liver. An autopsy was scheduled for one of the three victims of the young offender's crime.

The 17 year old, who was nicknamed Baby Gangster, was sentenced to one year. His name was not released. The judge in that case said "he has a propensity for violence but it is more attitude than anger". The judge cited a psychological report urging social and anger managing counselling. With all due respect, attitude was not the problem. The lack of social management counselling was

not the problem. The problem was that there was a violent thug who nearly took a child's life.

We as legislators need to take more seriously the justice part of the justice system when it comes to imposing appropriate sanctions on individuals like this young so-called gangster.

I also raise the tragic case of young Clayton McGloan of the northeast part of Calgary. Later this month I will be hosting a town hall meeting with his parents. Clayton McGloan was a 17 year old who was viciously attacked by a gang of youths in the Coral Springs community of Calgary on October 31, 1998. He was hit over the head with a bottle, knocked unconscious and stabbed 12 times in the back. This was not an attitude problem on the part of the person who attacked him. It was a vicious murder, attempted and executed.

Clayton fought hard to stay alive. However life support was removed two days later after he was declared clinically brain dead. Close to 2,000 people attended his funeral.

Two juveniles, 15 and 17 years old, were charged but again they cannot be identified under the Young Offenders Act. They will not be identifiable under the bill recently introduced by the Minister of Justice. Both these juveniles stand a good chance of re-entering society in a couple of years.

This is the backdrop we see as members of parliament in representing our constituents. I find it unfortunate that after years and years of advocacy and hard work on the part of victims and their families to establish more meaningful sanctions for violent crime, particularly violent youth crime, that Bill C-68 placed before this House by the Minister of Justice does not come anywhere close to addressing the very real concerns of Canadians on this issue.

I now turn to a growing trend which really is very disturbing, the trend of home invasions. This is a situation where criminals invade a home as a random act if they know the occupants are there. This is not just a simple break and enter for the purpose of robbery. This is an aggravated form of assault on the property and home of residents.

In Kitchener—Waterloo a 71 year old woman was terrorized. Teenage thugs broke into her home, bound her, blindfolded her and threatened her with assault. I read of a case on Saltspring Island, British Columbia where residents were dismayed after their home had been invaded twice in five weeks by separate groups of young offenders.

In my own riding I recall going door to door in the election. I knocked on a door and an elderly lady came to the door after several minutes. She was petrified to open the door. She kept the chain on. She asked me what I wanted. I said I was running for parliament. She said she would not open the door because two young teenagers had tried to break down her door the previous week while she was there. She broke down in tears. She could not sleep at night. She was concerned that they were going to come

Supply

back. The police were called but the boys ran off. The police said that even if they had been arrested they would be back out on the street in a day or so.

• (1535)

I have seen the very real faces of people concerned by this. It is not just the Reform Party who are concerned about this. I read the comments of the Attorney General of British Columbia from the New Democratic Party who says that home invasion is a serious problem across the country and the federal government needs to take some leadership on it. He proposes, as do we, that there be a minimum Criminal Code offence for home invasion above and beyond the offence for breaking and entering, and that this be considered an aggravating factor in sentencing. There would be a higher sentence if this kind of home invasion is a factor in a crime that is committed.

I call on the government to listen to Canadians who are suffering from the growing number of home invasions. I urge government members to listen to the official opposition, listen to the provincial attorneys general. Bring in the kind of sentencing guidelines which would more seriously punish those who violate the privacy of innocent law-abiding Canadian citizens in their homes.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my first choice would have been for a Liberal member to get up and ask a question and get into the debate. Let us talk about what can be done to solve these problems.

I appreciated the examples my hon. colleague used. I guess we all have stories and anecdotes which underline the need to improve our justice system and our dealings with people who so blatantly walk over the rights of other people.

The most serious one that has happened in the Edmonton area in the last little while involved three young people whose names could not be released. They invaded a house one night looking for money. The lady of the house went down to see about the noise thinking it was her dog. It was the three young people who stabbed her to death. A young mother's life was taken. Under the protection of the law, their names cannot be released. How can we justify having this lack of accountability for people and their actions?

Beyond publicizing their names thereby holding them accountable for what they have done, has the member given any thought to what kind of sentences and how long those sentences should be for things such as home invasions especially if weapons are used? Has the member given any thought as to how we treat these youths in terms of giving justice to the people whose rights are seriously violated?

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to be an expert on sentencing guidelines, but I do know that the current Criminal

Code does not have a minimum sentence provision for simple robbery as an example. I am proposing that home invasion be treated along the same lines as committing a crime with a firearm, which I gather carries a minimum sentence of four years.

The member is absolutely right when he says that this is a serious problem.

I read a story of a different home invasion which occurred in Edmonton this year. Two young people invaded a home, attacked the occupants and ran off when the police appeared. A reporter who covered the story interviewed some neighbours who said that these types of invasions had been going on for some time. These young people will check mailboxes, look in windows and when chased away say what are the cops going to do.

It is comments like that which reflect the growing lack of confidence Canadians have in our criminal justice system. I think it is atrocious that ordinary law-abiding lay people feel that the police do not have the criminal sanctions they need to ensure these kinds of violent invasions of people's homes do not occur.

I do not propose a particular guideline, but I do think there should be some kind of minimum sentence for cases which involve this aggravating factor of home invasion.

• (1540)

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, will the member tell the House, when he looks at all the countries in the world and all the criminal justice systems, which country does he think should be the model that Canada might look at? Which country's model is closest in its thinking and philosophy? I would like to hear that from the member.

Mr. Jason Kenney: Mr. Speaker, I am no expert on the criminal laws of other jurisdictions, so I would not propose any single model. I suggest that a made in Canada solution is probably the best. We have different conditions, different circumstances which we should consider in framing our own criminal justice laws. I think that question probably is not relevant.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking to different parts of the motion, but I am first going to make some general comments.

The member said that he does not know much about criminal justice models around the world. I suggest that the member is correct. I suggest that the Reform Party knows little about criminal justice models around the world and if Reform members do, we would like to have them stand in the House and tell us which system they would like to see us model our system on. Would it be

Supply

Europe? Would it be the United States? Would it be South Africa? Would it be Texas? Which?

One of the problems when we enter into this type of debate is that members of the official opposition ends up trafficking in a lot of fiction. By saying that I mean they would misrepresent a situation of crime and the number of victims in this country as to how we compare to other countries.

The Reform Party would have us believe that our Young Offenders Act is the most lenient act around. For the record, our Young Offenders Act incarcerates 15 times as many young people as similar acts in New Zealand and Australia, 10 times as many young people as in western Europe and even twice as many young people as in the United States. Our Young Offenders Act is more punitive to young people than an adult charged with the same kind of crime. Young offenders spend more time in jail for a crime than adults do in the adult system.

When I say that the official opposition is trafficking in fiction, that is exactly what I mean.

It is nice for the Reform Party to go around and say there is a fear of crime in this country and that people should not be afraid. Every one of us in the House would agree that one victim is one victim too many, that one crime is one crime too many.

The reality is that the crime rate has been dropping over the years. It has been progressively going down. Compared to the United States, our crime rate is much lower. Canadians feel much safer in this country than they do in the United States. Every example calling for tougher sentencing and dealing more toughly with law breakers always points to the American model.

One of the biggest fears people have of crime involves the use of guns. That is why the government put in place gun registration, which I must say is being ignored and was not supported by the Reform Party.

I want to touch on immigration. Immigration has certainly been a greatly exploited topic by the folks on the other side.

● (1545)

The safety and security of Canadians are a concern of the government. Through the immigration program numerous measures have been undertaken to ensure that criminals do not enter and that those who have entered have no right to remain and are removed.

This undesirable group, however, represents a small fraction of the total number of visitors and immigrants that come to Canada. Citizenship and Immigration Canada strives to ensure public

safety while facilitating the entry of legitimate travellers. It is difficult to balance.

Last year alone 110 million people crossed our borders to enter Canada. Many of them were Canadian citizens returning home, as well as visitors, immigrants, foreign students and refugees. Security screening is used for all those who are entering Canada. Toward the goal of public safety there are three screens in place to guard against illegal entry and to identify those who should not be here.

Before I continue, I will be splitting my time with the member for Erie—Lincoln and I look forward to his contribution.

At the international level a screening occurs. Those wishing to come to Canada as visitors or immigrants are scrutinized when they apply for a visa. Immigration control officers working in Canadian embassies and missions abroad ensure that security and health checks are done. It is at the international level that we have formed partnerships with foreign governments to help confirm the identities of foreign criminals and to prevent them from coming to Canada. The problem of illegal migration is a global one with crime rings operating beyond national borders. It is therefore necessary to work toward solutions at the international level.

A second screen is conducted at the Canadian border where Citizenship and Immigration Canada officials and those of Revenue Canada deal with incoming travellers. The use of computer databases has helped greatly in establishing identification, ensuring that those seeking to enter Canada have not been previously arrested or removed. The work at these border crossings and airports is a key element in our defence against illegal entry.

The third type of screening goes on within Canada with the co-operative work of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, the RCMP, and all Canadian police forces. This inland screening is an ongoing process that makes use of shared databases and immigration warrants. Often something as routine as a traffic stop allows an officer to determine immigrant status and possibly the existence of warrants.

It is this information sharing with police forces across the country that has allowed Citizenship and Immigration Canada to identify and remove criminals and those without status in Canada. I remind members opposite that the removal of foreign criminals and failed refugee claimants has increased steadily over the last four years.

In 1998, 8,012 people were removed from Canada. This represents an increase of 67% from 1995 when citizenship and immigration effected 4,798 removals.

While there is much to commend in the current Immigration Act there are avenues for improvement. Changes are now being considered. On January 6 this year the minister proposed new directions for immigration legislation and policy. Under these proposals the system would be improved by clearly defining who

Supply

is admissible to Canada, by creating new inadmissible classes, and by enhancing the capacity of government to remove people who have no right to establish themselves in Canada. Also among the proposals is the removal of a level of appeal for serious criminals as well as those people who obtain permanent resident status through misrepresentation.

As we advance with these proposed changes I look forward to the contributions of members opposite so that we might recognize the efficiencies and improve the Immigration Act.

There is no question that we have problems in enforcement in terms of having people who come to the country that commit offences.

• (1550)

When we look at our immigration policies over the years we have to recognize that we have a country with a population of 30 million. Something like six million people were not born here. We have a generous acceptance of refugees which is both humane and generous. Beyond that, the number of people who involve themselves in criminal activity compared to the whole is very small.

People look at Canada overall as being a nation of immigrants. I can look around the House and say there are 47 members who were born outside Canada. A number of people were refugees and are represented pretty well in all parties.

Canada is a nation that was built on immigration. If we look at the status we occupy in the world because of this reality, we have to say that our policies overall, which will get some improvement, have served the country very well.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the member talked about crime decreasing, but youth violent crime has been rising, as I am sure the member knows, particularly among young women. If he doubts that, he can get on the Internet and look up the website for *North Shore News*. He will find an article within the last two weeks with plenty of statistics for the Vancouver area.

In addition, the member talked about how Citizenship and Immigration Canada strives to protect Canada's borders and to do screening during entry. Yesterday afternoon on Vancouver's top radio station, CKNW, a Mr. Johnston from Citizenship and Immigration Canada was on the line for an hour. I invite the member to call in and get a transcript of the program. He will find out that it is just not so.

Certainly fingerprints of refugee claimants are taken at the port of entry. What happens is that those fingerprints are sent to Ottawa where they are hardly ever checked. During a recent drug arrest in downtown Vancouver when 80 Honduran refugee claimants were arrested for drug trafficking, a local policeman from the Vancouver

area took it upon himself to check the criminal records of these claimants. He found that 20% of them had criminal records in the United States. Yet here they were coming into Canada. It is absolute bunkum.

The member would have us believe that things are getting better by talking about how the number of deportations has risen 67%. I am not the least bit surprised. Probably the number of criminals getting into Canada has gone up by at least 67%. If the member doubts it, he needs only to come out west, take a little visit to the Vancouver area and find a dose of reality, what is really happening out there.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Speaker, I say to the member opposite that I go out west twice a year. I stay for about a week at a time. When we first came to Canada we lived in Vancouver, including North Vancouver. I have returned there on many occasions.

If the member does not believe that the crime rates are dropping, there is not a whole lot I can do about it. I can only suggest to him that he read the facts.

People abusing our immigration system is a problem at times. The member continually refers to the Honduran claimants. Whether or not those people are kept in custody when they are apprehended or charged is a decision made by the local courts. It is important for the member to understand that. If the local courts believe that the person will commit another offence or not show up for the next hearing, the person will be kept in custody.

I implore the member to read the statistics so that he understands that the crime rate has been dropping not just in Canada but in the United States and in western Europe as well.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, my hon. friend from the Reform Party was suggesting that while overall crime has certainly decreased in Canada—thank goodness for that—violent crime involving young people appears not to have decreased. As a matter of fact it appears to have been somewhat on the increase. I think that is the point my friend was making about young people and violent crime which make the headlines.

• (1555)

There is unquestionably a problem with current immigration policies. He reminded us how generous Canada is. Indeed we are possibly the most generous country in the world in terms of welcoming folks into our country, in particular refugees.

I am concerned about two issues. One is about the number of people who come to Canada allegedly on a temporary visa and are guaranteed by a sponsor, or someone sponsors them, and then decide to go underground or abandon that process. We are left

Supply

holding the tab and the sponsor is left not knowing where his colleague or relative is. Also there are people who sponsor people to come into the country and then essentially abandon that sponsorship.

When persons sponsor an individual, or guarantee that an individual is coming for a wedding, for a visit or whatever, has the hon. member given any thought to their posting a bond so that in the event the visitor chooses not to be a visitor the bond would be forfeited to help cover some of the costs that accrue to Canadian citizens? If a—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but we are out of time for questions and comments.

Mr. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. member that we will be reviewing the act. What he suggests in terms of bonds, in terms of sponsoring visitors, is certainly one area that will be discussed and actually has been discussed by some people. That is working in the criminal justice system as far as sureties and posting of bonds are concerned, which will be worthwhile looking at when we review the act.

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to what I would call an omnibus resolution which certainly covers a plethora of criminal items. However I would like to concentrate my remarks on the subject of correctional facilities. It is after all perhaps the most high profile, most expensive and in many ways most important feature of our correctional system today.

As hon. members know, we have a great variety of correctional facilities operated by both levels of government, the provinces and the federal government, and in some cases by the voluntary sector. At the federal level we have institutions varied by security level: maximum, medium and minimum security levels. In addition Correctional Service Canada operates halfway houses called community correctional centres and contracts with the voluntary sector to operate other halfway houses called community residential facilities.

This was not always the case. Until about 1960 the system consisted of nine Gothic maximum security institutions built decades ago. Some of those structures are still with us today. However it was realized that the vast array of individual differences among offenders required an array of correctional approaches if the system was to achieve its fundamental principal purpose, that of protecting the public.

Public protection requires safe and secure custody which I can assure hon. members is well achieved by today's system of institutions and inmate classifications. It also requires program-

ming that prepares offenders for their eventual release back into society and conducts that release in a careful and gradual manner. This too is achieved very successfully today.

The variety of institutional styles that exist allow for placement of offenders at the security level and with access to the correctional programs they require. By providing programs such as anger management, substance abuse reduction, psychiatric treatment and counselling, offenders can be helped to overcome the factors that caused them to adapt criminal patterns in the first place. They can be tested and observed to ensure that they are overcoming these factors. They can be carefully supervised as they move from prison back into the community.

We often hear about initiatives in other countries to privatize correctional institutions. This is not a course of action that has been adopted by the federal government. Nor does available evidence about the experience in other countries justify doing so. However it is often not realized to what extent we already have partnerships with the private voluntary sector.

• (1600)

Through arrangements with organizations such as the Salvation Army, the John Howard Society, the St. Leonard's Society and many others a network of halfway houses is operated to supervise and assist offenders as they make their first important steps back into the community.

Some may say we should not be releasing offenders into the community as freely as they allege we do. I ask them if it would be better to hold those offenders until the very last day of their sentences and then thrust them back on the community anonymously, without supervision, support or controls. I submit that we in Canada have chosen a better way, gradual release with conditions, supervision and assistance after a careful assessment of risk.

Almost all offenders will return to the community. Our system of justice demands it. After serving prescribed sentences most offenders must be returned to the community. We have little choice about that. The choice we have is how that release will take place and how it can be made as safe as possible, not just for the immediate future but for the long term. Treatment, risk assessment, careful release planning and graduated movement through several security levels and then into the community is the way to achieve the goal of public safety.

The record demonstrates the validity of this approach. Of all the 5,000 offenders released each year on some form of conditional release, 90% complete the balance of the sentence without committing a new offence. This record of a successful completion of conditional release has improved steadily during recent years. This is strong support for the approach we have adopted.

Supply

There are those who would measure the criminal justice system by only one test, how much punishment it dispenses and whether it is constantly being made tougher on offenders. Obviously those who break the law can and should expect to pay a price and to receive an appropriate sanction. If the purpose of the criminal justice system is to uphold society's values it must be seen to give appropriate weight to the offender's transgression.

Is our penal system perfect? No. Can it be improved? Surely it can. The government is responding. As we speak here today an all-party subcommittee of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights is studying this issue. It is reviewing the Corrections and Conditional Release Act. It is inspecting custodial facilities across this land. It is hearing from all the stakeholders, the prison population, the frontline corrections officers, the guards, prison administration, victims groups, prosecutors and members of the general public, among others. It is seeking the opinion and the advice of these people. It is drawing on the experience of these individuals who deal on a daily basis with Correctional Service Canada.

After the subcommittee completes its investigation and studies it will prepare a report for the House and the solicitor general. If necessary, legislative change will be proposed and debated in the House. I am confident this nationwide consultation on the Corrections and Conditional Release Act will improve the overall effectiveness of Canada's correctional system.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the member spent a lot of time telling us about how the government is consulting with this group, that group and the other group. All I can say from my observation of almost six years here in the House is that the Liberal government for all the consultation it has ever done has never taken the slightest bit of notice of the input it receives from ordinary Canadians.

Mr. John Maloney: Mr. Speaker, I would strongly disagree with that suggestion. I was a member of the justice committee, as was the member for Crowfoot. We did a comprehensive study of the Young Offenders Act. As a result of that a report was prepared, filed in the House and given to the Minister of Justice who responded to it. We have recently seen a new youth justice criminal act which has considered many of the points we put forward in that report.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, has the government looked at the reasons we have such a problem these days with our young people? I get really worried when I hear there is to be a debate on whether we might legalize marijuana if only for health care use.

• (1605)

Once we do that we also send a message to young people that marijuana is all right for them to use as well. We have to look at the

drug situation which is terrible. It is the worst I have ever seen in Canada.

When they took out the port police in my riding of Saint John, New Brunswick I told them we would have cocaine like never before. We have cocaine houses all over the city. They were never there before. Because of the drug situation we have the break-up of families.

We have to look at what is causing this problem with youth crime. It comes from drugs and break-up of families. We have to see how we can solidify that family unit. Have they looked at this? What steps will they take to correct this terrible ailment we have in society today?

Mr. John Maloney: Mr. Speaker, I compliment the member on her question as well as on her dress today. It is very appropriate as we lead into St. Patrick's Day. I think the question was what are we doing to prevent these matters.

Last year the Minister of Justice announced a crime prevention initiative directed toward children whereby we set aside 1% of the justice department budget, which would amount to roughly \$32 million, for crime protection initiatives. These programs are now starting to come to fruition.

I agree with the member that drugs are a horrendous problem with our youth. Something must be done about it. There must be stricter enforcement. We must get to the suppliers of these illicit items. That is not only within Canada but beyond our borders. We must cut off the flow from these countries. We are working together with many of our international partners to cut off the flow of drugs to this country.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the speech by my colleague, the member for Erie—Lincoln.

He says that 10% of the 5,000 inmates released each year reoffend. There are therefore 500 of them who will commit an offence in the months or years following their release.

If our communities are not affected by these 500 individuals, we can easily turn a blind eye. But when we see the terrible crimes they commit, we would be entitled to ask the following question, which I am going to put to the member for Erie—Lincoln: Could he tell us what specifically his government is doing to prepare inmates who will be released before serving their full sentence?

[English]

Mr. John Maloney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Even 1% would be too much. There is no question about that.

Supply

While these inmates are in prison they receive treatment. There is a careful release planning. They move from maximum security to medium security to minimum security, then to a half-way house. They are supervised and observed at all stages. If the individual is known to be at risk or thought to be at risk they are not released. That is an important factor to take into consideration. It is a graduated movement through various security levels into the community.

It is eminently better than having them serve their full sentence and then bang, out on the street, like a caged animal most likely to behave in a much more serious manner than perhaps the 10% who do manage to reoffend. It may be a small offence or whatever but they are very strict on them.

I have heard from some of these offenders today in our committee. For a very slight offence they are back in. They may have consumed a glass of alcohol and they are back in prison.

Mr. Leon E. Benoit (Lakeland, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to the motion today. We have heard members from the official opposition and other parties present their case in several areas.

• (1610)

What I want to talk about today is the problem we have with crime and how it relates to problems in the immigration system. When we look at the warnings and the variety of people who have commented on the problem, we will see it is quite a wide problem.

Ward Elcock, director of the Canadian Security and Intelligence Service, CSIS, and the attorney general for British Columbia have made some very strong statements on the problems with criminals finding their way into our country through our immigration and refugee system. We also have statements from several previous officials from the Department of Citizenship and Immigration. I will use some quotes from some of these people.

We have statements by law enforcement officers about the problems they have in dealing with the crime that is caused by bogus refugee claimants who come into our country under less than honourable terms. We even have Liberal members of parliament who have made some very strong statements on the weaknesses in our immigration system and how that leads to crime. I will quote from one or two Liberal members later.

Who pays the price for the problems in our immigration system and for the crime that comes to our country as a result of a broken system? Canadians pay the price. It is Canadians who are having their lives destroyed due to drug abuse. They can find a ready supply of drugs from, for example, bogus Honduran refugee claimants on the streets of Vancouver.

Many times it is new Canadians who are intimidated and forced to pay protection from the criminal element that finds its way into their communities from their country of origin. These are the very people from whom new Canadians have escaped by leaving their homelands. These people are now here in our country and the same type of organized crime has followed them.

New immigrant communities pay a price in another way. We have all read story after story about problems with our immigration and refugee system which allow criminals to get into our country so easily. As we hear, read and see those stories on television, we know that it reflects negatively on the new immigrant population as a whole. I think that is sad. The new immigrant population is tarnished because of a small percentage of criminals who find their way into our country so easily through our immigration system. Canadians right across this country are victims of this problem and it must be dealt with.

I mentioned the problem with the drug trade in Vancouver, in particular the problem with Honduran people who come to Canada claiming refugee status which are bogus claims. That they are in our country is a problem in itself. How did they get to our country? We do not have proper resources up front to screen and so on, but I will talk a bit about some of the solutions at the end of my presentation. However, there is no doubt this is a problem.

I quote the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam who stated recently that refugee claimants convicted of dealing drugs should be deported immediately with no review or appeal allowed to drag things out. That is from a Liberal member who has recognized the problem.

• (1615)

We do not have the proper resources upfront. Therefore, people are finding their way into our country who should not be here. They should be screened by the process.

Our process is lenient and dragged out, and we allow so many appeals that we cannot get people who have been targeted and named as undesirables by the immigration department out of the country. That is what led the Liberal member to make the statement that they should be deported immediately, with no review or appeal allowed to drag things out.

The attorney general for British Columbia has stated “If you are abusing the hospitality of Canada by committing crimes, you should be deported forthwith”. He is very frustrated with this problem, in particular, but he is also frustrated with other problems, some of which I will touch on later.

A Vancouver staff sergeant stated recently that people who come in, flaunt our refugee system and sell poison to our children should be deported immediately. This again is frustration speaking. He goes on to say “I am disgusted that the system did not take action long ago”. Many of us have heard quotes like this. It is not really a

Supply

quote that stands alone. This is a problem that we should not ignore.

When it is narrowed down, the most visible drug problem is that of the Honduran drug dealers in Vancouver. However, there are many others involved in organized crime which I will touch on a bit later.

Members have to be even more concerned when they find that the immigration minister and her department came down on a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who made statements that are completely honest on this issue.

What happened a couple of weeks ago was that RCMP Constable Mark Applejohn suggested that refugee claimants be fingerprinted and detained until their prints are run through police databases for criminal checks. He stated that immigration laws are lax and cumbersome, allowing claimants who have broken the law to stay in Canada while their claims continue.

How does the immigration department respond? Chris Taylor, who is head of western services for the immigration department, said "I consider these comments to reflect breaches of the code of conduct and the oath of allegiance of the RCMP".

Instead of the department attacking the problem, it attacks RCMP officers who are frustrated. They do not have the tools they need to deal with the problem. The immigration department and the immigration minister are too weak to do something about it. In five years we have had no legislation whatsoever to deal with the problem.

The frustration is bound to show. This RCMP officer should not be criticized and attacked by the head of western services, backed up by the minister in the House and in committee. Instead of attacking the police for making statements that are completely correct, the government should attack the problem. I think it is sad that has not been done.

Another issue that has become huge is people smuggling. The former solicitor general spoke at a chiefs of police conference a couple of months ago. He said "This study estimates that between 8,000 and 16,000 people arrive in Canada each year with the assistance of people smugglers". This estimate is probably very low. He said "The human costs are staggering when we consider that these people are vulnerable, often exploited, socially isolated and sometimes forced to engage in criminal activity just to survive". This is a problem which not only causes severe harm to this country, but also to the people who are exploited.

Often people smuggling is done by organized crime groups such as the triads and most recently Russian organized crime that has found its way to this country.

There are some common solutions to the problem. Some of them have been set out by police. For example, when all refugee

claimants are fingerprinted, why do we not simply cross-check these fingerprints with our internal police forces first and then with the police forces from other countries, including the country of origin.

• (1620)

Many other solutions have been proposed and I would be happy to talk about those at some future time. I appreciate the time I was given to make a few comments on this issue.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, according to the speaker who came before my hon. colleague from Lakeland, the member for Erie—Lincoln, 10 out of 100 prisoners obtaining early release could commit a repeat offence afterward.

On the other hand, my colleague from Lakeland focussed mainly on immigrants.

There are very few immigrants in my rural riding, in the eastern townships, in Beauce, in the area around Quebec City. Among those we have welcomed is Dominico Staniscia, an Italian gentleman who has been responsible for creating twenty or so jobs, and who is known pretty well all over Quebec.

Then there is Catherine Ballas, who employs more than 30 people. In Milan, there is Jacques Benoît, a VIP in that municipality. Disraëli owes a number of jobs to Denis Spiratos.

In Lac-Mégantic, there are 18 Serbian families helping out their community. They are putting their culture and training to use, at minimum wage, to help others and to help themselves adapt to life here.

All of these people have managed to master French, while retaining their mother tongue.

I would ask the hon. member for Lakeland if he is not getting a bit carried away. Is he not laying too much blame at the feet of the immigrants, when he refers to the trade in illegal immigrants to this country? He has even suggested a figure of 16,000. It is all very fine to bandy numbers about, but there is no need for scaremongering.

[*English*]

Mr. Leon E. Benoît: Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the question because it gives me a chance to clear up what I did say.

I want to make it very clear that the problem is not immigrants, nor is the problem legitimate refugee claimants. This government and this minister have allowed our system to continue to be completely ineffective. In five years there has not been a bit of legislation to help solve the problem.

Supply

It is a few. We do not know how many because no stats are kept, or at least they are not allowed to be released to the public. The 15,000 or 16,000 that I mentioned are only a small part of the problem. It is not the immigrants or refugees generally; it is bogus refugee claimants, the people who abuse our system, who come here with less than honourable intentions in mind.

The problem is that the system is so lax that it allows in too many people who come here to commit crimes. I am not only talking about local crime, I am also talking about organized crime. It has become a huge problem. I am talking about terrorism which is growing in this country to the point that the head of CSIS says that Canada is a country which harbours more terrorists than any other country except the United States. It is a big problem.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the biggest shortcomings that I have viewed in our justice system is the treatment of aboriginal people or the disproportionate representation of aboriginal people within the system.

I noted a startling figure recently. In 1969, in the Kingston Penitentiary for women, 100% of the population was aboriginal.

Recommendations were made by the aboriginal justice inquiry that came out of Manitoba and recommendations were made by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples which deal with aboriginal involvement in the justice system.

Would the Reform member and his party agree that we should be pushing for the implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples as they pertain to the disproportionate representation in our penal system and in the justice system?

• (1625)

Mr. Leon E. Benoit: Mr. Speaker, the question does not relate to the presentation I gave, but I am all too happy to respond to it.

What I would like to say is that the Reform Party for five years now has been proposing solutions to this problem. We are not going to solve the problem with more programs which may help to deal with the problem after it has developed. We are going to solve the problem by allowing aboriginal people to give themselves more control over their own destiny. Until that happens this problem will never be solved.

It starts with proper accountability, on the reserves in particular; proper accountability by chiefs and councils on the reserves, some of whom are abusing the trust given to them by people on the reserves. We have a list of well over 100 reserves across the country that have very serious problems with accountability. The money that goes to the aboriginal people is not going to the people who desperately need it. There is very little being done to help develop the economy, for example, so that these people can dig

themselves out of this problem which has gotten worse and worse over the last 30 to 40 years.

Until we deal with the cause of the problem we are not going to be able to do anything in an effective way to deal with the problem of too many aboriginal people finding their way into our prisons.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, DEVCO; the hon. member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, Royal Canadian Mounted Police; the hon. member for Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Canada Port Authorities; the hon. member for Davenport, Housing.

[*English*]

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure today to speak to the Reform supply day motion.

There are two ways we can deal with crime. We can manage it or we can prevent it. Inevitably, it is a combination of both within the context of our justice system. However, I would submit that what we have done over the past several decades is placed our focus on the management of the problem and we have utterly failed in our ability to prevent it.

If we look at what has been taking place not only within Canada but around the world, we see that there have been some innovative programs which have been developed to prevent crime. One of those programs is in Moncton.

Last spring this House passed a private member's motion that I put forth calling for a national head start program. This program would take the best from programs found in Moncton, Hawaii, Michigan, the United States; programs which have been proven to decrease child abuse by 99%, which keep kids in school longer, which have dropped youth crime by 50%, which have decreased teen pregnancies by 40% and which have saved the taxpayer \$30,000 per child.

New scientific data shows very clearly that when a child is subjected in the first eight years of life to issues such as drug abuse, sexual abuse, violence, or even to more subtle things such as improper parenting or the absence of parenting, it has a dramatic negative impact upon the development of that child's brain. The neurological development of that child's brain is impeded, which has a dramatic negative effect when the child becomes a teenager and later an adult.

When we look at prison populations we find that large chunks of the prison populations were subjected to violent sexual abuse and such in the course of their childhood. While that does not exonerate them from the crimes they committed, therein lies perhaps some

Supply

truths and perhaps some answers as to how we can prevent these people from becoming criminals.

Work that was done by the minister of labour and her husband in Moncton shows very clearly that when we enable children and parents to come together, when parents learn how to be good parents and ensure that children in the first eight years of life have the basic building blocks to enable them to have their basic needs met, they have a much greater chance of becoming productive, integrated members of society. Remove those or destroy the ability of that child to develop and we have the problems that I mentioned before such as criminal abuse.

• (1630)

The Moncton head start program was focused on having parents involved in children's behaviour, teaching proper nutrition, proper discipline and what it means to be a loving, caring parent. One would be surprised to know that in some communities parents do not know that because they were never taught it or brought up in that environment. Where that is lacking in a child's development the impact can be dramatic and profoundly tragic at times. Not all children who are subjected to that wind up with deleterious effects, but it happens all too often.

The Perry preschool program in Ypsilanti, Michigan, has been in existence for some 30 years. It shows very carefully that when children's basic needs are met we save \$30,000 per child. There was also a 50% reduction in teen pregnancies which we know is a route to poverty for many young women and their children.

The Hawaii head start program uses a very innovative tool which I think we could employ in our country. It uses trained volunteers, primarily women in their fifties who have had children. These women were actually integrated with families at risk. They developed a co-operative integrated relationship with those families.

What was the outcome? There was a 99% drop in child abuse among those children. We see a dramatic benefit at the level of child abuse. At the level of society now, with a large number of babies boomers in the fifties and sixties age groups, maybe there is a way of utilizing their valuable experience in parenting to help those in our community who are less able to do it.

If we are able to integrate that group of people in the way that has been done in Hawaii it would be very cheap and the profound, dramatic and positive effects on children would be amazing. We would have a paradigm shift in our thinking on social programs from one of the management of problems to the prevention of problems.

Through the head start motion I am not asking for the feds to take on the responsibility of having a national program with lots of money being poured into it, but that the ministers merely ask their provincial counterparts beforehand to come together at a meeting

to find out what works in their provinces and what does not. By asking them to come to the table it will force the provinces to rationalize their programs, in which case they can remove what is not working and keep what is.

There are many programs in provinces that are done in a hodgepodge fashion that work very well for families at risk. There are also some programs that are not working well. It behoves all of us as legislators to find out what is working well and what is not. It is our responsibility to the taxpayer to do that.

By calling their provincial counterparts together the federal ministers can sit down at a table, work together and have an integrated approach with cost sharing between the feds and the provinces. The amount of money required for this would be minimum.

At point zero we could use the medical community. In the middle we could use trained volunteers. At the age of four through eight we could use the education system. By working with the provinces and the feds we could have an integrated approach which would help not only families at risk but families that are doing financially well with children who are not doing well.

One of the more subtle elements that we are not taking into consideration in our communities is latch-key children. Those children, despite coming from backgrounds that are privileged, have subtle psychological changes taking place within them because they do not have parenting.

Money is not the most important thing in the development of a child. It is good parenting. Children have their basic needs met in a loving, caring and secure environment. Perhaps the proof is in the pudding. Let us look at the number of immigrant families that come to our country with very little from a monetary perspective but have strong parenting skills. Their children are privileged to have such parents.

• (1635)

I grew up in environment in which there was very little money. I was very lucky to have parents with strong parenting skills. All of us who were privileged to have such parents know the value of what they gave us. They may not have given much in terms of monetary goods but they gave us a loving and caring environment and society in which to live. For that we are grateful.

Many colleagues on the other side have a great deal of expertise and experience. Many ministers and members of parliament on the other side have worked very hard on this issue. The Minister of Labour has worked very hard and has been a leader with her husband in this regard. The Secretary of State for Children and Youth has worked very hard in her aboriginal community to make this a reality as many members have done.

Supply

I challenge us to work together on the issue and make a national head start program a reality. If we were to do this, it would probably be the greatest thing we could do for children and for Canadian society in the future. By doing so we would radically change the way we think from the management of these problems to their prevention. No longer would we see half the people in jail suffering from fetal alcohol syndrome or fetal alcohol effects, the leading cause of preventable birth defects.

These individuals are suffering from irreversible brain damage. Their average IQ is 68. They cannot integrate and function properly. When they go to school they are at a loss. They are often marginalized, picked on and left in the periphery. As a result their problems are merely compounded as time passes. While not all of them will become criminals by any stretch of the imagination, a disproportionate number of them have an enormous amount of difficulty becoming integrated productive members of society.

I know my time is up. There is much more to say not only on this issue but on the RCMP and truth in sentencing. I will close with a plug for the RCMP. For Heaven's sake, please fund them. They are not getting the resources they need. The CPIC computer is ready to fall apart. My colleagues have mentioned many constructive solutions which the RCMP need to enable them to do their job. If we do not give them the support they require, they will not be able to support our community.

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his eloquent speech. He puts many of these issues back into a realm where reality reigns. He talks about the true nature of many of the problems and the predeterminants of some of the situations, especially of young people with different disadvantages which lead them to a later involvement in a system of justice that perhaps is not the best suited to the correction of problems at that stage.

Many members of the official opposition constantly cry out for longer sentences and what would appear to be much harsher penalties. Would the hon. member agree that perhaps not only tax dollars would be saved but real results could be obtained if instead of lengthier sentences some efforts went toward better use of money, behaviour modification and wrap-around systems with productive results for the child and society as a whole?

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, I know the member who asks the question has had a long interest in this issue. Many of my colleagues are dividing children who commit crimes into two sections. There are those who are violent criminals and have been proven to repeat violent offences against innocent civilians. Those people have demonstrated their wilful neglect of innocent Canadians. We want harsher penalties for them because we feel the primary role of the justice system is the protection of society, not rehabilitation. We put protection first and rehabilitation second.

That is not to say we are not interested in rehabilitation. In fact we are. The member for Surrey North introduced a private mem-

ber's bill which the Minister of Justice integrated into her young offenders bill.

• (1640)

That bill provided for younger children between the ages of 10 and 11 to be tried under the Young Offenders Act. The reason was not to have punitive measures enacted against individuals. The reason was to ensure that children at 10 and 11 years of age would have the benefits of our judicial system in terms of what the hon. member mentioned.

How do we treat these problems? The sooner we can treat the problems, the better chance we will have of the child not becoming a lifetime criminal and prevent a lot of problems in the future.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague in the Reform Party would like, and this is legendary in this party, extremely harsh and long sentences, which, as my colleague in the party opposite so nicely put it, cost society a bundle.

I have two suggestions for my colleague. Would it not be a good idea first to consider full employment? Having each Canadian working? Work gets the brain going.

Second, education is a virtue. Unfortunately, our government is hanging on to significant sums that should be going toward education. We should start educating people when they are very young to get them used to working and living honourably.

Would my colleague in the Reform Party not consider these two solutions rather than invest huge sums to put people in prison for crimes often starting with petty larceny? Success at it leads to greater and greater crimes, and after 10 or 12 years in crime, an individual becomes a powerful criminal and heads into violent crime.

Mr. Keith Martin: Mr. Speaker, I thank my Bloc Québécois colleague for his question.

[*English*]

I want to correct the hon. member on one pervasive myth about the Reform Party. Many of our members have been in the forefront of being advocates for the prevention of criminal activity and for using innovative methods of dealing with non-violent crime. However, for individuals who have participated in violent criminal activity and have proven to be a danger to society, the Reform Party says that the primary objective of the justice system is to protect innocent civilians. That is why we believe pedophiles should be

Supply

locked up. We believe people who are repeat violent offenders should be locked up for a long time.

We also believe that for individuals committing petty crimes we should find alternative, non-custodial ways of dealing with them. We also feel there should be innovative ways of dealing with drug problems. For example, instead of incarcerating individuals we should do what was done in Scandinavia.

The post-needle park Geneva experiment is perhaps the most effective and successful method of getting hard core drug abusers off the street. In a one year period of time there was at least a 50% or 60% success rate in terms of having hard core drug abusers out of jail, in society, working, and off drugs. There is no other program like it in the world. That is what the Reform Party is pushing for, along with many other innovative ways of dealing with crime.

We very much support the aboriginal initiatives and some of the methods that aboriginal communities use to deal with non-violent crime. It is something that we could all learn from.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Saada (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before beginning, I wish to point out that I will be sharing my time with the member for London West.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity today to debate justice issues. Before solutions can be found to certain problems, we must first ensure that the problems are correctly identified. It happens that there are a number of myths about justice, and these myths get in the way of solutions.

• (1645)

Obviously, one of these myths is that parole is a very bad thing because of recidivism. This is a widespread myth, but a myth nonetheless, for it is not true.

I will give a very simple example. The success rate of supervised or unsupervised temporary absences is 98%; this is not a failure. The success rate for paroles is 89.2%. I think that one would be relatively satisfied with a mark of 89.2% on a school exam.

These myths are detrimental to the entire justice debate. Over the last five years, the number of violent offences committed by inmates released on parole dropped by 70%. I repeat: the number of violent offences committed by inmates released on parole dropped by 70%.

Because of these myths, suggestions are very often made, and unfortunately I must point out that they come primarily from certain members of the Reform Party and the Progressive Conservative Party. These proposals are very simplistic: lock the criminals up for as long as possible and everything will be fine.

This is a simplistic solution. If offenders are locked up, they are not hurting the public and the public will therefore be safe. With all due respect, this is absolutely not the case, and I will explain why.

When a person commits a criminal offence and is sentenced to jail, if the jail term is used to prepare that person to better understand the world and to reintegrate it, when that individual will regain his freedom, he will behave like a law-abiding citizen. This is the best guarantee for public safety.

An inmate who is released without any preparation after spending 10 or 15 years in jail, is not at all prepared to deal with the outside world. In these cases, the chance that the individual will reoffend is understandably greater, which means the risk is also greater.

Whether the issue is impaired driving, which we are discussing right now, whether it is Bill C-251 on cumulative sentences, whether it is the bill that we just tabled regarding young offenders, the reaction of some people in this House is invariably the same, namely that we must take harsher measures, provide more penalties, impose stiffer sentences.

I submit that these are very primary reactions, which are based on myths and perceptions, not on reality. There is no doubt that there are some erroneous perceptions among the public, and that we have to correct them. However, it would be a fundamental mistake to want to use the justice system to correct such perceptions. If the perceptions are wrong, then we have to change these perceptions, not the justice system.

In this connection, I would just like to point out that I have had a number of interesting experiences since becoming the Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General. In particular, I asked to sit in on a parole board hearing. This was at Laval. As it happened, the person who was entitled to apply for eligibility for parole was someone who had been given a life sentence for murder.

I listened to the deliberations, and everything was more or less predictable, except for a reference made at one point to an event that had occurred several weeks or months before, when the inmate in question had made a section 745 request to appear before the board.

• (1650)

A member of the victim's family was in attendance. This person turned to the inmate and said "You hurt me very much, but I forgive you". The 42-year old inmate, a tough and hardened man, burst into tears. He wanted just one thing, to discover how to try to begin to make amends for the harm he had done.

This morning, in committee, where we are working on Bill C-251, we had a similar experience. Someone who had been found guilty of murder and has been on parole for 9 years now works with young people in order to prevent them from repeating the same

Supply

serious mistakes. Is this not an initiative with the greatest chance of successfully ensuring public safety?

There are two ways of looking at things: one can take the populist approach, and then when public concern starts to build, put more people in jail, increase penalties and jail time; or one can look at the true nature of things, which is that human beings change and evolve, that they are capable of change and the more they are helped to make changes, the more they are helped to understand the constraints of society, the more they will be brought to contribute to changing our society, and the more they themselves will be in a position to help contribute to public safety.

That is our position as government. It is not an easy one in political terms. I am well aware that it is easier to say to someone "Do not worry, the criminals are behind bars. There is no problem". Criminals do indeed have to pay for their crimes, and they must serve time in jail, and prisons are necessary because there must be retribution.

But this is not the only way. There is a combination of approaches. Prison, detention, is one, reintegration through community programs combines with that, as does awareness of community needs and the role of victims too.

Is there anything more instructive for a criminal than to face their victim? When I say face, I do not mean aggressively, but face to face. Previously, the victim had just been a number, someone they did not know. Suddenly they meet and they talk.

The criminal gets a sense of the wrong he caused his victim, a wrong in the victim's daily life and sometimes an irreparable wrong. It allows the criminal to become so much more aware and to contribute so much more or at least to have the opportunity to contribute so much more to public security.

These are not easy problems. I would really hope that we do not fall into simplistic solutions. There are no easy solutions. But if I have to choose, I believe in human nature.

[*English*]

Mrs. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I commence by saying how much I enjoyed the logic of my colleague in his remarks just prior to this. There is logic to be utilized when we are talking about a system of justice in Canada which really is a pillar of our democracy, the justice system itself and the way we deter those people going against the social values of our communities.

There is logic to be utilized in the way that our justice system relies on a due process of law so that evidence based reality will prevail, the way that we have juries, our peer groups, to make decisions and the way we have an independent judiciary functioning every day across the country in court rooms helping to ensure just results occur based on evidence.

That is a very difficult job. Over the last year it has disturbed me greatly the number of occasions where more and more in the press and in public discussion there has been something I will term judge bashing.

• (1655)

I think this is a serious situation. It does not help our society. The judiciary is an arm of our system of government that is doing what many of us in the House attempt to do by way of public service to our communities.

The reason I have raised this is that if someone disagrees with my views as a politician, be it in my community or during an election campaign, it is fair game for them to target me and to voice an opposite and sometime very harsh opinion of my views.

However, at the end of the day I have the ability to stand up and defend myself by voicing my side of the same arguments. That is something that is not available to justices and judges across this land. Occasionally we will have, coming to their defence, some of the organizations such as the bar or the attorneys general. Historically it has been the attorneys general who take on this role.

That position inside the judiciary to my mind is not a position that is there for popularity. There is a service also to be done if a judge points out a piece of legislation that in their view is ambiguous or needs redefinition.

Some of us may agree that the view one is getting through a newspaper article, which obviously does not have all the facts, may be a situation that seems dead wrong. In that case, thankfully in this country we have a system of appeal. It is possible, in a very civilized and due process manner, to get a further interpretation or, if necessary, our judicial system provides us in this Chamber with the opportunity to change the laws.

Unfortunately I have not had a chance all day to hear what has been going on, but I want to stress that in Canada it is a shared jurisdiction in areas that affect justice. Here in the Chamber we can change the Criminal Code. We can put in a new act concerning youth. We can do many things with respect to the detail of the law.

However, when it touches the ground it has to be provincial or territorial jurisdictions that take the administration of those laws into the courtrooms.

We heard the Minister of Justice addressing the situation of divergent groups and divergent positions across this country. I believe that in reality the Canadian public in all the communities across the land want the best for the safety of their children and their families.

I therefore think we can all agree with the goals. I do not think there is any party in the House that can take ownership of feelings for victims as is often done by parties opposite and the official

Supply

opposition. All of us are concerned about our constituents and their lives.

When one is addressing solutions in a justice situation, it is very important to not only look at the back end, the enforcement end, which often does not solve situations. What really has to be there in full force and with a lot of resources is the crime prevention end, the determinants of situations.

I know there are colleagues among in all parties who are singing from the same songbook on crime prevention. If we dig a little deeper we see situations where talk is cheap.

I just heard my hon. colleague across talking about the needs of the aboriginal communities. I know these communities have great needs. There are systemic problems in a system that would place so many aboriginal youths in jail.

• (1700)

The Reform Party taxpayers budget was going to remove \$800 million from the resources going to aboriginal populations. It is easy to say we support, we support, but when push comes to shove, the support realistically has to be implemented with budgets that are real and for a goal that has as its desired outcome a change of behaviour or support for existing conditions.

I think specifically about fetal alcohol syndrome. More resources need to be directed to the mother of the youth rather than directed to the youth. Some of the contraindications of partaking in alcohol affects taxpayers and communities and particularly the affected child who pays throughout his or her life. This is preventable. It is not going to be fixed by enforcement. Never.

That is why we talk about the difference between a real solution and the simplistic sound bite "Well, I am really going to fix this because I am going to be tougher".

In my city experiments are going on with sentencing circles, youth justice circles. It is a new way of diverting youth from the formalized court system especially with minor property offences. It takes the example from the aboriginal community. The aboriginal community started sentencing circles. They are effectively working in London, Ontario today and they are being expanded.

The circles involve the victim, community players, volunteers from the community and the offender. In our case we are using it for youth. There has to be an admission of a wrongdoing. There has to be some sort of restitution. The committee itself in less than a couple of hours has to come up with some sort of support to wrap around the individual to help change his or her behaviour or address the deficiencies in his or her life.

I have talked with many people who have sat on these sentencing circles, including youth who are participating in them. They see this as something that will work. They see the possibility of rehabilitation.

There are many such examples. We have a crime prevention initiative with \$32 million ongoing. The resources that are available to communities and their groups are not only those enforcement resources. Yes, they are important and they serve a function and there is a time and a place for them. Generally speaking we want to modify unacceptable behaviour.

I have personal experience as a member of the Ontario Criminal Code review board for six years. I dealt in a quasi-judicial role with people who had very bad behaviour who through no fault of their own but because of a mental incapacity were involved in horrible acts against society. They needed to be there to address some of the underlying forces.

I know that with my colleagues we will start addressing root causes.

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the member mentioned how pleased she was that we have an independent judiciary. The fact is that many of our judiciary are political patronage appointees, especially at the higher levels. They are clearly setting out to accomplish a social engineering agenda and the public does not like it.

As the member mentioned, she can be held accountable by the voters. She has the opportunity to defend her record and to ask her constituents to return her to this place. That is exactly why Reform has suggested a more transparent and open process of appointing judges. There really should be a system that more publicly examines a person who is going to be in a judiciary position so the public can have confidence in that person's ability to be totally independent.

• (1705)

Frankly I think perhaps a lot of the judges like the rule where they cannot defend themselves because they cannot defend themselves. They cannot defend the decisions they make, as being completely out of touch with the community standards.

I have sat in the courts in North Vancouver and I have seen plenty of decisions made that are completely out of touch with the community standards. The people in the court have almost booed at what has been done there. This is a problem that needs to be addressed. It is as if the judges have become desensitized over time because they have seen so much crime in their courts.

I refer the member to the case of New York which had a zero tolerance policy. Taking care of the small things automatically takes care of the big things. If there is a zero tolerance for small crimes, the big crimes do not happen.

Finally, with respect to the aboriginal affairs situation, around 250 Squamish band members have contacted me in relation to Bill C-49. As part of that process a number of them submitted to me budgets of the Squamish band. In one social services part of that band budget which is supposed to look after children, the budget is \$1.5 million and almost \$900,000 of it is used on administration.

Supply

The band members are complaining about it because it is not flowing to the people who should be getting the help.

That is the point Reform is making. There is plenty of money in Indian and northern affairs. It is just not getting to the right places.

Mrs. Sue Barnes: Mr. Speaker, on those comments I would not know where to start. There are so many issues that could be addressed.

Suffice it to say that in every situation there are difficult decisions for our judiciary. Unlike many people who have spoken and the comments I have heard over the last year, I have respect for the judiciary. I am very grateful that in Canada we have due process of law.

Many I would call moves to shortcuts to make life easier. If someone was charged in our household we would want full due process of law and every opportunity for a proper defence. At the end of the system we would want proper sanctioning.

Proper sanctioning has nothing to do with length of sentence. It has to do with obtaining a result that will be better for the safety of the community and which will work toward a rehabilitation of the individual.

Public safety and security is of utmost importance. One of the ways this is accomplished is through rehabilitation. The reality is that most offenders will get out of the system. At the end of the day as a society, do we want them better functioning when they leave than when they went in, or do we just want them hardened and bitter and without hope? At the end of the day they are going to be members of our society.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Solicitor General commented earlier about how useful the parole system is in having some limitation on whom people can engage with, where they must report to, where they live. These are safeguards that are in the system. If we checked the recidivism rates, we would actually see that where there are no parole systems in place, the small percentage of people where there is no parole provision, they are the ones who are more likely to reoffend.

The hon. member has asked something about which I could talk for hours addressing all of those situations. Suffice it to say that I have a lot of faith in our democratic judicial system, a democracy supporting an independent judicial system. I certainly would never want to see elections for judges. I believe that there is not a justice in this country appointed to the bench who was not qualified.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it appears that I am lucky enough to be the last speaker for the last few minutes on this debate. It is like being the hammer rock in curling; hopefully if one is witty enough maybe one can just clear house.

It has been far too broad and expansive a debate to even try to summarize things. I would like to use these last few moments to add a couple of points to what has already been put on the table.

● (1710)

Everybody here will agree that crime, punishment, safety and justice are issues we hear about in our ridings all the time. It does not matter what our political stripe is. Canadians are talking about them and Canadians want to talk about them.

I am always amazed at how with the same set of circumstances we can come up with two so different sets of conclusions.

What we have heard for most of the day from the majority of the Reform Party speakers is an ongoing barrage about tougher enforcement, more boot camps, more prisons, lock them up and hang them high. It harkens back to the day when Spanky wanted to go to Singapore, buy a stick and learn how to beat children better.

We really have not heard anything innovative from the Reform Party, with the exception of the member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca who actually brought a very balanced approach to the whole day. I am glad he spoke toward the end because there are many parts of his remarks which I can certainly work with. The Reform Party has one view of the world by and large. The member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca is clearly in contrast with most of his political party. He smiles in front of it intellectually.

The Reform Party says one thing. The NDP would much rather talk about victims rights than increased levels of punishment. We have tabled documents in the province of Manitoba. The NDP was very well received in terms of taking care of victims rights but also in taking care of the root causes of crime.

I mentioned the aboriginal community when I rose for one of my interventions. There was the shocking, horrifying fact that the Kingston women's penitentiary was 100% aboriginal population, that every single woman there was aboriginal for a period of time in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. The figure is still hugely disproportionate to the population. Three or four per cent of the population is aboriginal. Seventy or eighty or ninety per cent of the prison population are aboriginal. Something is clearly wrong when there are figures like that. This needs to be addressed.

In the province I come from it is a very real issue. I know that if I had been walking home instead of J. J. Harper one winter evening, I may have been stopped by the police but I probably would not have died that night. I know that if Helen Betty Osborne had been a white girl rather than an Indian girl, it would not have taken 16 years to solve her murder. It would have been a far more pressing issue. People would have seized themselves of the issue.

Obviously the issue of the aboriginal people and their presence in our penal institutions and our justice system needs to be

Supply

addressed first and foremost. I am surprised that was not one of the main focuses of the Reform Party's motion today.

We have seen the U.S. model. We heard ideas about boot camps and other things that are clearly from the U.S. We saw what happened in the U.S. as it tried to lock up a whole generation of young black men. That was the solution to crime in the United States. The U.S. tried to lock up a whole generation.

The U.S. built more prisons and then privatized them, turning them into for profit ventures. Private prisons, what a concept. Locking people up for profit. I am surprised this did not come from the camp to my left because it is clearly in keeping with its ideology.

Prisons are big business in Canada too. The one thing I would like to use my last moment to comment on is the privatization of the education system within our Canadian prisons. Former Correctional Service Canada employees are quitting their jobs and contracting out the education of inmates on a for profit basis, and they are not the low bidder. In the prairie region, the contracting company's bid was millions of dollars higher than that of Evergreen School Division which used to deliver the service, quality service at a lower cost.

It makes one wonder. If we care about this kind of thing at all, why would we pay more money for less service? When I say less service, the contracting company owned by former Correctional Service Canada employees is not even licensed to give any kind of credit for the high school training given. More money is being paid for less service and the graduates do not even get any kind of credentials when they leave the system.

Penal institutions for profit and the privatization of the education system within the jails are things I wanted to point out.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): It being 5.15 p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that the proceedings on the motion have expired.

• (1715)

This being the final supply day in the period ending March 26, 1999, it is my duty to interrupt the proceeding and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (C), 1998-1999

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1C—PARLIAMENT

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Vote 1c, in the amount of \$1,975,500, under PARLIAMENT—Program Expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (C) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

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.

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:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): Call in the members.

• (1750)

[*English*]

(The House divided Motion No. 1, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 343*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brison	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)

Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Volpe	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—161	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Blaikie	Brien
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Casson
Cadman	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chatters	de Savoye
Davies	Desjarlais
Debien	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Desrochers	Duncan
Dumas	Epp
Earle	Gagnon
Forseth	Gilmour
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Grey (Edmonton North)
Grewal	
Guay	

Supply

Guimond	Hardy
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Lowther	Lunn
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	McDonough
Mercier	Meredith
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nunziata	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Ramsay	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Vautour	Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—89	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Canuel
DeVillers	Duceppe
Paradis	Galloway
Fournier	Hubbard
Grose	Longfield
Lefebvre	Ménard
Marleau	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Perron	Wappel
Venne	

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Antoine Dubé: Mr. Speaker, there may have been some confusion earlier because I rose at the same time as the Progressive Conservative members. I made a mistake. I wished to vote the same as the Bloc Québécois.

The Speaker: There may have been a small mistake over there, but not over here.

[*English*]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1C—JUSTICE

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Vote 1c, in the amount of \$12,551,750, under JUSTICE—Program Expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (C) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

Supply

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no on this motion. It is a bad motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois members are in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote no on this motion, with the exception of the member for Burnaby—Douglas who votes yes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, those members of our party present, including my colleague, the member for St. John's West, vote no on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents I would vote no to this motion.

• (1755)

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 344)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bevilacqua
Bertrand	Bonin
Blondin-Andrew	Boudria
Bonwick	Brien
Bradshaw	Bryden
Brown	Byrne
Bulte	Calder
Caccia	Caplan
Cannis	Catterall
Carroll	Chamberlain
Cauchon	Charbonneau
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Coderre
Clouthier	Comuzzi
Collenette	Cullen
Copps	Debien
de Savoye	Dhaliwal
Desrochers	Discepola
Dion	Drouin
Dromisky	Duhamel
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Easton
Dumas	Finestone
Eggleton	Folco
Finlay	Fry
Fontana	Gagnon
Gagliano	Godfrey
Gauthier	Goodale
Godin (Châteauguay)	Gray (Windsor West)
Graham	Guay
Guarnieri	Harb
Guimond	
Harvard	

Ianno	Ifody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mercier	Mifflin
Miliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Murray	Myers
Nault	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Richardson
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—173	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison	Cadman
Casey	Casson
Chatters	Davies
Desjarlais	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hardy
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lill	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	Meredith

Supply

Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Proctor
Riis
Schmidt
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—77

Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Strahl
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

[English]

Mr. John Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, the privy council does not do much to my constituency, so I vote against this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 3, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 345)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
DeVillers
Fournier
Grose
Lefebvre
Marleau
Perron
Venne

Canuel
Duceppe
Galloway
Hubbard
Longfield
Ménard
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1C—PRIVY COUNCIL

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Vote 1c, in the amount of \$2,740,846, under PRIVY COUNCIL—Program Expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (C) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, be concurred in.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, you would find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

[English]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois oppose this motion.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, all members present in the New Democratic Party today vote no on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote no on this motion.

YEAS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri

Supply

Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—145

Volpe
Wilfert

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Proctor
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wasylcyia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forseth
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—105

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
DeVillers
Fournier
Grose
Lefebvre
Marleau
Perron
Venne

Canuel
Duceppe
Galloway
Hubbard
Longfield
Ménard
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (C) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1999, except any vote disposed of earlier today, be concurred in.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the question now before the House.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(Division No. 346)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)

Supply

Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—145

Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that Bill C-73, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

• (1800)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that Bill C-73, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1999, be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(*Division No. 347*)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Proctor
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forseth
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—105

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
DeVillers
Fournier
Grose
Lefebvre
Marleau
Perron
Venne

Canuel
Duceppe
Gallaway
Hubbard
Longfield
Ménard
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wappel

YEAS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano

Supply

Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—145	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brisson
Cadman	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Epp	Forseth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Godin (Châteauguay)	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hardy
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	

Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Price	Proctor
Ramsay	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Turp	Vautour
Vellacott	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—105	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Canuel
DeVillers	Duceppe
Fournier	Galloway
Grose	Hubbard
Lefebvre	Longfield
Marleau	Ménard
Perron	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)

(On clause 2)

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Chairman, could the President of the Treasury Board please confirm that this bill is in the usual form?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in previous years.

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Supply

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 4 agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 6 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chairman: Shall clause 7 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 7 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the schedule carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Schedule agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall Clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Preamble agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Title agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Mr. Ken Epp: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am sure I cannot challenge your rulings, but it seems to me the noes are quite a bit louder than the yeses and you should be ruling that it is defeated.

The Chairman: If members wish to rise and force a vote, the Chair is the servant of House and will of course comply. Everyone seems happy that we carry these on division. If members are unhappy we will do something else. Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Bill reported)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be concurred in.

• (1805)

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote at second reading to the question now before the House.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Mr. John Solomon: Mr. Speaker, on this motion and on subsequent motions we would like to add to the no column the NDP member for Bras d'Or—Cape Breton.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(*Division No. 348*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln

Supply

MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patri
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—145

Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—106

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
DeVillers
Fournier
Grose
Lefebvre
Marleau
Perron
Venne

Canuel
Duceppe
Galloway
Hubbard
Longfield
Ménard
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: It was, Mr. Speaker, to ask you to add the name of my colleague, the hon. member for Shefford, to the entire voting procedure.

The Chairman: On this vote? That is agreed.

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 349*)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Dhaliwal
Discepolo

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forseth
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Proctor
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
Strahl

Supply

Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—145

Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Proctor
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—107

Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Canuel
DeVillers	Duceppe
Fournier	Galloway
Grose	Hubbard
Lefebvre	Longfield
Marleau	Ménard
Perron	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forseth
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Guay
Hardy

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brisson
Casey
Chatters
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond

* * *

INTERIM SUPPLY

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.) moved:

That this House do concur in Interim Supply as follows:

That a sum not exceeding \$13,825,965,402.19, being composed of:

(1) three-twelfths (\$7,905,805,057.50) of the total of the amounts of the items set forth in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2000, which were laid upon the Table Monday, March 1, 1999, and except for those items below:

(2) eleven-twelfths of the total of the amount of Canadian Heritage Vote 120, Finance Vote L15, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Vote 15, and Treasury Board Vote 5 (Schedule 1) of the said Estimates, \$533,508,250.00;

(3) ten-twelfths of the total of the amount of Fisheries and Oceans Vote 10 (Schedule 2) of the said Estimates, \$227,395,833.33;

Supply

(4) nine-twelfths of the total of the amount of Parliament Vote 10 (Schedule 3) of the said Estimates, \$13,432,500.00;

(5) seven-twelfths of the total of the amount of Canadian Heritage Vote 70, Finance Vote 20, and Human Resources Development Vote 35 (Schedule 4) of the said Estimates, \$763,144,083.33;

(6) six-twelfths of the total of the amount of Canadian Heritage Votes 20 and 135, Industry Vote 50, and Justice Vote 15 (Schedule 5) of the said Estimates, \$64,698,500.00;

(7) five-twelfths of the total of the amount of Canadian Heritage Vote 65, Foreign Affairs and International Trade Vote 5, Health Vote 10, Indian Affairs and Northern Development Vote 15, Industry Vote 40, Justice Vote 1, Public Works and Government Services Vote 10, Solicitor General Vote 5 and Transport Vote 1 (Schedule 6) of the said Estimates, \$1,848,579,250.00;

(8) four-twelfths of the total of the amount of Canadian Heritage Votes 25, 40, and 50, Citizenship and Immigration Vote 10, Environment Vote 1, Health Votes 1 and 5, Human Resources Development Votes 10 and 25, Indian Affairs and Northern Development Votes 35 and 40, Industry Votes 30, 35 90, 95, 100 and 110, Natural Resources Vote L10, Privy Council Votes 15 and 35, Public Works and Government Services Votes 1 and 15, Treasury Board Vote 15 (Schedule 7) of the said Estimates, \$2,469,401,928.03; be granted to Her Majesty on account of the fiscal year ending March 31, 2000.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the question now before the House.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

*(Division No. 350)***YEAS****Members**

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cloutier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)

Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Richardson	Robillard
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—145	

NAYS**Members**

Abbott	Ablonczy
Alarie	Anders
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brisson
Cadman	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Harvey
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoeppner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	

Supply

Lebel
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Proctor
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—107

Lill
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Miffin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—145

Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
DeVillers
Fournier
Grose
Lefebvre
Marleau
Perron
Venne

Canuel
Duceppe
Galloway
Hubbard
Longfield
Ménard
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that Bill C-74, an act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 2000, be read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the motion now before the House.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(*Division No. 351*)

YEAS

Members

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bevilacqua

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bertrand

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok

NAYS

Members

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Supply

Blaikie	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brisson
Cadman	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Godin (Châteauguay)
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guay	Guimond
Hardy	Harvey
Herron	Hill (MacLeod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Matthews
McDonough	Mercier
Meredith	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Nunziata
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Price	Proctor
Ramsay	Riis
Ritz	Robinson
Sauvageau	Schmidt
Scott (Skeena)	Solberg
Solomon	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Jacques
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Turp
Vautour	Vellacott
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
White (North Vancouver)	Williams—107

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Canuel
DeVillers	Duceppe
Fournier	Galloway
Grose	Hubbard
Lefebvre	Longfield
Marleau	Ménard
Perron	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Milliken in the chair)

• (1810)

The Chairman: The House is in committee of the whole on Bill C-74.

Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

[Translation]

The Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

[English]

The Chairman: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

(On Clause 5)

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not know how this happened. Can the President of the Treasury Board give the House his assurance that this bill is in the usual form?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, the proportions requested in the bill are intended to provide for all necessary requirements of the Public Service of Canada up to the second supply period of 1999-2000. In no instance is the total amount of an item being released by the bill.

The form of the supply bill is the usual one for interim supply bills.

[Translation]

Passage of the present bill shall not prejudice either the rights or the privileges of members to criticize any item in the estimates when it comes up for consideration in committee. The usual undertaking is hereby given that these rights and privileges shall be respected and shall be neither abolished nor limited in any way as a result of the passage of the present bill.

[English]

The Chairman: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 1 agreed to)

Supply

[Translation]

The Chairman: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 2 agreed to)

[English]

The Chairman: Shall schedule 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 3 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall schedule 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 4 agreed to)

[Translation]

The Chairman: Shall schedule 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 5 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall schedule 6 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 6 agreed to)

[English]

The Chairman: Shall schedule 7 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule 7 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

[Translation]

The Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

[English]

(Bill reported)

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I would first ask your co-operation to withdraw the member for Kingston and the Islands from this vote and all subsequent votes.

I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote at second reading to the motion currently before the House.

[English]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(Division No. 352)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Ianno
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi

Supply

Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—144

St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—107

Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson
DeVillers
Fournier
Grose
Lefebvre
Marleau
Perron
Venne

Canuel
Duceppe
Galloway
Hubbard
Longfield
Ménard
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Marcel Massé moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

● (1815)

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to the question now before the House.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

(Division No. 353)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Belair
Bellemare
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Bradshaw
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp

Alcock
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bennett
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Boudria
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Cannis
Carroll
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forseth
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Guay
Hardy
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grey (Edmonton North)
Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Proctor
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg

Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Drouin
Easter
Finestone
Folco
Fry
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Iftody
Jennings
Karetak-Lindell
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
MacAulay
Malhi
Manley
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Reed
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wilfert

Dion
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Ianno
Jackson
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Lincoln
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Massé
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Speller
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Whelan
Wood—144

Guimond
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Matthews
Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)
Nunziata
Obhrai
Penson
Plamondon
Proctor
Riis
Robinson
Schmidt
Solberg
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Vellacott
Wayne
Williams—107

Supply

Hardy
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lunn
Mark
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough
Meredith
Morrison
Nystrom
Pankiw
Picard (Drummond)
Price
Ramsay
Ritz
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Solomon
Stinson
Strahl
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Vautour
Wasylcia-Leis
White (North Vancouver)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Anderson	Canuel
DeVillers	Duceppe
Fournier	Galloway
Grose	Hubbard
Lefebvre	Longfield
Marleau	Ménard
Perron	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wappel

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

NAYS

Members

* * *

Abbott
Alarie
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cadman
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forsyth
Gauthier
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Grewal
Guay

Ablonczy
Anders
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Casey
Chatters
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Grey (Edmonton North)

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed certain bills, to which the concurrence of the House is desired.

● (1820)

It being 6.20 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

*Private Members' Business***PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS**

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE**Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP)** moved:

That a legislative committee be established to prepare and bring in a bill, in accordance with Standing Order 68(4)(b), to abolish the legal defence of provocation contained in section 232 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

She said: Mr. Speaker, the intent of the motion is to abolish the defence of provocation which makes excuses for murder. If we as a country hold murder to be abhorrent, so much so that we do not have the death penalty, why on earth would we incorporate values that excuse murder on the basis of an insult or a wrongful act? My intention is to get rid of this defence so that we do not come out at the end of a trial wondering how on earth someone could get less than five years for murdering someone.

This happened in my community. I am still wondering how Ralph Klassen could get a five year sentence for murdering his wife. How can we say that he did not intend to murder her when he strangled her by tying a pillow case around her neck? Because he did not intend to murder her, his sentence was reduced to manslaughter and he got a very small sentence. I will again state that it clearly comes down to how we value human life.

There were huge walks in protest against this sentence. I have been presenting petitions in parliament over the last year and a half asking for the abolition of the defence of provocation. Our justice minister put out a discussion paper last fall but there has been no movement on it.

I will go into more details on this defence. It is a partial defence for murder. What it does not do is take away the right of people to defend their family, themselves or their property. There are specific areas of defence in our laws that look after that.

This law came out of the 17th century where two men of equal class were considered able to fight a duel in effect because someone had been insulted. Since their honour was at stake it was considered quite normal that they would fight. What we call that now is a bar room brawl.

At that time there was a death penalty for murder. The idea was to provide an understanding of a human frailty. Yet we do not provide a defence for someone who commits a murder out of compassion or pity. We do not excuse the fact they felt so bad for the person that they felt it was justified to kill him or her, but we are saying that if someone gets angry, furious or enraged it is all right for them to act on that rage and murder someone.

I will now jump back to Yukon. Within a period of years we had the Klassen murder case in which he got a five year sentence. He was a man who had many degrees, studied theology and held himself to be morally and intellectually above most of his peers or anyone in his community. He got a very short sentence for the murder of a woman he said provoked him, taunted him, drove him to murder.

- (1825)

There was also a young woman who killed her spouse when she came upon him having sex with another man. She stabbed him. He died. She got a maximum sentence. She was not even eligible for parole for a minimum of 10 years.

I am not saying that she should have got Mr. Klassen's sentence. What I am saying is that the defence is wrong and he should have got her sentence. We should not be excusing murder because of a passionate outburst or an angry, rage filled outburst.

The defence of provocation will accept an excuse of something that is grossly insulting, an attack upon a friend or a man coming upon his wife in adultery. Those are the foundations of the defence. It is based on the idea that uncontrollable acts of anger or passion should be forgiven with a lesser penalty, but again not acts of compassion. It is also based on the premise that the victim got what he or she deserved, that somehow he or she deserved to be murdered and we should then excuse the person who did it.

In the Klassen case torment and taunt were alleged. We have to remember that Susan Klassen was dead at that point. The husband and wife were separated. He drove thousands of miles out the highway, came to the marriage home, expected to sleep in the marriage bed, and she said "what is the use?"

To defend this supposed statement he had someone say that a few years ago she had made an allusion to his low sperm count. That was the provocation. That was the wrongful act, words, or the insult which drove this man to murder his wife. There is no way that we should accept those kinds of excuses within the Criminal Code.

It goes even further than that because after that sentence was rendered people who were in anger management programs felt that they would have been better off if they had murdered their spouses because then they would not be in anger management programs and would have been out of jail without having any further obligations to their community or society.

Provocation basically went unchanged until the 19th century when some criteria were placed on it. It had to meet the standard of a reasonable person, someone who identified with you or I or anyone who had reasonable control over his or her emotions. One of the criteria is that the person had to have acted suddenly, that the insult or provocation had to have been sudden and unexpected.

Private Members' Business

Someone who suffered long term abuse could never use the defence of provocation. If a person had been beaten for years then the provocation of having been beaten was not sudden. Nor was it unexpected. People who have been beaten, whether a child, a spouse or an elderly person who sometimes and often sadly are abused in society, and react in any way to defend themselves or to kill someone who routinely beat them could not apply for the defence of provocation because it was not sudden. They had been beaten before so they would expect to be beaten more. That defence is patently not available to those people.

Even in the Ratushny report prepared by that judge for justice minister she said that four of the approximate 100 women's cases that she looked at would have been eligible to invoke the defence of provocation. One of them did and it was rejected in the court, and the other three refused to do it for very personal reasons. They felt they were making excuses for what they did and so they did not invoke that defence.

It is not often used for women because the context of the defence does not allow for conditions in which, sadly, women murder. The case in Yukon was a classic case of provocation and it was not even considered for that young woman. She got a penalty which I think is accurate and fair for anyone who murders, especially in a fit of rage, because we are supposedly brought up to control ourselves, not to let words get to us, and to act in a manner according to our community's desire for peace and harmony.

Using the term a wrongful act or an insult widens how this defence can be used. It has been used over and over. For example, if someone says she is barren she could not kill her husband and use that as a justification. Yet if it is turned around it is being justified.

• (1830)

If a man makes a sexual advance toward another man, it is used in cases where homosexuals are killed. Is that reason enough to kill someone? Is that considered an insult? Is that response a lethal response?

Is killing someone else an acceptable response to a word or an insult? No matter how dreadful one feels about that insult, can they retaliate with taking someone's life?

Remember when it comes to using the defence of provocation, murder is never in question. It is established that it was not murder. It is firmly entrenched in our cultural ideas of what an insult is, what honour is.

There was a *Witness* program which documented honour killings which we generally associate with the Far East. Women I talked to who had watched that movie were absolutely horrified. We have honour killings. That is what the defence of provocation is all about. It is about justifying honour killing.

It is legal for a person to want to leave a relationship. We call it divorce. A person can do that. The most dangerous time for a woman who leaves a relationship is the time period immediately thereafter. That is when she is most in danger of being murdered. She has stepped outside the boundaries, outside of what is considered honourable and outside of the control of the person she married. Therefore her life is in danger, as possibly are the lives of her children. Often her life is taken. Such was the case with Susan Klassen.

What we accept in law is not far from the rule of thumb, where it was perfectly all right for a husband to beat his wife as long as he did not use anything thicker than the width of his thumb. That was the rule of law.

This defence still hinges on those kinds of concepts. They are based on gender and class. They do not have any room in our society. We cannot excuse a man or a woman for acting out in a rage or frenzy. It is not acceptable to say that a person deserved to be killed and because that person said something that was not liked, the person who did the killing is given a lesser sentence.

When a judge reduces a sentence for murder to manslaughter there is no minimum sentence applied. Moving it down to manslaughter means that the judge has complete discretion over the sentencing.

Violence in the home and violence between intimate partners should carry a heavier sentence. It is a position of trust that has been violated. We should be safe in our home, not in more danger. Of those women who are killed, most are killed within the home. Our chief justice says that our law has traditionally insulated accountability for violence in the home, that it has made it all right, that we would turn a blind eye to violence in the home.

It still happens. It happens at the basic level of law enforcement. RCMP officers and other police officers do not want to go into those situations. They turn the other way. It does not matter how many times a woman calls, there is no response to their situation.

What has been accepted as insults in our law? These actions are unlawful but have been considered insults concerning the defence of provocation: articulating one's rights; expressing a difference of opinion; taking a job; having a relationship with persons other than one's spouse, partner or lover; selecting one's friends; maintaining family relationships; striking back when being battered. They are used to justify battering of partners and the murder of partners. The nature of insults is troubling because they can provide and do provide a licence to kill. We have to question, are there any words that we would accept as giving a lethal response?

• (1835)

Other arguments are that this defence would be better if it was broadened and opened up for women to use as well. I argue against

Private Members' Business

this because the premise is bad. The idea of being able to kill for one's honour should not be expanded to include another gender. It would be broadened on a basis that is wrong, on values that are wrong, on a principle that is wrong.

Why would we expand something that is essentially wrong and allow more people access to making excuses? We do not make excuses in other areas of law. Lesser offences do not have a built-in provocation defence to make excuses for people. Why when we hit the most dreadful of crimes in our country, murder, would we then be willing to make excuses?

Canada does not have a death penalty any more. Nobody is facing a death penalty when charged and found guilty of murder. Why would we lessen a sentence to a point where it is almost meaningless within our community?

If we look at provocation in terms of principles, we should not have it. It should not exist and we should not be honouring it in any terms, let alone by entrenching it in our thoughts and in our courts. If it is looked at in terms of stakeholders and who benefits from using the defence of provocation, then there are a lot of problems and questions based on value. We would have a defence that as it stands is more accessible for men to use when they kill their spouse or when they kill someone they have gotten into a fight with. We are making it more accessible in those terms.

Based on principle and value it is not a defence we should be promoting, using or having available for a judge to apply in any manner whether it is justified or unjustified. My point is the defence of provocation is never justified.

The Minister of Justice put out a discussion paper. I travelled around the Yukon Territory last year. In the fall I held a town hall so that I could give a response to the minister and be part of the discussion.

This is one of the topics that is more difficult to speak about but it does not mean it should not be discussed. It means we have to push hard to move forward and to make changes in our justice system that will bring equality.

I do not believe if we abolish the defence of provocation that suddenly we will have a far more peaceful and violence free society. I do not think that will happen but it is a step in that direction.

We have to address the intent to kill. We cannot accept that someone did not mean to kill the person, even though they put their hands around the person's neck and choked the person until their thumbs broke, even though they tied a pillowcase around the person's neck, even though they stabbed someone 47 times. We cannot accept that they did not somehow intend the action to kill. If they do that and do not claim insanity or any altered mental state, then they by their actions meant to kill somebody.

Again, I do not think this will change our society dramatically but it will be a step in that direction. It will be a movement toward saying you cannot beat somebody up and blame it on them; you cannot murder somebody and blame it on them. We will not give a lesser sentence under those circumstances.

I will end with a tribute to Susan Klassen's family, to every man or woman who has been murdered and their murder excused on the basis of this defence.

When our country lost a woman like Susan Klassen, it was a terrible tragedy that will not go away. She was a kind and generous woman, a storyteller of international renown. She was generous with her stories which came out of her like a symphony. She shared them with the young and old, throughout her day, in her job, in our arts centre. She was a focal point for the northern storytelling festival which storytellers from around the world attend.

• (1840)

It was terribly symbolic that she was choked, that her voice was cut off. If her husband could not have her, nobody could have her. Nobody would hear from this woman again. She was in the prime of her life. It was particularly cruel and degrading and frightening to everybody in the community. I am really proud that our city stood up, men, women and children protested.

We cannot allow this. We cannot exonerate people for murder. We certainly cannot do it based on an archaic sense of honour, that someone should be allowed to take another life on the basis of an insult.

This is a votable motion. I appeal to have the issue sent to a committee to be looked at even more closely with the intent to hopefully abolish it and move what we need into self-defence.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 265 by the hon. member for Yukon would establish a legislative committee to prepare a bill abolishing the defence of provocation as contained in section 232 of the Criminal Code.

The hon. member presented quite a case and I commend her for paying homage to the reason she brought forth the motion in the House. The Minister of Justice knows the case very well.

While the minister has indicated that reforming the law of provocation is one of her priorities, she cannot support this motion at this time.

[Translation]

Last June, the minister initiated public consultation on the subject by publishing a consultation document. In our opinion, it would be premature to strike a legislative committee while the Department of Justice is still studying public responses on means of defence based on provocation.

*Private Members' Business**[English]*

The law respecting provocation is complex and admittedly controversial. I think the hon. member referred to that in her own remarks. The defence of provocation is a partial and limited defence and I want to stress that. It applies only to a charge of murder.

Section 232 of the Criminal Code provides that a charge of murder may be reduced to manslaughter if the offence was committed by a person in the heat of passion caused by sudden provocation. Furthermore, the provocation must be caused by a wrongful act or insult that would be sufficient to deprive an ordinary person of the power of self-control and it must also be shown that the accused acted on it on the sudden and before there was time for his passion to cool.

If the defence is successful, it does not result in acquittal. Instead it results in the accused being convicted of the crime of manslaughter which carries a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.

[Translation]

Historically, the defence of provocation has been of very limited application; it was used by men defending their honour during an unpremeditated confrontation, or when their wife had committed adultery.

Nowadays, the defence of provocation is justified by the fact that the law must be tolerant toward human frailty, when a person is subject to a provocation that exceeds his ability to control himself.

[English]

Some recent cases which received significant media attention have given rise to concerns over the application of the defence of provocation. Some have suggested that the criminal law in this area condones violent behaviour by men against women and excuses extreme violence provoked by insults or injury relating to a person's sexuality or masculinity.

• (1845)

[Translation]

The Minister of Justice is well aware of these cases and of the growing public criticism of the legal rules that govern provocation, and she is taking a very serious look at these issues.

A number of groups and individuals, including the former Law Reform Commission of Canada, have drawn our attention to related issues and have asked that we restrict the use of that legal defence.

The criticism primarily has to do with the fact that the historical origins of this defence still form the basis for its use before the courts, and that current rules may not reflect modern values and ideals.

[English]

At the same time it must be stated that support for the abolition of provocation is not universal at this time. Other groups have recommended expansion of the defence, such as the Canadian Bar Association, on the basis that human frailty should be recognized by criminal law.

It is clear that there is a great deal of disagreement over the proper scope of the defence of provocation in modern Canadian society. Any move toward limiting this defence must be done carefully and with due consideration of all the options and the potential consequences of each of these actions.

[Translation]

As I mentioned, the Department of Justice is following up on the requests for a reform and on the change in the public's perception of the law on provocation, and it has conducted a careful review of the issues and various options for reform.

The Minister of Justice also met with provincial and territorial justice ministers to discuss this specific issue, and the federal and provincial justice officials are working together to determine the feasibility of the various options for reform.

[English]

In an effort to better understand how Canadians feel about this issue, the Department of Justice released a discussion paper in the summer of 1998 which formed the basis of public consultations. I am glad to hear that the hon. member also did a consultation in her own riding. The department is currently reviewing responses submitted by individuals and interested groups.

The minister is committed to ensuring that the law reflects modern values and works fairly for all Canadians. The law on provocation is very complex, as I said earlier, and is also tied to other areas of criminal law, in particular to the law of self-defence, adding further complexity to the task of reforming Criminal Code defences and again highlighting the need for an in-depth study before making changes.

[Translation]

In my opinion, the hon. member's motion to abolish the legal defence of provocation is premature.

[English]

Reforming the law on provocation is important, as I said earlier, to the Minister of Justice. She has taken the steps necessary at this time to ensure that any amendments will reflect and respond to the views and values of Canadians. Consultations have been done. We have finished the consultations and we are reviewing what options we will take.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, while I commend all the members for their work in representing their constituents and while I commend all members for their

Private Members' Business

efforts to make Canada's laws better, I really cannot agree with the motion introduced by the hon. member.

She made the point that this is a women's issue and I immediately remember reading the paper put out by the justice department. Here is what the justice department's own figures show, that this really is not a women's issue. In fact, it is the opposite.

The Department of Justice's own research shows that in 64% of the cases where a man killed a woman the defence of being provoked was rejected. In the cases where men were killed by women 43% of the cases rejected this defence. Obviously women benefit more than men from this law.

I too consider carefully what my petitioners are telling me. Tens of thousands of petitioners have written to me with their concerns about the government's gun registration bill, the defunding of abortions, parental rights and property rights. I have introduced private member's bills and motions on these issues and I am not as fortunate as the hon. member for Yukon to have one of my bills or motions made a votable item. Perhaps my bills and motions are not closely aligned with the agenda of the Liberal Party. I have personally introduced petitions with more than 43,000 signatures calling on the government to repeal Bill C-68, the Firearms Act, but the government continues to ignore these requests by Canadians.

• (1850)

Why do the Liberals respond to issues from some petitioners and not others? Maybe the government will listen and act if the Liberals happen to agree with the petitioners.

Putting politics aside, I am pleased to be given the opportunity to participate in this debate about the defence of provocation. I hope to expand the debate about the need to retain self-defence sections of the Criminal Code as they are currently written.

The first thing I did when I saw this motion was to reread section 232 of the Criminal Code. The justice department claims this section has remained virtually unchanged since 1892. My initial reaction is to reject any demands to abolish a law that has been serving Canadians for so long. I do not have a closed mind about this but it makes me very wary. The longer the law has been in force is directly proportional to the level and seriousness of the debate the House should have about the abolition of such an old and fundamental defence.

From the synopsis in the Criminal Code it is clear that the interpretation and application of the defence of provocation has not remained static. Many cases before the courts have set legal precedents to determine the sufficiency of evidence to raise this defence, the nature of the objective test of the term ordinary person, the instructions or charging of a jury, the applications of

this defence to attempted murder, the definition of self-induced provocation, and constitutional considerations. This section of the Criminal Code has been in a constant state of change by the judicial process, as it should be.

Let us look at the hon. member's Motion No. 265. It is not simply a motion to have a legislative committee investigate or review the defence of provocation. If it were, we might be able to support it. If the House approves this motion, it directs the committee to prepare and bring a bill to abolish the legal defence of provocation contained in section 232 of the Criminal Code of Canada. I cannot accept that.

Not even the justice department's own consultation paper, "Reforming Criminal Code Defences: Provocation, Self-Defence and Defence of Property" released last year goes that far. The justice department's paper asks for public input on a range of nine options with respect to the defence of provocation.

I will list these nine options so they are on the record for *Hansard*: to abolish the defence of provocation; to reform the defence of provocation by removing the phrase "in the heat of passion"; to replace the term "wrongful act" with "unlawful act"; to remove the ordinary person test to reflect the mixed subjective-objective test; to reform the defence of expanding the "suddenness" requirement; to reform the defence so that it is not available in cases of spousal homicides; to reform the defence so that it is not available in cases where the victim asserts his or her charter protected rights; to reform the defence to limit it to situations where excessive force was used in self-defence; to leave the Criminal Code provisions on the provocation defence exactly as they are.

Before the House can support this motion, each of these nine options has to be seriously considered and debated. Eight of the options proved unworkable beyond any doubt. That is what has to happen and that is why we cannot pass this motion. The justice consultation paper even outlined the pros and cons for each of these options.

The duty of the House before we approve a motion to abolish the defence of provocation would be to look at each of the arguments for and against abolition. It would be reform or no change to section 232. We would have to be convinced that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages. We would have to examine each of the arguments against abolition or reform and rule on each.

Look at the justice department's own arguments against abolition as stated in the department's consultation paper. The defence of provocation might be useful for women in situations of domestic violence who kill in self-defence but with excessive force in response to the provocation of physical or verbal abuse. That is a very important point. There could be an increase in acquittals by juries that no longer have the alternative to a murder condemnation

in cases where they view the accused as morally less worthy of blame. Murder might be considered an inappropriate term for killing under provocation. The reasons to abolish the provocation defence put forward by my hon. colleague from Yukon do not adequately address these arguments raised by the Justice Department, let alone the arguments that have yet to be raised by the legal community and the general public.

• (1855)

Finally, I want to comment about the tendency of some to clamour for changing or abolishing a law because of the circumstances of one case. For every case the member raises which seems to support abolition, I could rebut her position with another court case that supports the opposite view.

For example, last year in my home province a 29 year old, James Allan Tomlinson, was sentenced to life imprisonment with no chance of parole for 10 years for the second degree murder of a 67 year old farmer, Stacey Clark. Mr. Tomlinson alleged that Mr. Clark grabbed his genitals and that this provoked Mr. Tomlinson to stomp Mr. Clark to death, breaking most of the bones in his chest.

Tomlinson claimed that he should be found guilty of the lesser charge of manslaughter because he did not intentionally kill Mr. Clark. Justice John Kelbuc shot down the argument, saying the defence of provocation was not intended to create an open season on homosexuals who act unlawfully. We have an example of a case that completely contradicts the examples given by the hon. member.

I firmly believe the facts of each of these seemingly contradictory cases are best left in the hands of judges and juries. If mistakes in the law are made, these individual cases are best left in the hands of crown prosecutors and provincial attorneys general to appeal all the way to the supreme court if necessary. If the supreme court rules contrary to the wishes of parliament or the people, then we must amend the law. So far this has not happened.

The Supreme Court of Canada had the opportunity to review a case on defence of provocation as recently as 1996. I quote from an article that appeared in the February 19, 1996 issue of *Western Report*:

Chief Justice Cory clarified when it [section 232] can be invoked. There is an objective and a subjective test. The former determines whether the insult was severe enough to deprive the killer of his self-control. The latter requires that his subsequent response was sudden, before his passion cooled. Prior to leaving this defence with a jury, the judge must find some evidence of provocation. It is then up to the jury to determine if the defence holds up under the facts. The jury must take into consideration the age, sex, and racial origin of the accused, to determine whether an "ordinary person" of reasonable self-control would, under similar circumstances, be provoked by the act or insult in question. The supreme court also endorsed for the first time the finding of a lower court that the history of the relationship between the victim and perpetrator should also be considered.

Mr. Justice Cory stated in his judgment:

Obviously, events leading to the break-up of the marriage can never warrant taking the life of another. Affairs cannot justify murder. Still any recognition of human

Private Members' Business

frailties must take into account that these very situations may lead to insults that could give rise to provocation. The good sense of jurors will undoubtedly lead them to consider all the facts, including the presence of a loaded gun in the car.

This does not sound like a section of the criminal code that has outlived its usefulness. I will vigorously oppose this motion. I hope all members of the House will take these arguments into consideration that I have presented and make their decisions to support or oppose this motion.

I compliment the member for Yukon for raising this issue. It has been very good for me to do the research and to find out the background about this. We really should have legislation before the House that can be debated. Some expert witnesses could then be called and we could spend our time debating the legislation. As this motion is worded, I cannot support it.

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I too am honoured and pleased to take part in this debate. I offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Yukon for bringing about this very important matter and giving us in the Chamber an opportunity to discuss this issue.

The defence of provocation I would not go so far as to call an obscure section of the Criminal Code but it is one that does not receive broad application.

• (1900)

It is one that I did come across in my time as a crown prosecutor in Nova Scotia. It is a section that has a fair bit of confusion surrounding it. Much like the defence of self-defence, it is extremely difficult for jury members, in particular lay persons without legal training. I would even go so far as to say that many in the legal profession have a great deal of trouble interpreting sections such as this including provocation.

The motivation behind the hon. member for Yukon in bringing this matter forward is certainly laudable. I am also familiar with the very tragic case of Susan Klassen. I had the pleasure of meeting her sister when she attended a justice conference here in Ottawa last summer. Her motivation is beyond question. I note from her remarks that it is something she feels very passionately about, and rightly so.

However, as we progress in the law we must be aware that there is a true danger in taking single cases in isolation and using that as a motivation to entirely change the law. I am not suggesting that is entirely what is happening here, but there is always a danger in holding up one particular case as a means to entirely revamp or, in this proposed scenario, withdraw a section of the Criminal Code.

That is not to say that there is not often a great deal of need and in fact a legitimate desire to change a section of the Criminal Code to make it operate in a more efficient and just way for Canadians at large. However, to remove section 232 of the Criminal Code, I

Private Members' Business

would suggest, would ignore the fact that there is a real element of human frailty encompassed in that particular section.

The Criminal Code is a document that is not immune to change. However, there are certain sections of the code that have been in place for some period of time. One would make the strong argument that they have been subject to considerable judicial interpretation and expression over a long period of time, which does have some weight when one considers the desire to remove that section completely from the code.

With respect to Motion No. 265, I would suggest that there is really a need for change, but perhaps not a need to go as far as this motion would suggest, which is to withdraw the entire section completely because of an unpopular or an unjust interpretation of that section.

All sections of the Criminal Code, however old, are written in such a way as to allow for judicial interpretation. Upon first glance, sections of the Criminal Code may seem to be outdated, yet when subjected to judicial interpretation they are brought up to speed in a number of ways which allow a judge to ensure that justice does prevail.

Detractors may argue that problems arise in judicial interpretation and that allows for decisions such as we saw in the B.C. court case involving Shaw. That particular case once again highlights the danger in taking one particular instance of a judicial interpretation and suggesting that we must then repeal an entire section of the Criminal Code.

I am a firm believer in change for our system. I am also confident that the judges of the supreme court will correct the ruling with respect to child pornography. With that said, the Criminal Code is a written reference by which Canadians conduct themselves. It is intended to provide guidelines for our society, for a safe and orderly environment and it is an embodiment of a moral standard that is to be upheld by those who choose to live or visit Canada.

It is true that the Criminal Code is not perfect. How could it be? It is made by man. Yet to allow the dissolution of an entire law simply to appease the demands of a special interest group would set a very dangerous precedent and would lead to constant band-aid solutions to very specific problems.

The oversimplification of any law would limit judicial interpretation of the code when dealing with future cases.

Being quick to enact a change each time a particular case emerges through the courts and is handed down, I suggest, would be very dangerous and would lead to an eventual dismantling of our Criminal Code or such disarray or uncertainty amongst the judiciary, law enforcement agents, lawyers and, most importantly, the

general public that this type of confusion would further undermine an already very sceptical and cynical public.

• (1905)

The Department of Justice has been asked for commentary on this particular section, among others, such as self-defence and the defence of property, but in particular the defence of provocation. This is an extremely useful exercise.

It is important to say at the outset that provocation is not a complete defence, as has been mentioned. It mitigates, it brings a murder charge into a manslaughter situation and denotes a lesser degree of culpability.

Concern over the issue of the defence of provocation stems from societal progress. In the early 1990s critics felt that this section of the Criminal Code promoted outdated values and was used to defeat modern egalitarian principles. However, it affords a degree of protection that is legitimate, perhaps limited at times, and as a blanket statement it does not lower or lessen the level of accountability in all cases.

Currently the Criminal Code allows for the defence of provocation. However, in recent years the nature, the use and the existence of this law has become more narrowly defined. The objective and the subjective tests that are incorporated into this section provide some degree of protection.

Moreover, the successful use of the defence of provocation in a number of well publicized cases raises public concern. However, there is no suggestion here that this law condones violence in any way, shape or form. In a legal sense it takes into consideration the deprivation of a person's reason and ability to respond rationally and proportionately to a very stressful situation. Where they might have acted otherwise, the defence of provocation does particularize and individualize the law.

I do not believe for a moment that the law condones violence. In fact the law protects those who find themselves in this condition of mental anguish or distress. This condition could stem from an extreme situation, such as mental, physical or emotional abuse. Therefore, persons who found themselves reaching that point of distress should not be deprived of the ability to raise this issue at trial, not for the purposes of completely removing responsibility for their actions, but for the purposes of putting a particular scenario into a particular circumstantial scenario before the trier of fact and the jury.

The Criminal Code can protect persons if it remains in its current form where non-partisan judges are left to interpret the code and hand down a decision that will address the needs and concerns of modern society. Specific interpretations or specific factors, such as

age, race, sex or religion, are taken into account when a judge is faced with weighing the applicability of provocation. A taunt or the provocative action or remark is also taken into consideration, so it is very much an individualized and tailored piece of legislation.

Issues of self-defence and defence of property have also been singled out for change.

Again, I commend the member because this is a very timely intervention. It is fair to say that it is an extremely complicated and confusing section of the Criminal Code that requires greater study and greater definition under the current provisions.

The Department of Justice has expressed a desire to look at these proposed changes. As was previously mentioned, it has already made certain recommendations as they pertain to the defence of provocation.

With respect to dealing with this particular motion, the Department of Justice has expressed that willingness. As we have seen with other cases, and particularly situations involving changes to the Criminal Code, this government does not exactly have a great record to stand on in terms of its timeliness of response, but hope burns eternal in this regard. One would hope that the non-partisan level of debate that we have heard here will also prevail when it comes time to look at this situation at the committee.

Issues dealing with the legality involved in the interaction between men and women are in a constant state of flux in today's society. Working toward creating a level playing field is a constant challenge to our legal drafters, as well as those who are left to interpret these laws. We cannot either change the law as frequently as society changes or react in a very shortsighted way when occasion occurs.

• (1910)

I commend the hon. member again for taking the initiative to bring this matter forward. The Progressive Conservative Party is not opposed to looking at this matter further at the justice committee or perhaps even looking at making specific amendments to the bill that has been brought forward.

The wording is what troubles me. I am afraid that it would be perhaps pre-emptive and an overreaction to simply remove this from the Criminal Code at this time.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, as the seconder of Motion No. 265 I am very pleased to have the opportunity to rise and to lend my support to the motion.

Briefly, I would like to comment on the tone and the content of the debate in the House of Commons today. I would compliment all of the speakers for taking this issue in a very serious and respectful way.

Private Members' Business

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice started her remarks by saying that this is an issue that the government is taking seriously and one in which it is interested. She herself has been seized of the issue for a good number of years, as has the current Minister of Justice.

The member for Yukon is to be doubly complimented for bringing this very timely issue forward now. From the debate we have heard in the House, there is a great level of interest. This is not something that came out of the blue or that stemmed out of one isolated incident in Yukon, although that is where the hon. member for Yukon started her remarks, speaking very passionately about the tragic death of a woman at the hands of her husband. We heard some of the detail. I am glad that we were spared some of the gruesome detail.

Too often in the House of Commons when we are dealing with tragic issues members fall into the sensationalism of the horrible deaths and other things which people went through. Surely the merits of the case can survive without dwelling on the gruesome and the gory.

The member from the Reform Party disappointed me, frankly. I was very surprised to hear the attitude of Reform members toward this motion. He prefaced his remarks by saying that gender should not be taken into consideration in this issue. He gave some statistics which indicated that in the tragic situation where a man killed a woman, 60% of the applications for taking this into consideration were rejected. Only 40% succeeded.

However, if it was the case of a woman killing a man and the lawyer for the defence wanted to use the defence of provocation, the numbers were reversed. The inverse was true. Forty per cent of the cases were rejected and 60% were accepted.

The member somehow used this as rationale or justification, suggesting that there is an imbalance and that women are treated more favourably in the application of the provocation rule than are men. I would like to take a moment to point out that it is the member from the Reform Party who fails to see the historic imbalance in the power relationship between men and women and who fails to recognize how such figures might come about, even given the fair application of the provocation rule.

Other members have spoken today of what a complex issue we are dealing with. It is true that lay people like me, frankly, have a hard time even getting our minds around when this rule should be used and when it should not. I do not envy the judges or whoever makes the determination as to whether a particular case should qualify under the provocation rule or whether it should be self-defence or spousal abuse syndrome arguments.

I can see this really getting to be a quagmire of minutia when someone is trying to determine when this works. The fact that it works at all and works even once in a rare blue moon is clearly too many. The member for Yukon made very good points indicating

Adjournment Debate

that this was an arcane leftover in our judicial laws. We do not need such a reference any more. It hearkens to a darker time when this kind of thing could be contemplated.

• (1915)

I do not like the idea that we can justify the use of violence in any situation, frankly, because it tends to condone it. Is it okay to lash out in the schoolyard if Joey pushes you down? We spend a long time teaching our children that is not okay. There are other ways of conflict resolution other than striking out. A black eye in the schoolyard was sort of a common incident when I was growing up certainly, but now hopefully we have moved beyond that and have matured.

In the same light and by the same token, why then do we accept that any level of violence is acceptable if one is insulted or provoked mercilessly to the point where one could not stand it any more? Really one is saying "I can't take it any more" and lashes out. This law deals with lashing out in the ultimate way, murder, killing someone.

In one of the cases cited by the member for Yukon, the B.C. case involving a man named Burt Stone, he stabbed his wife 47 times, put her body in a toolbox and then went to Mexico for a month. For this he got a sentence of four years in jail. He was able to prove that his wife had provoked his violent behaviour by verbal insults delivered over a four hour road trip. He had to suffer nagging, abuse or insults for a four hour period and the result was he stabbed her 47 times and stuffed her into a toolbox. The defence of provocation was allowed in this incident.

That one incident alone would motivate me to rise up and speak against ever allowing the defence of provocation to be used. I do not need other incidents, although, as I say, the reason the member for Yukon originally rose on this issue was to deal with the Klassen murder in Yukon.

One member spoke of the folly of letting special interest groups drive our legislative agenda when it comes to justice issues, as if to say that we cannot be so loose with our changing of laws that if we get 50,000 signatures and lobby the government aggressively it will have no choice but to chuck that section of the code. No one is advocating that. I do not think we could accuse the member for Yukon of acting in a frivolous way or asking government to act in a way that is not prudent.

There is a great history of the lobbying and studying that has gone on about this issue. The member walked us through some of the review and study by groups and by the Department of Justice, knowing full well that this set of rules and laws should be changed. It was reviewed by the Law Reform Commission of Canada in 1989. We had the report of the federal-provincial working group on homicide in 1991, the report of the bar association in 1992, a House of Commons subcommittee on the recodification of the Criminal Code in 1993, and on and on it has been reviewed. It is only fitting and only proper that we now have it where it should be, being debated in the House of Commons.

A member mentioned special interest groups. He tried to imply that this was somehow the women's movement or something. I do not know if that is what he was getting at, but to even say that is to trivialize the issue and not to show respect for the member for Yukon who clearly is following through on a progressive movement that has been going on for over a decade to try to have this aspect of the code altered and changed.

One murder which results in a charge of manslaughter as a result of the use of the provocation defence is too much. I take issue with one member who said earlier that one does not get acquitted, that one is reduced from murder to manslaughter and manslaughter can have a penalty of life.

• (1920)

That member failed to point out that manslaughter can also have no minimum sentence whatsoever. The person could in fact walk with a probation, without serving any jail time. It is a huge advantage if the lawyer manages to successfully argue the provocation defence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The time provided for the consideration of Private Member's Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

DEVCO

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill (Bras d'Or—Cape Breton, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the government has misled Canadians about Cape Breton Island.

Since Liberals decided to close the door on my home two months ago they have spread convoluted and inaccurate information. Let us look at the facts and not at Liberal rhetoric. Just over \$1 billion have gone into Devco and \$5 billion has come out, which is a five to one return on the public's investment. No stockbroker would sneeze at that.

The men who worked hard and paid taxes will not receive benefits. Our tax dollars will go in and nothing will come out. It is Liberal financial planning.

For every job lost at Devco another three will disappear from the private sector. Picture the impact in towns where unemployment is already over 40%.

This economic vandalism is all the more upsetting when looking at the reality of Cape Breton coal. The government has tried to say that \$1 billion was wasted on Devco. It conjures up images of lazy workers and inefficient operations. What it does not say is that most of the money spent on Devco went on cleaning up sites the government inherited from the private mining companies which ran Cape Breton like a private empire for 200 years. When they bailed out they left the taxpayers the bill.

It has nothing to do with inefficient workers but everything to do with a government that did not have the spine to stand up to foreign companies and the big banks that backed them.

The truth is that Devco's coal mining operations, stripped of the clean-up costs and the numberless failed economic development schemes hatched by the government, actually made money. That is right. Do we hear about that from the government's spin doctors? Do we hear how Devco miners are known to be the best in the world or how Devco's employees have provided power for Nova Scotia and cash for their communities? No, of course not.

All we hear are more derogatory stereotypes, more contempt. Now, to add insult to injury, the government has announced its latest plan to revitalize our economy. There is \$40 million for the social research and demonstration corporation, \$40 million for a corporation based in Ottawa hiring Ontarians to study Cape Bretoners. What an insult.

I want to be on the record opposing yet another Liberal patronage gift. I want to be on the record condemning money for Cape Breton being spent in Ottawa. Just as the books were fudged with Devco and whole communities demeaned by slander and innuendo from the government, so now we see the future: more money for friends of the government, more money for Ontario.

I hope the government will have the courage to admit the obvious truth, that it thinks of Atlantic Canada as nothing more than a convenient way to channel money from the taxpayers to its friends. The government should stop studying Cape Bretoners and start listening to us. We want honesty. We want accountability and we want to control our own destiny.

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we have said before in the House, meetings have already been held between Devco's management and union representatives to review the human resources package and they continue to meet.

I am pleased to say that co-operation between management and the union is strong at the present time. Before the roof fall at Phalen colliery, production was very good. Since the roof fall, unions and

management have been working together to clean up the coal face and assess the damage. To this end, both the unions and management have hired independent experts to assess 8 east wall with Devco management agreeing to pay half of the union's independent expert.

• (1925)

To reiterate, the criteria to determine eligibility for the early retirement incentive program have not been pulled out of a hat. They are the criteria that were negotiated between Devco and its unions through a joint planning committee in 1996. They are the criteria that Devco's collective agreements indicate shall apply to the early retirement incentive program for any further workforce reductions. The \$111 million in funding that has been approved by the government for workforce adjustment measures includes \$60 million for an early retirement incentive program, \$46 million for severance packages and \$5 million for training for employees who receive severance packages.

I want to make it clear that the early retirement incentive program has absolutely no relationship to the pension benefits that Devco's employees have earned through participation in one of the corporation's pension plans. Workers will continue to be eligible for any earned pension benefits.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pursue a question I first asked prior to the federal budget regarding funding for the RCMP.

The RCMP cadet training academy, better known as the depot, is located in my riding of Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre. We are also home to F Division of the RCMP which serves as our provincial police force. Its head office is in my riding. Regina is very proud to be associated with the RCMP and many of the workers there are constituents of mine.

Over the past six months a number of them have approached me concerned about the future of the depot and the future of the force. NDP caucus colleagues from rural, northern and remote communities have also been raising concerns about a shortage of RCMP constables in their districts.

Last October training was suspended at the depot. RCMP budgets across the country were frozen, \$10 million was redirected to B.C. and a \$1 million study of management problems was ordered by the Treasury Board.

In a former life I worked as a management consultant advising businesses on various aspects of their operations. It is not a bad idea for an organization facing or coping with significant change and outside pressure to step back and analyse what it is doing and how it could be done better. Evaluation, auditing and medium to long term planning are vital for an organization that spends \$1.1

Adjournment Debate

billion annually with such a critically important mandate as the RCMP.

The RCMP staffing shortage is an urgent problem, one that is already documented and that management and the Liberal government need to fix now. We do not need to wait for an organizational audit to see that. I am told that fully one half of the 16,000 member force will be eligible for retirement in seven years. We already have a shortage of 400 constables in western Canada. Why have we not been spending every single day training their replacements?

The depot knows there is a problem. Chief Superintendent Harper Boucher said just last week in the newspaper: "Right now, right across the country, there's a demand for new members, so we're not meeting that need".

Last week it was announced that the depot could resume training using shorter length courses starting in April. That is a start but it will not begin to fill the backlog if half the force is retired by 2006. I see the government has restored about a quarter of the funds it cut to the RCMP's budget. They had better invest some of it in training new constables as soon as possible.

I would also like to mention the persisting worries of the depot's civilian workers who are being scapegoated for RCMP management's overspending in B.C. and Alberta divisions and headquarters.

They have been told that RCMP management wants to bring in alternate service delivery, ASD, which is a new word for privatization as a so-called cost saving measure. Everyone knows that in Saskatchewan privatization means fewer jobs, lower pay, reduced services and higher costs to taxpayers.

The civilian workers asked to meet with the solicitor general when he was scheduled to attend the graduation ceremonies last week. The solicitor general later cancelled his plans to attend and referred them to his deputy. The deputy then cancelled.

I hope the solicitor general and his deputy are not afraid to meet with those workers. They have important information for him about why privatizing those services will not save the money management claims. I have met with those workers. They provide a professional, loyal and dedicated service to the depot and the force.

Fundamental decisions such as privatizing civilian services at the depot should not be made until after the KPMG management audit has been completed and after the employees have had their input. The solicitor general should put the drive to privatize on pause and consider the impact on the workers, their families and on the city of Regina. I wrote to him and to the President of the Treasury Board over a month ago asking them to do so. I look forward, as do my constituents, to a reply which hopefully will be coming shortly. It has been over a month now.

• (1930)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Saada (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre has asked what the government is doing to ensure that the RCMP has the resources and qualified personnel necessary to carry out its policing mandate, given that training was suspended at the Regina depot in October 1998.

As is well known, the government takes its financial responsibilities towards Canadian taxpayers very seriously. In order to be able to implement the plans necessary to be able to operate within its 1998-99 budget, the RCMP imposed a temporary freeze on discretionary spending earlier in the current fiscal year. Another temporary measure consisted in suspending any new training activities at the Regina depot.

Before resuming its activities, the RCMP decided to carry out a detailed review with respect to the alternative service delivery of all programs provided by its training centre in this division. This review enabled the RCMP to identify whether internal resources or non-members were more qualified to deliver the services now being provided at the training centre.

I am pleased to say that the commissioner recently announced that training at the depot will resume effective April 6, 1999. The RCMP will implement a more efficient cadet training program. This modified approach will allow the RCMP to attain its program objectives more effectively, while ensuring the high quality of training for which the RCMP is known the world over.

I myself can testify to this reputation. Whether at Interpol headquarters in Lyon or in Bosnia, it was brought home to me that, far from being an idle claim, this reputation was very richly deserved.

[*English*]

CANADA PORT AUTHORITIES

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I see the hon. member for Thunder Bay—Atikokan is doing double duty tonight so he has good reason to miss his dinner.

A long time ago, on November 17 to be exact, I asked the Minister of Transport about the nominating process for directors of the Halifax Port Authority. At the time I correctly predicted that the board would be purely Liberal and would include Merv Russell who is back in the saddle again as chairman.

Adjournment Debate

The minister then and more recently invoked the principle that all advisory groups are represented. Of course there are board members from various walks of life. It would be pretty hard to avoid that. But they all share one common important qualification, which is that they have their common loyalty to the Liberal Party.

This problem is not just restricted to Halifax. In Vancouver, only two out of five stakeholder nominees were appointed as directors to the new port authority. I guess this conforms to the Liberal definition of devolution of power to the local level.

Looking ahead, the Prince Rupert Port Authority is scheduled to swing into action on about May 1. I fearlessly predict that one Rhoda Witherly, twice defeated Liberal candidate and current chair of the port corporation, will find a safe berth in that harbour. I will not even be surprised if her campaign manager, a Ms. Denton, makes it into the dock as well.

It is well known and clearly understood that in the Liberal lexicon privatization is a synonym for patronage and the creation of these port authorities is a form of privatization. Can the Liberals just occasionally loosen their grip and respect not only the letter but also the spirit of the marine act? It is not too much to ask.

There were some highly qualified candidates bypassed on the Halifax and Vancouver lists. There are some really outstanding people among those being sponsored for Prince Rupert.

• (1935)

I ask the parliamentary secretary, will the government change its longstanding policy and attach some importance to the business and technical qualifications of non-Liberal candidates to this and other boards?

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to address the concerns that have been raised with respect to the port advisory committee process in Halifax. I might indicate that the process is also applicable in all other port authority compositions.

The role of the port advisory committee was to develop a user nomination process in response to the requirement in the Canada Marine Act to consult with users on certain board appointments. This nomination process has been reflected in the letters patent. The purpose of this process was to solicit names for user representatives of Canada port authority boards and to forward nominations to the Minister of Transport for consideration.

Port advisory committee members will not be appointing directors to the Halifax Port Authority. The authority is an agent of the crown and the majority of directors are appointed by governor in council. In addition, the province and municipality each appoint a board member.

To ensure that the process was inclusive, port managers were asked to contact users and invite them to attend a nomination meeting. In addition, an advertisement was placed in the local newspaper advising of the port advisory committee nomination meeting.

With respect to the composition of the port advisory committee, a broad cross-section of port users was represented, including members of the Halifax Chamber of Commerce and the Halifax Shipping Association. The list provided by the port advisory committee was used by the minister in making his recommendations to the governor in council.

As with the provincial and municipal appointees to the Halifax Port Authority, each user representative will serve the board with a view to the needs of the Halifax Port Authority as a whole.

HOUSING

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a report was published in January 1999 of the Toronto mayor's homelessness action task force, better known as the Golden report. It revealed that in Toronto alone about 3,000 individuals stay in shelters, about 37,000 people are on waiting lists for subsidized social housing and an additional 40,000 are spending more than half of their income on rent or are living in extremely precarious housing conditions. The situation in other Canadian cities is also serious and has been described by municipal leaders as a national disaster.

Some weeks ago I asked the Minister of Public Works and Government Services whether the government would be prepared to launch a housing program to meet the needs of the homeless. This issue requires urgent and special attention. There is a great need for federal and provincial funds for the construction of social housing units.

Since the Golden report was released, the picture has not improved. Homeless people in many Canadian cities are a reality. More people have died as a result of cold and exposure, including highly publicized deaths such as the one a short distance from Queen's Park in Toronto.

The government has announced some measures. For example, on December 18 the Minister of Public Works and Government Services announced \$50 million in addition to the \$50 million already committed to the residential rehabilitation assistance program, RRAP, for the fiscal year ending this March. Only \$11.6 million of this money is for the most needy homeless. This is not adequate to meet the need.

In 1996 a decision was made to transfer social housing to the provinces. In some provinces, for example in Saskatchewan, the arrangement has worked. In others, such as Ontario, the situation is bad because of the unwillingness of the Ontario government to build social housing.

Adjournment Debate

It must be noted that Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation can and has played a strong leadership role in the past. Examples are Woodgreen Red Door in Toronto, Metropole Hotel in Vancouver and the Interlodge centre in Montreal.

• (1940)

I urge the federal government tonight to inject new funds into a program for the construction of new social housing units in those provinces that are not taking such initiative themselves, particularly in providing for the homeless.

We all know that in addition to providing shelter, the construction of social housing stimulates the economy, creates jobs and maintains social stability.

Therefore I ask the parliamentary secretary tonight if she can indicate to us whether the government will provide additional funds for the construction of social housing, in particular for the homeless.

Ms. Carolyn Parrish (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the hon. member who has a very long history of deep concern for the less fortunate in society. As a stay at home mom many years ago I followed his career as minister of the environment and was always a big fan.

The minister responsible for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation shares this member's concern, particularly about the homeless.

The government recognizes the importance of affordable, adequate and suitable housing in promoting the health and well-being of all Canadians. We are working to improve the economic climate in Canada to help promote housing, affordability and accessibility.

We also recognize the value of partnerships among governments, community organizations and the private sector in addressing the problems faced by the homeless.

Because of the complexity of this issue many players must be involved in finding a solution. However, there is currently a lack of understanding and consensus on the best methods to address the needs of Canada's homeless.

Governments and service agencies have asked for better documentation and information sharing on best practices for addressing homelessness. In response, CMHC has undertaken two initiatives. First, it has identified a range of best practices in addressing homelessness from across the country and is currently documenting and evaluating ten of the better ones. Selected projects include a variety of project types, population served and regions of the country.

Second, CMHC is investing in the most effective means of passing on information on these and other best practices to those who need it most.

CMHC undertook consultations with shelter agencies and stakeholders across the country in 1998. As a result the corporation is now planning a series of small focused regional round table discussions to take place in April 1999, followed by a national round table in June. These round tables organized in partnership with local networks for service organizations have the following goals: to bring together key people involved directly with the homeless population; to explore the transfer ability of successful approaches; to provide regional and national round tables for the exchange of information and experience among decision makers; to facilitate new links for the partnership opportunities in the development of solutions.

I am afraid I am out of time. I would be pleased to share the rest of that with the hon. member for Davenport.

[*Translation*]

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 2 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.43 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 16, 1999

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Ways and Means

Notice of Motion

Mr. Kilgour 12907

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Adams 12907

Committees of the House

Public Accounts

Mr. Williams 12907

National Parks Act

Bill C-70. Introduction and first reading 12907

Mr. Mitchell 12907

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time
and printed) 12907

Budget Implementation Act, 1999

Bill C-71. Introduction and first reading 12907

Mr. Kilgour 12907

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time
and printed) 12907

Income Tax Act

Bill C-72. Introduction and first reading 12907

Mr. Kilgour 12907

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time
and printed) 12907

Petitions

Iraq

Mr. Adams 12907

Human Rights

Mr. Szabo 12908

Trade

Mr. Riis 12908

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Adams 12908

Request for Emergency Debate

Grain Handling

Mr. Hilstrom 12909

Mr. Breitreuz (Yorkton—Melville) 12909

Speaker's Ruling

The Deputy Speaker 12909

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply

Allotted Day—Criminal Justice

Mr. Reynolds 12909

Motion 12909

Mr. Strahl 12909

Mr. Reynolds 12909

Mr. Szabo 12910

Mr. Reynolds 12911

Mr. Lee 12911

Mr. Adams 12911

Mr. Reynolds 12911

Mr. Reynolds 12913

Mr. Riis 12913

Mr. Reynolds 12913

Mr. Adams 12913

Mr. Reynolds 12913

Mr. Reynolds 12914

Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) 12914

Mr. Reynolds 12915

Mr. Adams 12916

Mr. Reynolds 12916

Ms. Bakopanos 12916

Mr. Reynolds 12916

Ms. Bakopanos 12916

Mr. Bellehumeur 12918

Ms. Bakopanos 12918

Mr. Forseth 12918

Ms. Bakopanos 12919

Mr. Bellehumeur 12919

Mr. Bellehumeur 12920

Mr. Coderre 12920

Mr. Bellehumeur 12921

Mr. Riis 12921

Mr. Riis 12922

Mr. Duncan 12923

Mr. Riis 12923

Mrs. Wayne 12923

Mr. Riis 12923

Mr. MacKay 12923

Mr. Duncan 12925

Mr. MacKay 12925

Mr. Harris 12926

Mr. Obhrai 12927

Mr. Harris 12927

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 12927

Mr. Harris 12928

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 12928

Mr. Harvard 12929

Mr. Harvard 12929

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 12930

Mr. Harvard 12930

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 12930

Mr. Harvard 12930

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River) 12930

Mr. Duhamel 12930

Mr. MacKay 12932

Mr. Duhamel 12932

Mr. Cadman 12932

Mr. Duhamel 12932

Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre) 12932

Mr. Duhamel 12932

Ms. Fry 12933

Mr. Obhrai 12934

Mr. Obhrai 12934

Ms. Fry 12934

Mr. Reynolds 12935

Ms. Fry 12935

Mrs. Barnes 12935

Ms. Fry 12935

Mr. Reynolds 12935

Ms. Fry 12935

Mr. Cadman	12935
Mr. Abbott	12937
Mr. Cadman	12937
Mr. Riis	12938
Mr. Cadman	12938
Mr. Abbott	12938
Mr. Riis	12938
Mr. Abbott	12938
Mrs. Chamberlain	12939
Mr. Abbott	12940
Mr. Myers	12940
Mr. Ramsay	12942
Mr. Myers	12942
Mr. Cadman	12942
Mr. Myers	12942
Mr. Szabo	12942

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Taxation

Mr. Ritz	12944
----------------	-------

Gratien Gélinas

Ms. Folco	12944
-----------------	-------

National Aboriginal Achievement Awards

Mr. Bonin	12944
-----------------	-------

Canadian Curling Championship

Mr. Harvard	12945
-------------------	-------

Health

Mr. Jackson	12945
-------------------	-------

Canadian Police Information Centre

Mr. Abbott	12945
------------------	-------

Sommet de la Francophonie

Mr. Paradis	12945
-------------------	-------

Gratien Gélinas

Ms. St-Hilaire	12946
----------------------	-------

Bell United Way

Ms. Bulte	12946
-----------------	-------

Standing Committee on Transport

Mr. Morrison	12946
--------------------	-------

Ginette Reno

Mrs. Jennings	12946
---------------------	-------

Olympic Advocates Together Honourably

Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	12947
---------------------------------------	-------

Poverty

Mr. Doyle	12947
-----------------	-------

Employment Insurance

Mr. Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	12947
-----------------------------------	-------

Gérald Larose

Mr. Bachand (Saint-Jean)	12947
--------------------------------	-------

Impaired Driving

Mr. Harris	12947
------------------	-------

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Ms. Carroll	12948
-------------------	-------

The East Coast Fishery

Mr. Matthews	12948
--------------------	-------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

The Economy

Mr. Solberg	12948
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12948
Mr. Solberg	12948
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12948
Mr. Solberg	12949
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12949
Mr. Kenney	12949
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12949
Mr. Kenney	12949
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12949

International Forums

Mr. Gauthier	12949
Mr. Dion	12949
Mr. Gauthier	12949
Mr. Dion	12950
Mr. Plamondon	12950
Ms. Copps	12950
Mr. Plamondon	12950
Ms. Copps	12950

Bill C-55

Ms. McDonough	12950
Ms. Copps	12950
Ms. McDonough	12950
Ms. Copps	12950

The Economy

Mr. Jones	12950
Mr. Manley	12951
Mr. Jones	12951
Mr. Manley	12951

The Senate

Miss Grey	12951
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12951
Miss Grey	12951
Miss Grey	12951
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12951

International Forums

Mr. Gauthier	12951
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12951
Mr. Gauthier	12952
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12952

Justice

Mr. Lowther	12952
Mr. MacAulay	12952
Mr. Lowther	12952
Mr. MacAulay	12952

Employment Insurance

Mr. Crête	12952
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12952
Mr. Crête	12952
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	12952

Cuba

Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12953
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	12953
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	12953
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	12953

Employment Insurance

Mrs. Gagnon	12953
-------------------	-------

Ms. Fry	12953
Trade	
Mr. Patry	12953
Mr. Marchi	12953
Grain	
Mr. Hilstrom	12953
Mr. Massé	12954
Mr. Hilstrom	12954
Mr. Massé	12954
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation	
Ms. Lill	12954
Mrs. Bradshaw	12954
Ms. Lill	12954
Mrs. Bradshaw	12954
National Defence	
Mr. Price	12954
Mr. Eggleton	12954
Mr. Price	12954
Mr. Eggleton	12955
Correctional Service Canada	
Mr. McKay	12955
Mr. MacAulay	12955
Grain	
Mr. Johnston	12955
Mr. Massé	12955
Internship Program	
Mrs. Lalonde	12955
Mr. Manley	12955
The Senate	
Mr. Nystrom	12955
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	12955
Taxation	
Mr. Brison	12956
Mr. Dhaliwal	12956
Canadian Public Service	
Mr. Bellemare	12956
Mr. Massé	12956
Rail Transportation	
Mr. Lefebvre	12956
Mr. Collenette	12956
Grain	
Mr. Johnston	12956
Mr. Massé	12956
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	12957
Points of Order	
Tabling of Documents	
Mr. Strahl	12957
Mr. Marchi	12957
Mr. Kenney	12957

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Supply	
Allotted Day—Criminal Justice	
Motion	12957

Mr. Duncan	12957
Mr. Szabo	12958
Mr. Ramsay	12958
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	12959
Mr. Ramsay	12960
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	12960
Mr. Ramsay	12960
Mr. Kenney	12960
Ms. Bakopanos	12961
Mr. Kenney	12961
Mr. Epp	12962
Mr. Kenney	12962
Mr. Telegdi	12962
Mr. Kenney	12962
Mr. Telegdi	12962
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	12964
Mr. Telegdi	12964
Mr. Riis	12964
Mr. Telegdi	12965
Mr. Maloney	12965
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	12966
Mr. Maloney	12966
Mrs. Wayne	12966
Mr. Maloney	12966
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	12966
Mr. Maloney	12966
Mr. Benoit	12967
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	12968
Mr. Benoit	12968
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	12969
Mr. Benoit	12969
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	12969
Mrs. Barnes	12971
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	12971
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	12971
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	12971
Mr. Saada	12972
Mrs. Barnes	12973
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	12974
Mrs. Barnes	12975
Mr. Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	12975

Supplementary Estimates (C), 1998–1999

Concurrence in Vote 1c—Parliament

Mr. Massé	12976
Motion No. 1	12976
Motion No. 1 agreed to	12977
Mr. Dubé (Lévis—et—Chutes—de—la—Chaudière)	12977

Concurrence in Vote 1c—Justice

Mr. Massé	12977
Motion No. 2	12977
Mr. Kilger	12977
Mr. Strahl	12978
Mr. Bergeron	12978
Mr. Solomon	12978
Mr. Harvey	12978
Mr. Nunziata	12978
Motion No. 2 agreed to	12979

Concurrence in Vote 1c—Privy Council

Mr. Massé	12979
Motion No. 3	12979
Mr. Kilger	12979
Mr. Strahl	12979

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 : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9