



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 227 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 12, 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

Wednesday, May 12, 1999

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1400)

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesday we will now sing O Canada, and we will be led by the hon. member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore.

[Editor's Note: Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

CHRONIC IMMUNOLOGICAL AND NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, May 12 is International Awareness Day for Chronic Immunological and Neurological Diseases such as chronic fatigue, fibromyalgia, gulf war and multiple chemical sensitivity syndromes.

These devastating illnesses are striking a growing number of Canadians who suffer from cognitive problems, chronic muscle and joint pain, extremely reduced stamina and numerous other symptoms which leave sufferers ill and bedridden for years at a time. Most sufferers are unable to work because of their pain. However, their suffering is not only physical. A lack of public knowledge about these disorders often causes sufferers their jobs and disability benefits.

A constituent, mother and very close friend of mine, Leni Spooner, suffers from fibromyalgia syndrome. She will live with this condition for the rest of her life. Her 16 year old daughter was also recently diagnosed with the same disorder.

I urge all members of parliament to spread the word about these devastating conditions so that people like Leni and her daughter may suffer a little less.

TRADE

Mr. Deepak Obhrai (Calgary East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, once again the Government of Alberta is taking a leading role in shaping the future of our country.

Recently Premier Klein invited the governors of several north-west U.S. states to Drumheller, Alberta for the annual western premiers conference to be held later this month. Premier Klein's mission is to persuade American politicians that there are provinces within Canada that support a growing and prosperous trade relationship with the United States.

Time and time again, this Liberal government has failed to take a proactive role in addressing contentious trade issues. The split-run magazine issue and Canada's most favoured nation status for U.S. defence contracts are just a couple of the disputes which come to mind.

The official opposition and the provinces are to be commended for taking the lead in ensuring a cordial trade relationship with the United States.

* * *

CHRONIC FATIGUE SYNDROME DAY

Hon. Andy Scott (Fredericton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today is Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Day in the province of New Brunswick. Chronic fatigue syndrome, or CFS, is a debilitating and complex disorder characterized by profound fatigue that is not improved by rest and may be worsened by physical or mental activity. The cause or causes of CFS have not been identified and no specific diagnostic tests are available.

This is a real disease that deserves real research in order to find a cause and cure. Its affects are made worse by the fact it is commonly not recognized within programs that are otherwise available.

In past years in my riding of Fredericton I have participated in the annual elephant walk which raises money and awareness for CFS. This year's walk will take place in the town of Oromocto on May 30. I urge all adults and children in the riding of Fredericton to help this worthwhile cause, because together we can work to make life better for those suffering from chronic fatigue syndrome.

S. O. 31

● (1405)

[Translation]

CANADA HEALTH DAY

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, May 12, is Canada Health Day. It is also the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth.

Canada Health Day is sponsored jointly by the Canadian Public Health Association and the Canadian Healthcare Association.

The 1999 campaign highlights three important environments: home, work and nature.

By working together to make where we are a healthy place to be, we can ensure a promising future for ourselves and future generations.

Let us take this opportunity to thank and congratulate the staff of Canada's health care organizations, facilities and services.

Happy celebrations.

* * *

THÉRÈSE MARTIN SCHOOL IN JOLIETTE

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I draw attention today to the presence in the gallery of Amnesty International student group 731 from Thérèse Martin school in Joliette.

These young people collected more than 2,000 signatures from people opposed to trafficking in human organs, to which Guatemalan street children are prey. Their petition calls on the government of this country to take action to ensure the safety of these children, and of the humanitarian aid workers trying to help them.

I wish to congratulate the man who spearheaded this project, Marcel Lacroix, and the students who took part: Marie-Pier Bellemare, Marie-Élaine Sabourin, Jean-Luc Coutu, Jean-Pierre Coutu, Éric Lévesque and Francis Giraldeau, not to mention Dulus Racine, their spiritual adviser on this worthy endeavour.

The exceptional interest the young students at Thérèse Martin school have taken in children from a less privileged country deserves our heartfelt admiration. May their example pave the way for other humanitarian initiatives to put a stop to this unacceptable practice to which young Guatemalans fall victim.

* * *

TEAM CANADA

Mrs. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, next September, the Prime Minister will leave on a trade mission with Team Canada to promote Canada's economic interests in Australia and Japan.

The mission will focus on seven sectors identified as priorities by our government: aerospace, energy and natural resources, agriculture and food biotechnology, health care, telecommunications and information technologies and, finally, education and the environment.

This fourth trip to the Asia-Pacific region speaks to Team Canada's interest in developing trade ties in the area.

It is one specific way in which the government can promote the professionalism and know-how of Canadians and Quebecers.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, here is yet another poem from an overtaxed Canadian:

Now he's a common, common man.

Tax him. Tax him all you can.

Tax his house, tax his bed,
Tax the bald spot on his head.

Tax his bread, tax his meat,
Tax his shoes clear off his feet.

Tax his pipe and tax his smoke,
Teach him government is no joke.

Tax his "Henry", tax his gas,
Tax the road that he must pass.

Tax the farmer, tax his fowl,
Tax the dog and tax his howl.

Tax his plow, and tax his clothes,
Tax the rag that wipes his nose.

Tax his pig and tax his squeal,
Tax his boots run down at the heel.

Tax his cow and tax its calf,
Tax him if he dares to laugh.

Tax his barns and tax his lands,
Tax the blisters on his hands.

Tax the water and tax the air,
Tax the sunlight, if you dare.

Tax the living, tax the dead,
Tax the unborn before they're fed.

Tax them all and tax them well,
And do your best to make life hell.

* * *

[Translation]

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Departments of Foreign Affairs and International Trade recently distributed a fine document in celebration of the first five years of life of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

[English]

The report presents a scorecard of impressive statistics including a marked increase in trade with the U.S. and Mexico. Added to these global data are seven success stories highlighting quotes from spokespersons in various sectors.

What concerns me is that while I too am committed to open door trade policy, the reports of the impact of NAFTA are highly selective. To obtain a more complete picture we need to see the other side indicating the compromises to our environmental protection policies and our heritage and cultural strategies.

• (1410)

[Translation]

Even if it is difficult to isolate the causes and effects of trade agreements, we have a duty to aim for the utmost transparency, and to present both the negative and the positive aspects of the situation.

* * *

SEMAINE QUÉBÉCOISE DE LA FAMILLE

Mrs. Chritiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this year, the theme of the Semaine québécoise de la famille is “families: a social strength”.

In the past few decades there have been major changes in the family landscape, but the family still remains a keystone of the socio-economic structure of Quebec and of the psycho-affective development of the individual.

Despite the federal government’s never-ending efforts to weaken social programs with its see-sawing social transfers, and its preference for visibility for the maple leaf over the needs of the clientele concerned, Quebec is the province with the greatest investment in services to the family and to children.

Because of its integrated approach, Quebec’s family policy constitutes an innovative solution and offers a real model for the rest of Canada. We in Quebec are justifiably proud of the priority given to a family policy which respects the multiple realities and fundamental needs of families.

* * *

[English]

HMCS EASTVIEW

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a distinct honour and privilege to salute the World War II naval veterans of HMCS *Eastview* who have travelled from across the continent to be here today.

The HMCS *Eastview* escorted convoys from St. John’s to Ireland through cold treacherous U-boat infested waters during the bloody bitter Battle of the Atlantic.

S. O. 31

The Royal Canadian Navy lost 24 warships and suffered 2,024 fatal casualties. However, the *Eastview*’s greatest distinction is the fact that she never ever lost a warship.

* * *

FIFTY WAYS TO LEAVE YOUR JAILER

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, following the revelation that there are 1,000 convicts at large in this country we have come to the conclusion that there must be 50 ways to leave your jailer.

You can slip through the cracks, Jack,
Break out of the can, Stan,
You don’t need to be coy, Roy, it’s not hard to get free.

You can hop on the bus, Gus,
And get lost when you can, man,
And you don’t need a key, Lee, to set yourself free.

You can walk through the gate, Nate,
Or hitch a free ride, Clyde,
There are so many ways, Jay,
To set yourself free.

You won’t have to kill, Phil,
Because the system is lax, Jack,
And there’s no locks to pick, Dick,
To get out on the street.

In no time you’ll be gone, John,
Say goodbye with a wave, Dave,
You don’t even need luck, Chuck,
To walk away from the clink.

Forget the RCMP, G.
They have no funding in B.C.,
It’s so easy to get free,
Under Lawrence MacAulay.

The Speaker: Members should not use each other’s names in the statements.

* * *

WINDSOR—ST. CLAIR

Mr. Rick Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I now represent the riding of Windsor—St. Clair because of the untimely demise of Shaughnessy Cohen whom members all came to know so well.

I have no intention of replacing Shaughnessy. Frankly, I would not know where to start. It is however my intention to serve the people of Windsor—St. Clair and all of Canada to the best of my ability.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many volunteers, family and friends who helped to ensure my victory at the polls on April 12.

Oral Questions

I can say firsthand that our citizens expect the work of the government to continue. They expect us to deliver services and legislation in a balanced and caring way while reducing the tax burden that each of us is feeling.

I would also like to thank the members of the House of every political stripe, and the hard working and diligent staff members who have made me feel so welcome.

* * *

NURSING

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, every member of the House at one time or another has experienced the compassion and skill of our Canadian nurses.

• (1415)

Today, International Nurses Day, we honour these hardworking women and men on the frontlines of health care. The best way to show our gratitude to the people who put care and compassion into health care is to improve their working conditions, hire more full time nurses, improve their training, reward them fairly for their work including pay equity, and, most of all, listen to and address their concerns about the quality of care in our beleaguered health care system.

If we take seriously our responsibility to do that, nurses in Canada will be properly recognized and rewarded for their critically important work, and all of us who use health care services in the country will be the beneficiaries.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, there is a serious staffing situation in the province of New Brunswick which can mean a serious downturn in patient care. Because of the high demand for radiation therapists across the country, provinces are competing for qualified staff to fill vacancies.

Sadly, radiation therapists in New Brunswick are the lowest paid in the country. For that reason many are seeking better paying jobs in other provinces. Already the province has lost four people and one more is planning to leave.

The people of New Brunswick deserve access to qualified health care providers. We need to stress the importance of retaining our qualified, experienced radiation therapists in New Brunswick to care for the hundreds of cancer patients who are in desperate need of treatment. We have an obligation to those patients to ensure that this alarming situation does not create an exodus to the west or stateside and that our health care workers remain in the province.

I challenge Premier Thériault to address this issue. If he does not, Bernard Lord will.

[Translation]

FÉDÉRATION DE L'ÂGE D'OR DE LA MAURICIE

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Fédération de l'âge d'or de la Mauricie is this year celebrating its 30th anniversary in Trois-Rivières.

Indeed, it was in 1969 that senior citizens met to bring together people 50 years of age and older proposing activities to suit their needs and interests.

The Fédération de l'âge d'or de la Mauricie is the birthplace of all seniors' groups in Quebec. On May 19 and 20, thousands of people will gather in Trois-Rivières under the banner "La Fédération, in tune with society for all ages".

As the member for Trois-Rivières, I am proud to pay tribute to all those attending. In this, the international year of older persons, I can assure them they have the support of the Bloc Québécois in defending their interests and in demanding fairness and respect from this government.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, six weeks ago I met an auto plant worker in southern Ontario who had just received a paycheque for overtime work.

He was madder than a boiled owl because the amount the government had ripped out of his paycheque was equal to the amount that was left for him and his family. He said he thought he was working for Chrysler but it turns out he is working half time for the federal government.

When will the Prime Minister provide substantive broad based tax relief for the overtaxed workers of Canada?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have reduced taxes. A surtax of 3% which was put in place by the previous government has been taken away. We have reduced taxes for a family of four with two earners and an income of \$60,000. They have seen a reduction in their taxes of virtually 10%. The same family with an income of \$100,000 has seen its taxes cut by 4.8%, and we have reduced the EI premium by 20%.

We have balanced the books and so on. The people of Canada are much better off today than they were when we took over.

Oral Questions

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister gave that answer to that auto plant worker, the worker would laugh in disbelief.

While the government is promising \$16.5 billion in tax relief by the year 2002, like it promised to get rid of the GST, in fact what it has done is collect over \$42 billion in tax increases since it took office. That is why that worker is paying half of his overtime pay in tax deductions.

The Prime Minister could give every worker in the country a pay increase this year simply by reducing the federal tax rip-off from paycheques. Why does he not do so?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 600,000 Canadians who paid taxes before we reduced them are not paying taxes any more. We have moved in many other fields, as I explained earlier.

• (1420)

Of course for the opposition there is only one problem. It thinks it will solve everything with just that. However, the balanced approach is to have some tax relief and at the same time to help productivity in the land and to resolve social problems. That is the way to have a better society. There is not only one avenue to having a good situation in our country.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister runs a tax system which not only gouges workers but particularly gouges low income workers with almost \$4 billion per year in incomes taxes from Canadians who make \$20,000 a year or less and over \$2 billion per year in payroll taxes from workers who make \$20,000 or less.

The tax policies of the government have become one of the chief contributors to poverty in Canada. How can this tax rich government, which is sitting on a \$7 billion to \$15 billion surplus, justify ripping \$6 billion a year out of the pockets of the working poor?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, a two earner family with two children making \$60,000 is paying \$620 less this year than it was paying two years ago. Also it is paying \$270 less in EI premiums. That gives the family \$900 more in its pocket which it did not have before. It is the right direction.

To have a proper society we must not look only at one side of the ledger. We must look at all the problems of society, which is what my party is doing.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government talks about a balanced approach. Here is some balance. It ripped \$21 billion out of health care and social services and then

it put \$11 billion back in. It ripped out \$42 billion more in taxes and then it says it will give us \$16.5 billion back in tax relief. It looks to me like this is the new Liberal math, and taxpayers just do not get it.

Why does the Prime Minister not just get up off his big fat surplus and give taxpayers the money back that he owes them?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what a compliment. We are standing in the House after five and a half years when we started with a \$42 billion deficit. The country was facing bankruptcy and we have solved it. Now the opposition pretends that we are doing too well.

We will spend a lot more money in health care, \$11.5 billion in the next five years. We have invested in innovation. We have invested in federal health care programs. We have invested in child tax credits. We have done a lot of things so the country is in much better shape.

Thanks again to the member of the opposition for saying that we have done quite well in the last five and half years.

Miss Deborah Grey (Edmonton North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister talks about a surplus as though it is some kind of Liberal largesse. Taxpayers are the ones who looked after that. They looked after balancing the budget. It was not the Liberals.

Every Canadian is paying \$2,000 more in taxes now than they were in 1993. Those are the figures. People have just finished doing their taxes so they know that.

The Prime Minister has a million and one excuses for why he needs these high taxes but he keeps getting mixed up with the facts. They just keep getting in his way.

I would like the Prime Minister to stand in his place and tell Canadians why they have such a big surplus and he still wants to keep his mud hooks on it. Why is that?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reason Canadians are paying somewhat more taxes is because they have a lot more revenue. That is not a problem. That is what happened. It is because interest rates are the lowest they have been in a long time and productivity is increasing.

Perhaps I could quote somebody the Reformers know quite well who had this to say about the opposition's chances in the next federal election:

First, be realistic. There is no way that either the Reform or the UA will beat the Liberals in the 2001 election. Voters do not turf out governments that have presided over economic growth, new jobs and a balanced budget.

This was said by a guy by the name of Ted Morton, senator in waiting, member of the Reform Party.

Oral Questions

• (1425)

[*Translation*]

MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite the damning criticism of Canada's information commissioner, the Minister of Human Resources Development boasts about the government's transparency and has even gone so far as to say that Quebecers in general have great regard for that transparency.

How can a minister accused by the information commissioner of defying the Access to Information Act for 74 days and putting his own interests ahead of those of the public boast about the government's transparency in the House?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us step back a bit.

First, the documents requested by the journalist were provided. Second, there was a delay, for which I am sorry. This delay was due to the fact that my department has twice the number of access to information requests to process that it had one year ago.

We are doing everything possible to meet demand and to ensure that there are no further delays. This is truly making a mountain out of a molehill. There is no substance to the charge.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a molehill that the information commissioner finds unacceptable. The minister held on to these documents during the quota debate to keep the House in the dark.

He responded 95 days after the legal deadline. That is four and a half months during which the information was withheld and concealed, two and a half of them in the minister's office.

How can this minister talk to us about transparency when he has knowingly contravened the Access to Information Act, an act of this parliament?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must say that the leader of the Bloc Quebecois is putting on quite a performance today.

I can assure the House that neither my office nor my officials ever knowingly held up this information. The process is totally transparent.

I admit there was a small delay, but I can honestly tell the House that we are taking very specific measures to ensure that this most

admirable legislation of the Parliament of Canada, legislation which does Canadians proud, continues to be enforced.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister is so concerned about issues of integrity and honesty among the unemployed that he has established an integrity branch in his department, with quotas for harassing the unemployed.

This is the same minister who defies the Access to Information Act when documents requested could put him in hot water.

How can the minister demand integrity, honesty and transparency from the unemployed when he allows himself to defy the Access to Information Act and to deny us this information?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, neither my office nor my department has knowingly delayed the process in this case. We have complied with the Access to Information Act to the letter.

We will continue to do so, unless there are twice as many requests this year as last. We do miss one sometimes.

I can assure you that my department's batting average is excellent. A look at the whole issue will make that clear.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, their batting average may be excellent, but they have recovered so many millions they have exceeded the quotas. We knew that already, the minister did not need to tell us.

While the minister was in hot water in this House, while he was denying the existence, as we will recall, of quotas in his system, how, according to him, was it his office voluntarily hid documents proving that he was lying?

The Speaker: I would ask the hon. member for Roberval to withdraw the word "lying".

Mr. Michel Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word. I will simply say that what the minister was doing was completely—

The Speaker: The leader of the New Democratic Party.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the Prime Minister back from Borden where he had a chance to meet with refugee families, play a little basketball and kiss a little concrete. Let us say he was quick on the rebound.

Oral Questions

● (1430)

All levity aside, surely after being exposed firsthand to the grim experiences of these refugees, the Prime Minister is more sensitized to the unfairness of imposing a head tax on refugees who have lost everything and have nothing.

Will the Prime Minister today assure these refugees and all refugees coming to Canada that if they choose to stay they will not have to pay?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed to hear the New Democratic Party trying to raise a little problem which might happen if the refugees decide to become Canadian citizens. They are here as refugees.

I was very proud to be there and to see how well the refugees are being received by the dozens of volunteers who are working there. The refugees are very happy to be in Canada and are appreciative of what we are doing.

I told the refugees that we do not like being involved in the situation in Yugoslavia, but the reason we are involved is because we want them to have the opportunity to go back home to Kosovo with freedom and protection.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this is not a little problem that might arise. This is a problem now that faces every refugee who comes to Canada.

The finance minister introduced this odious head tax as part of his harsh medicine in 1995. The UN high commissioner for refugees has condemned it. The Canadian Human Rights Commission has condemned it.

How does the Prime Minister justify that Canada remains the only industrialized nation in the world to shake down penniless refugees for \$1,000 a head?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this policy was introduced some years ago. It is a policy that seems to be working because the people who are involved accept it.

The problem is not that people are refusing to come to Canada. People who know that they have to contribute to the cost of the operation are still arriving by the hundreds of thousands. The problem we face is that too many people want to come in and we cannot receive them all.

I think the hon. member is trying to score political points with this. Canada is a country that welcomes more immigrants per capita than any other nation in the world.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, we have been informed that approximately 20% of the troops sent to Kosovo are reservists.

In an internal report it is suggested that the Minister of National Defence is about to cut our reserves from 51 units to 20 in the infantry, from 15 units to 7 in the artillery and from 17 units to 10 in the armoured unit. He has already cut the military from 80,000 to 60,000.

Is the Minister of National Defence and his staff about to cut the strength of the militia in half? If so, what can we expect if another emergency arises?

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the reserves are an important pillar of the Canadian forces. They play a wide variety of roles, both at home and abroad. They have provided assistance during national emergencies and disasters, such as the ice storm and the Manitoba floods.

The document that the hon. member refers to is strictly a working paper. As yet, no decision has been made. The minister will make the final decision.

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am on my feet today with regard to the reserves because we know how important they are.

The internal document outlines the government's plan to cut the services. The document states that these cuts will "result in a reserve structure that will not be viable to meet current or future needs" if they make those cuts.

Will the Prime Minister give us his assurance that not one reserve unit will be cut or amalgamated out of existence, or will the government eliminate the Canadian forces altogether?

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to state again that this is not a government paper, it is just a working paper. There were some suggestions made by DND personnel, but the final decision will be made by the minister.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister seems to be interested in quotes, so I will quote from the intergovernmental affairs minister "I am for the creation of a united alternative that could challenge a national party like ours, the Liberal Party". Obviously, the intergovernmental affairs minister does not share the same views as the Prime Minister.

● (1435)

Speaking of inconsistencies, it is day two of American tax freedom day and Canadians are still sending their paycheques to our taxman.

Meanwhile, the Liberal government sits on top of one of the largest surpluses in Canadian history and tells us it cannot afford a tax cut.

Oral Questions

Those surpluses belong to overtaxed Canadians. They do not belong to the government or the Prime Minister. When is the government going to give that money back to taxpayers?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we want good national parties in Canada. However, the leader of the Reform Party, in trying to unite the right, managed to divide his own party in two. Rather than having two parties on the right, we now have three. If Reform keeps it that way we will be here for a long time.

We will continue having a balanced approach on taxes and social and economic programs in the country because that is the way to do it. We do not want to be single-minded about how to solve problems. We want to care about everybody, especially those—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Medicine Hat.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, maybe the Prime Minister should concern himself with his own party. He has the finance minister and the industry minister both gunning for him lately. He had better be careful. There is a lot to divide in that party.

The Prime Minister says that he wants to help poor Canadians. Why is it then that every year the government takes \$6 billion out of the pockets of Canadians making \$20,000 or less? That is an inconsistency. If he cares so much, why is he taxing the life out of low income Canadians?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have increased the tax exemption for people at the bottom end, and 600,000 people who paid taxes two years ago do not pay taxes any more. We are making much progress.

When we run a government we have to be preoccupied with all sectors of the economy. We have to invest in young people, for example. That is why we have introduced the millennium scholarship program. We have invested in innovation because it is very important for Canada to be ready to compete in the 21st century. I could go on and on with the good programs of this party that Reformers do not even read.

* * *

[Translation]

MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, recently a Quebec minister tendered her resignation because she felt responsibility for an error committed as the result of bad advice from her department.

As for the Minister of Human Resources Development, he has gone against a law of parliament in order to prevent directives that would have disastrous repercussions for him from becoming known.

Given the principle of ministerial accountability, what choice does the Minister of Human Resources Development have left?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I see the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques is resorting to humour today, or maybe it is just his usual bad temper showing through. I do not understand where there can be any parallel between what he is referring to and the situation today.

The journalists have been provided with the documents they requested. The only problem is that there was a regrettable delay because we have twice as many requests as last year. We need to take steps to remedy this. We are going to do just that.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the letter from the information commissioner is clear. The minister's office put his interests before those of the requesting parties and has defied the law all this time. This is totally unacceptable.

On behalf of the unemployed people who have been harassed, on behalf of the MPs who have been refused information, and on behalf of the law that has been broken, I am asking the minister to take the only appropriate step under the circumstances: resignation.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one would think we were back in a referendum campaign.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Human Resources Development.

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew: Mr. Speaker, honestly, I have trouble taking this seriously, but I shall try.

We are being told again that there are employment insurance quotas, when that is totally false. What is more, my office has never deliberately delayed providing information. There was a regrettable delay and we have taken corrective measures.

But the Bloc Québécois, the branch plant of the Parti Québécois, might perhaps have a look at what is going on in the Government of Quebec. We saw to social insurance. There was a target of \$100 million and the same sort of investigation came up with \$112 million.

Oral Questions

• (1440)

*[English]***HEALTH**

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, one excuse the government uses to justify the high taxes in our country is medicare. The U.S. government spends more on its public medic-aid and medicare system per person than does the Canadian government; in fact, \$800 per person more.

With taxes in Canada so high, why is medicare spending so low?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that the Americans spend so much money on health care is that their system is so inefficient compared to ours.

We have just announced that over the next five years we are putting an additional \$11.5 billion into the hands of provinces and they have promised to use it for health care.

We believe in medicare, unlike the Reform Party that would repeal the Canada Health Act and take the American route. If the hon. member does not like the American system, why is he arguing in favour of it?

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is another example of Liberal math. While he was telling us that the government is putting \$11 billion back into medicare, he quietly forgot to say that the government took \$21 billion out five years before. That is Liberal math, is it not?

This is not just an academic exercise. What has it done to Canadians? MRI is very valuable to health care. Here is what a radiologist said about our MRI, "The big shocker is that when Canada is compared to other countries in terms of MRIs per capita, we rank at the bottom".

With taxes in Canada so high, why is medicare spending so low?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the money we have given the provinces should help them address their responsibilities when it comes to MRIs.

This is not an issue of dollars for the Reform Party. It is not an issue of technicalities. It is an issue of policy and philosophy for that party. It does not agree with Canada in our approach to medicare. It does not agree with the Canada Health Act. It does not agree with the equity of making health care available to everybody regardless of what they have in their wallets. It takes a different approach.

We will never agree with the Reform Party and their American style approach to medicare.

*[Translation]***UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES**

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, UNHCR appealed to the international community to honour its financial commitments and hand over the \$66 million promised but not yet forwarded by the end of May.

Can the Minister of Foreign Affairs tell us whether Canada has given UNCHR the \$5 million promised and whether it undertakes to hand over before May 31 the additional \$20 million it promised UNCHR on April 22?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada always honours its commitments. We have already forwarded the money promised.

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, information I obtained only today does not make it clear whether or not the government has handed over the \$5 million.

Did the government hand over the \$5 million to UNCHR and, if not, is there not a credibility problem when a NATO member does not give UNCHR the money it has promised?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have delivered the money, but let us remember that many countries taking part have made grand promises that they have not kept. Pressure must be brought to bear of these countries.

* * *

*[English]***HEALTH**

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals like to say that health care is part of the basic fabric of Canada. We now see how the Liberals treat the basic fabric. They ripped \$21.4 billion out of the cloth and it is full of moth holes now. In spite of the \$800 more per person that the U.S. spends on public health care, American taxes are 30% lower than in Canada.

When is the government going to get off its big fat budget surplus and put the Canadian health care system back on the road to recovery?

• (1445)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just two months ago the government announced that it is increasing by \$11.5 billion over the next five years the amount of money available to the provinces for health care. Just two months ago we announced our plans to spend \$1.4 billion ourselves on areas like

Oral Questions

health research, early intervention with children to prevent illness and improving health for aboriginal and first nations throughout this country.

We know where the Reform Party stands. Reform would rip up the Canada Health Act, turn its back on public health care and opt for an American style model. We believe that health care is part of the fabric of this country.

Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a brother who would love to have the Minister of Health in his math class. This is math from the Liberal perspective.

The numbers are real. The government took \$21.4 billion out of health care. It is going to put back \$11.5 billion and it is telling Canadians to be thankful.

The U.S. government spends more per person on public health than the Canadian government. That is a fact. Canadian taxpayers pay over 30% more in taxes than their American counterparts. What do Canadians have to show for it? Waiting lists, delayed surgery, staffing shortages and the declining health of thousands of people. Thank you very little, Mr. Health Minister.

When will the government begin to act responsibly—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Health.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to like his sums today, so let us try a number on him which maybe he does not know. The member apparently likes the American system of health care. The member did not mention that over 100 million Americans do not have medical insurance because they cannot afford it. The member did not mention that there are tens of millions of working American families who worry that one day they are going to have to choose between their health and their homes.

If the hon. member likes that system, then he is free to go and join them. I will tell him one thing, we will never opt for the American style of health care.

* * *

[Translation]

COPYRIGHT BOARD

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Copyright Board cannot validly sit according to the Official Languages Act to hear the important case involving the representatives of the French language musicians and the cassette producers, because the Minister of Industry has taken so long to appoint French speaking commissioners.

When will the Minister of Industry facilitate the operation of this board, created through the struggles of authors, composers and interpreters?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would say to the member that the hearings of this agency were not delayed by the fact that there were not enough members. However, I will be appointing other members and a deputy chair soon.

* * *

[English]

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

Mr. Gurbax Singh Malhi (Bramalea—Gore—Malton—Springdale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport.

About one million vehicles are affected by recalls every year due to a variety of safety concerns. What will the minister do to get this important information to vehicle dealers and owners more quickly?

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question because it deals with an issue that is of concern to everyone who owns a vehicle in this country.

Transport Canada's first priority is safety. As a result, when a vehicle manufacturer or importer becomes aware of a safety related defect they are required under the Motor Vehicle Safety Act to notify the Department of Transport and to notify in writing each owner of the affected vehicles. Past experience shows us that this really works effectively.

In addition, the Department of Transport mails out a monthly list for recalls to subscribers. I would also like to notify everyone that they can find this information on the web, by inputting the make of the vehicle, the model and the year.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government has said that the charter of rights and freedoms applies to the Nisga'a government. The charter only applies if the Constitution says it applies. The Constitution limits the application of the charter to the federal and provincial governments or their agents.

● (1450)

As the proposed Nisga'a government is neither, I ask the minister, by what authority does she believe the charter applies to the Nisga'a government?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is clear is that the charter applies to all Canadians.

Oral Questions

As we come to the table as a party in negotiating this important treaty, it is clear from the federal government's point of view that the Constitution and the charter of rights apply. We have worked with the province and with the Nisga'a people to assess and sort out the application of laws in all areas of the subject matter pertaining to the treaty.

Mr. John Cummins (Delta—South Richmond, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the charter does not apply just because the government says it applies or because it is included in the treaty. The charter only applies if the Constitution says it does.

For that reason, in the Charlottetown accord, the proposed section 32.1(c) would have placed aboriginal government under the charter.

I ask the minister again: By what authority does she believe the charter applies to the Nisga'a government?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member gets at the heart of the issue of self-government and local government in the context of writing treaties in British Columbia.

If there is one thing I know, when I talk to British Columbians they want to ensure that local decisions are made by local authorities. That is exactly the case for aboriginal people. That is why we are very proud of the legislative structure that has been established in the context of this treaty.

* * *

PUBLISHING INDUSTRY

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, last fall our cultural community rallied around Bill C-55, spending months lobbying and participating in public debate. Now we discover that the bill has been left bobbing in the weeds in the Senate and the real action is taking place behind closed doors in Washington. So much for the parliamentary process.

When will the government let Canadians know the content of this secret deal? Will it allow adequate public debate before signing on the dotted line?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is no deal.

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am only going by reported newspaper articles. The reported trade-off is that we allow Canadian advertising in American split-runs and they put in some Canadian content. I am not convinced that this protects our magazine industry. In any event, this fundamental change is taking place without public debate.

If there are some issues around Canadian content and American ownership on the table, these issues have to come back to parliament before they are signed on the dotted line. Do we have any assurance of that?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN MILITIA

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian army in the first and second world wars was comprised primarily of militiamen.

Today, the Minister of National Defence is prepared to get rid of the militia faster than the German army ever did in the two world wars.

Is the war in Yugoslavia going to be waged on the backs of our Canadian militia?

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, no. These are two different issues.

We are currently doing a study of the reserves. However, the budget for the war in Kosovo is totally another matter.

Mr. David Price (Compton—Stanstead, PC): Mr. Speaker, the document they are studying is very clear. It even contains a lot of details.

Does the minister realize that by doing away with the Canadian militia he will be destroying the cadet corps, the best school of civics available to our young people?

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, the document my colleague refers to is a working document.

I assume it will be one of the many documents the minister will read before making a final decision.

* * *

[*English*]

THE NURSING PROFESSION

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Since this week is nursing week, can the minister tell the House what the government has done to encourage the nursing profession, particularly for the recruitment and retention of nurses?

• (1455)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the essential role played by nurses in our system is too often overlooked. The member for Kitchener Centre has been very instrumental in helping this government do something about it.

I am pleased to announce today, during nursing week, the appointment of Judith Shamian as executive director of nursing policy at Health Canada. In this new and important role, Nurse Shamian, who has an international reputation for her knowledge of

Oral Questions

nursing matters, will help the Government of Canada to ensure that everything it does is consistent with the best interests of nurses and the interests of the public.

We also created a \$25 million nurse fund in the recent budget.

* * *

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in Victoria, British Columbia, the whale watching capital of Canada, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is issuing permits to the Americans to hunt injured whales in Canadian waters.

My question is quite simple. Why is the minister endorsing this insane American whale hunt and why is he not demanding a whaling free zone so that the American problem does not become ours?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as usual the hon. member is quite incorrect. No permit has been issued for the killing of whale in Canadian waters.

* * *

[Translation]

OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals, who gave us the "Guide for the perfect Liberal woman candidate", are at it again.

Indeed, the Office of Energy Efficiency has put out a practical guide for reducing automobile energy consumption. But the guide comes in two versions, one for general readership, and a simplified and less complicated version, which is oddly enough called *AutoSmart Guide* for women drivers.

How can the Minister of Natural Resources explain that this simplified guide has been prepared solely for—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food.

[English]

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would inform the member that the information he is referring to is just what he says it is, a guide. It is not anything but that.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act needs to be enforced against polluters that harm our children. This act requires enforcement by our enforcement agencies.

Will the minister support the phase-out of toxic substances and enhance the enforcement budget of her department to stop polluters in this country?

Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act is an important piece of legislation which is coming back to the House at report stage. The member will have every opportunity to debate it and I am sure at the end of the day he will support it.

Enforcement of that legislation is a priority for my party.

* * *

ROYAL NEWFOUNDLAND REGIMENT

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence.

I come from a province where Canada Day is also Memorial Day. On July 1, 1916 the Royal Newfoundland Regiment was all but wiped out in the first day of the battle of the Somme.

Can the minister assure me that the proposed downsizing of Canada's armed forces reserves will not result in the elimination of the current Royal Newfoundland Regiment?

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think that all Canadians are quite conscious of the enormous sacrifices that were made by the Royal Newfoundland Regiment during the last two world wars.

To reinforce what I have said before, the report that he is quoting from was produced by a group that included Reserve 2000, the councils of honorary colonels and the reserve area commanders. They produced this document in April.

It must now be studied in detail and evaluated against all of the criteria established for reserve restructuring.

* * *

FISHERIES

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans just said that he has not issued any permits.

Let me read a grey whale fishing licence signed by the Government of Canada for the Makah tribal group. This is from last fall. The minister has declared on the record that as soon as they cross into Canadian waters he will issue a licence.

He is not coming clean. He is standing up for the Americans. He is allowing the Americans to hunt grey whales in our waters. We want him to stand up for Canadians.

When is the minister going to take a stand against the Americans and stop this insane American whale hunt?

• (1500)

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should be careful about using the term insanity.

We have to recognize that if a mortally wounded grey whale comes into Canadian waters, Canadians would want to have that animal humanely dispatched. That is a situation where I delegated my authority to the local fisheries officers so it could be done on the occasion that it occurs.

Let me repeat. There is no valid licence to any American group to kill a whale in Canadian waters, and I challenge him to table that piece of paper.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ): Mr. Speaker, while the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is spending millions of dollars to buy back groundfish permits, he is issuing new ones for crab and shrimp in Newfoundland, which means that there is a wholesale conversion of fishers from groundfish to shellfish.

How can the minister explain that he is stepping up shellfish capacity without even a study on the quantities available?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, according to departmental principles and policies, where there is an increase in the shrimp population in the northern zone, these shrimp are made available to fishers in contiguous fishing areas; if the fishers are further away and in another province, distant from that area, they do not get the TAC.

That is very clear, very simple, and the fishers are well aware of it.

* * *

[English]

DEVCO

Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago a delegation of miners' wives from Cape Breton came to Ottawa to seek assurances from the Minister of Natural Resources that he would review the inadequate package offered their husbands. He refused.

In good Cape Breton fashion they went to his boss. After meeting with the Prime Minister they reported that he assured the delegation he would sit the minister down and straighten him out.

Points of Order

My question is simple. Has the Prime Minister sat down the Minister of Natural Resources and told him to improve the Devco package?

Hon. Lyle Vanclief (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the minister has informed the House and Canadians a number of times that there is an adjustment package of \$111 million for workers. It is a fair severance package with early retirement.

A \$68 million economic development package has been made available, along with other programs of HRDC and ACOA to assist in the situation at Devco.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, PC): Mr. Speaker, let me go to the parliamentary secretary again. A national defence proposal to reduce and overhaul the combat role of Canada's reserves is a dramatic policy reversal which would virtually destroy the militia within a few years.

Will the parliamentary secretary be a little more clear? Surely he can indicate if such militia groups as the Royal Newfoundland Regiment are on the chopping block.

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times I can say this but the document they are referring to is just a working paper. It is not government policy; it is just a working paper.

The minister has the final say and we will have to await his decision.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Levon Mkrtchyan, Minister of Education and Science, of the Republic of Armenia.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

* * *

• (1505)

POINTS OF ORDER

MINISTER OF FINANCE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Oral Question Period the finance minister wrongfully attributed to me a statement about health care spending. Worse, he called this misstatement a "fact".

It is crystal clear from *Hansard* that what I actually said was precisely the reverse of what was attributed to me by the finance minister, and I believe it would be in order for *Hansard* to be quoted accurately by—

Routine Proceedings

The Speaker: The record will show what the hon. member said today. It is not a point of order but it is on the record.

GREY WHALE FISHING LICENCE

Mr. Gary Lunn (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, during Oral Question Period the Minister of Fisheries asked me to table the grey whale fishing licence that was prepared by the Government of Canada to be issued to the Makah tribal group of Washington State, U.S.A.

I am quite happy to provide this to him since he is unable to get it in any other way.

The Speaker: I take it the hon. member is seeking unanimous consent to table a document. Is that correct?

Mr. Gary Lunn: Yes.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to table the document?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

In accordance with its order of reference from the House on March 1, the committee has considered vote 25 under Privy Council in the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2000 and reports same.

After an eight year term as an officer of the Parliament of Canada, our Commissioner of Official Languages, Dr. Victor Goldbloom, takes his leave. His legacy is one of positive action in the promotion of Canada's two official languages, a value to prize and promote through designated bilingual instruments and services. We thank him and say au revoir.

[Translation]

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 74th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the membership and associate membership of some committees.

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

• (1510)

JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 19th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

[English]

Pursuant to the order of reference of Wednesday April 21, 1999, your committee has considered Bill C-69, an act to amend the Criminal Records Act and to amend another act in consequence, and has agreed on Thursday, May 6, 1999 to report it with the following amendments listed thereon.

I also have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 20th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Tuesday, October 6, 1998, your committee has considered Bill C-284, an act to amend the Criminal Records Act and the Canadian Human Rights Act (offences against children) and has agreed on Thursday, May 6, 1999 that Bill C-284 be not further proceeded with as the subject matter of the bill has been captured under Bill C-69, an act to amend the Criminal Records Act and to amend another act in consequence.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

Mr. Julian Reed (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today to table, in both official languages, international treaties that entered into force for Canada in 1995, a list of which is also tabled.

As was done with the 1997 and 1996 treaties, I am also tabling two CD-ROMs that contain electronic versions of these 39 treaties.

* * *

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to nine petitions.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Joint Committee on Official Languages.

TERRY FOX DAY ACT

Ms. Colleen Beaumier (Brampton West—Mississauga, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-512, an act respecting Terry Fox Day.

She said: Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce an act respecting Terry Fox Day. Almost 20 years ago Terry Fox captured the hearts and minds of all Canadians. His persistence and passion provided an example to all Canadians of how one person can make a difference.

The bill seeks the recognition of the second Sunday following Labour Day in each and every year as Terry Fox Day.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Speaker, if the House gives its consent, I move that the 74th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs presented to the House earlier this day be concurred in.

The Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to propose this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

GASOLINE ADDITIVES

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am honoured to present a petition signed by residents of Newbury, Wardsville, Arkona and Forest who urge parliament to review the new health studies and ban the gas additive MMT.

Car manufacturers and environmental groups also oppose the use of MMT.

THE SENATE

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour today to present a petition signed by people in different parts of the country including Saskatchewan and Ontario.

It may be a surprise that these citizens are calling upon the Parliament of Canada to listen to the argument that the Senate costs them \$50 million to run, that it is undemocratic, that it is

Routine Proceedings

unaccountable, and that we need to democratize and modernize our parliamentary institutions.

In conclusion they also say that the Senate should be abolished because of those reasons. I am sure you would agree with that, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: It is not for me to agree or disagree.

MARRIAGE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary—Nose Hill, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table in the House today a petition signed by the constituents of Calgary—Nose Hill who believe it is the duty of parliament to ensure that marriage as it has always been known and understood in Canada be preserved and protected.

They therefore pray that parliament enact legislation to ensure that marriage can only be entered into between a single male and a single female.

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table in this House a petition signed by close to 1,000 residents of the Magdalen Islands.

The petition is about the fishery restructuring and adjustment measures put in place in June by the Minister of Human Resources Development and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The petitioners submit that these measures are not geared to the needs of fisheries workers, and that over 800 residents of the Magdalen Islands will be affected by the moratorium. They feel that this change has a major negative impact on their community.

• (1515)

They are therefore asking the government to review the restructuring measures and to adjust these measures to the specific needs of the Magdalen Islands.

[*English*]

MARRIAGE

Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this petition is from citizens of Canada in my riding of Provencher. They draw the attention of the House of Commons to the following: Whereas the majority of Canadians understand the concept of marriage as only the voluntary union of a single male and a single female, and whereas it is the duty of parliament to ensure that marriage, as it has always been known and understood in Canada, be preserved and protected, therefore your petitioners pray that parliament enact legislation such as Bill C-225 so as to define in statute that

Routine Proceedings

marriage can only be entered into between a single male and a single female.

THE SENATE

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to stand in the House today on behalf of many people from Saskatchewan to present a petition that pertains to the Senate. These people are very unhappy with the Senate. They believe it is undemocratic, it is unelected, it is unaccountable and it is costing us \$50 million a year. They want it abolished as soon as possible.

Mr. Chris Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to present what is probably my last petition.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chris Axworthy: I am glad people are happy that it will be my last one.

The petition is from people all over Saskatchewan who confirm what everybody knows, that the Senate is undemocratic, unelected and unaccountable, costs \$50 million and undermines the institutions of this House. They call upon parliament to undertake measures to abolish the Senate.

FISHERIES

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have three different petitions here. The first one is from the beautiful island of Prince Edward Island.

These residents of the province of P.E.I. draw the attention of the House to the fact that the shell fishery is a vital component of the Prince Edward Island economy, that it is seasonal in nature and provides only a basic living for fishers and their families. The petitioners pray upon parliament to direct Revenue Canada, HRDC and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to harmonize record keeping requirements for all shell fishers and inform them of these requirements.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the second petition is from my people in the great Nova Scotia riding of Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore.

They wish to draw to the attention of the House of Commons that the majority of sexual assaults against children are committed by family members or friends of the family. Therefore, the petitioners call upon parliament to enact legislation which would strengthen and protect children from convicted child sex offenders.

CANADA POST

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the last petition is on behalf of the rural route mail carriers of Canada who wish to inform the House that they earn less than minimum wage in working conditions reminiscent of another era. Section 13.5 of the Canada Post Corporation Act prohibits the rural route mail carriers from having collective bargaining rights and are not under the Canada Labour Code. Therefore the petitioners pray upon parliament to repeal section 13.5 of the Canada Post Corporation Act.

THE SENATE

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, it is an honour and a privilege to present this petition on behalf of citizens of British Columbia. I will not read it, but there is a long list of reasons why the petitioners do not think the Senate is an appropriate institution and are calling upon the House to take steps to abolish the Senate of Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Questions Nos. 186 and 224 will be answered today.

[*Text*]

Question No. 186—**Mr. Jason Kenney:**

In the last year for which information is available, what was, in Nova Scotia: (a) the total sales of cigarettes and tobacco; and (b) the sales total of "GST" free or zero rated cigarettes and tobacco?

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed by Finance Canada and Statistics Canada as follows: (a) Personal expenditure on tobacco products in Nova Scotia was estimated at \$372 million in 1997, the latest year for which data are available. This amount includes all applicable taxes.

(b) Information does not exist on the sales total of GST free or zero rated cigarettes and tobacco in Nova Scotia.

Question No. 224—**Mrs. Michelle Dockrill:**

What grants or interest-free loans have been provided by Human Resources Development Canada, Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Industry Canada, Entreprise Cape Breton Corporation, Canada-Nova Scotia Infrastructure Program or Canada-Nova Scotia Cooperation Economic Diversification Agreement to Highland Environmental, Kevin Pembroke or Pembroke Project Managers Incorporated?

Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I am informed as follows: Entreprise Cape Breton Corporation, ECBC, provided a

non-repayable contribution of \$5,000 to Pembroke Project Managers Incorporated in 1996.

No grants or interest-free loans under any of the programs administered by the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, ECBC, Human Resources Development Canada and Industry Canada have been provided to Highland Environmental, Kevin Pembroke or Pembroke Project Managers Incorporated.

[Translation]

Mr. Mauril Bélanger: I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

[English]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Mauril Bélanger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

• (1520)

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Speaker: Colleagues, I have decided on a ruling for groups for report stage of Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development.

[Translation]

There are 236 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-32.

[English]

The motions will be grouped for debate as follows.

[Translation]

Group No. 1: Motions Nos. 1 to 3, 13, 14, 26, 61 to 68, 71, 83 to 91, 93 to 97, 101, 108 to 113, 115, 117, 118, 122, 123, 128, 130, 132, 136 and 206.

Government Orders

[English]

Group No. 2: Motions Nos. 4, 5, 11, 12, 15, 25, 30 to 33, 39, 42, 43, 46, 48 to 52, 56 to 60, 69, 74, 80, 81, 105 to 107, 116, 119 to 121, 125, 129, 133, 146, 147, 155, 156, 159 to 161, 167, 169, 171 to 174, 176, 181, 183, 189, 195, 197, 203 to 205, 207 to 213, 215 and 225.

[Translation]

Group No. 3: Motions Nos. 6, 7, 137 to 139, 148 to 150.

[English]

Group No. 4: Motions Nos. 8 to 10, 16, 18, 19, 22 to 24 and 47.

[Translation]

Group No. 5: Motions Nos. 17, 20, 21, 27 to 29, 34, 35, 40, 45, 54, 55, 72, 75 to 79, 82, 92, 98 to 100, 102 to 104, 114, 124, 126, 127, 131, 134, 136, 140 to 145, 152, 157, 158, 162 to 166, 168, 170, 175, 177 to 180, 182, 184, 188, 190, 196, 199, 216 to 224, 226 to 229, 232, 234 to 236.

[English]

Group No. 6: Motions Nos. 36 to 38, 41, 70 and 73.

[Translation]

Group No. 7: Motions Nos. 53, 151, 153, 154, 185 to 187, 191 to 194, 198, 200 to 202.

[English]

Group No. 8: Motions Nos. 214, 230, 231 and 233.

[Translation]

The voting patterns for the motions within each group are available at the table. The Chair will remind the House of each pattern at the time of voting.

[English]

I shall now put Motions Nos. 1 to 3, 13, 14, 26, 61 to 68, 71, 83 to 91, 93 to 97, 101, 108 to 113, 115, 117, 118, 122, 123, 128, 130, 132, 135 and 206 to the House. These are the motions in Group No. 1.

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-32, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 21 on page 1 with the following:

“knowledges the need to”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-32, in the preamble, be amended by replacing lines 19 and 20 on page 1 with the following:

“knowledges the need to virtually eliminate the most persistent and bioac-”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

Government Orders

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-32, in the preamble, be amended by replacing line 19 on page 1 with the following:

“knowledges, with the agreement of the governments of the provinces concerned, the need to phase out the genera-”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 12 to 16 on page 4 with the following:

“(j) endeavour to protect the environment including its biological diversity, and human health, from the release of toxic substances;”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-32, in Clause 2, be amended by replacing lines 14 to 16 on page 4 with the following:

“from the risk of any adverse effects of the use and release of toxic substances, pollutants and wastes;

(j.1) protect the environment, including its biological diversity, and human health, by ensuring the safe and effective use of biotechnology;”

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-32, in Clause 6, be amended by adding after line 38 on page 11 the following:

“(1.2) In subsection (1.1) “precautionary principle” means that where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.”

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-32, in Clause 64, be amended by replacing lines 34 to 39 on page 38 and lines 1 to 4 on page 39 with the following:

“entering or may enter the environment and (a) has or may have an immediate or long-term harmful effect on the environment or its biological diversity; (b) constitutes or may constitute a danger to the environment on which life depends; or (c) constitutes or may constitute a danger in Canada to human life or health.”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-32, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing lines 10 to 28 on page 39 with the following:

“below any measurable quantity or concentration that is at or approaching the level of quantification, as defined by the regulations, and that

(a) is specified by the Ministers or prescribed; and

(b) in the opinion of the Ministers, results or may result in a harmful effect on the environment or human life or health.

(2) For the purposes of implementing the virtual elimination of a substance, any factor or information that, in the opinion of the Ministers, is relevant shall be taken into consideration as provided for in section 91, including, but not limited to,

environmental or health risks and any other relevant social, economic or technical matters.”

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-32, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing lines 10 to 28 on page 39 with the following:

“below any measurable quantity or concentration that is at or approaching the level of quantification, as defined by the regulations, and that

(a) is specified by the Ministers or prescribed; and

(b) in the opinion of the Ministers, results or may result in a harmful effect on the environment or human life or health.

(2) For the purposes of implementing the virtual elimination of a substance, any factor or information that, in the opinion of the Ministers, is relevant shall be taken into consideration as provided for in section 91, including, but not limited to, environmental or health risks and any other relevant social, economic or technical matters.”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-32, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing, in the French version, lines 13 to 15 on page 39 with the following:

“(2) Les ministres établissent une liste de substances—la liste de quasi-élimination—qui précise la limite de dosage de chaque substance.”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-32, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing lines 17 to 19 on page 39 with the following:

“(3) When a substance is added to the Virtual Elimination List, the Ministers shall recommend that a regulation be made under paragraph 93(1)(w.1) prescribing the quantity or concentration of the”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-32, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing lines 17 and 18 on page 39 with the following:

“(3) When a substance has been listed for virtual elimination, the Ministers shall”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-32, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing lines 17 and 18 on page 39 with the following:

“(3) When the level of quantification for a substance has been specified on the List referred to in subsection (2), the Ministers shall”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-32 be amended by deleting Clause 65.1.

Motion No. 71

Government Orders

That Bill C-32, in Clause 67, be amended by replacing line 7 on page 41 with the following:

“tion (1) unless”

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-32 be amended by adding after line 41 on page 47 the following new clause:

“76.2 In section 76.1, “precautionary principle” means the principle that where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing line 30 on page 48 with the following:

“subsection (4), achieving virtual elimination by implementing subsection 65(3).”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing line 30 on page 48 with the following:

“subsection (4), the implementation of subsection 65(3).”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing line 30 on page 48 with the following:

“subsection (4), the implementation of virtual elimination under subsection 65(3).”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing line 32 on page 48 with the following:

“conducted under section 74 the substance is determined to be toxic and the Ministers are”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 36 on page 48 with the following:

“conducted under section 74, the substance is determined to be toxic or capable of becoming toxic, and the Ministers are satisfied that

(a) the substance may have a long-term harmful effect on the environment and is”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 89

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing lines 16 and 17 on page 49 with the following:

“the Ministers shall propose achieving virtual elimination of the substance under this Act by implementing subsection 65(3).”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing lines 16 and 17 on page 49 with the following:

“the Ministers shall propose the implementation of subsection 65(3) in respect of the substance.”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-32, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing lines 16 and 17 on page 49 with the following:

“the Ministers shall propose the implementation of virtual elimination under subsection 65(3) of the substance.”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-32, in Clause 79, be amended by replacing lines 18 and 19 on page 51 with the following:

“sure, as confirmed or amended, to achieve virtual elimination in respect of a substance by implementing subsection 65(3), the”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-32, in Clause 79, be amended by replacing lines 18 and 19 on page 51 with the following:

“sure, as confirmed or amended, is the implementation of subsection 65(3) in respect of a substance, the”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-32, in Clause 79, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 18 and 19 on page 51 with the following:

“sure, as confirmed or amended, is the implementation of virtual elimination under subsection 65(3) in respect of a substance, the”

(b) by replacing lines 28 and 29 on page 51 with the following:

“proposed actions in respect of the implementation of virtual elimination under subsection 65(3) of the substance in relation to the”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-32, in Clause 79, be amended by replacing lines 28 and 29 on page 51 with the following:

“proposed actions for achieving virtual elimination in respect of the substance by implementing subsection 65(3) in relation to the”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 97

Government Orders

That Bill C-32, in Clause 79, be amended by replacing lines 28 and 29 on page 51 with the following:

“proposed actions in respect of the implementation of subsection 65(3) regarding the substance in relation to the”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-32, in Clause 81, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 17 to 21 on page 54 with the following:

“this section, the Ministers and the minister responsible for the Act of Parliament referred to in paragraph (6)(a) are responsible for determining whether or not the requirements referred to in that paragraph are met by or under that other Act, or”

(b) by replacing line 23 on page 54 with the following:

“(a) if the Ministers and that other minister determine”

(c) by replacing lines 27 and 28 on page 54 with the following:

“regulations made under that Act, the Ministers and that other minister may by order add to”

(d) by replacing line 35 on page 54 with the following:

“(b) if the Minister and that other minister determine”

(e) by replacing, in the English version, line 39 on page 54 with the following:

“in Schedule 2, the Ministers and that other minister may”

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-32, in Clause 91, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 63 with the following:

“Ministers is achieving virtual elimination by implementing subsection 65(3) shall specify”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 109

That Bill C-32, in Clause 91, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 63 with the following:

“Ministers implements subsection 65(3) shall specify”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 110

That Bill C-32, in Clause 91, be amended by replacing line 34 on page 63 with the following:

“Ministers is the implementation of virtual elimination under subsection 65(3) shall specify”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 111

That Bill C-32, in Clause 91, be amended by replacing line 7 on page 64 with the following:

“with respect to achieving virtual elimination by implementing subsection 65(3) and sum-”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 112

That Bill C-32, in Clause 91, be amended by replacing line 7 on page 64 with the following:

“with respect to the implementation of subsection 65(3) and sum-”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 113

That Bill C-32, in Clause 91, be amended by replacing line 7 on page 64 with the following:

“with respect to the implementation of virtual elimination under subsection 65(3) and sum-”

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-32 be amended by deleting Clause 92.1.

Motion No. 117

That Bill C-32, in Clause 93, be amended by adding after line 6 on page 67 the following:

“(w.1) for the purposes of subsection 65(3), the quantity or concentration of a substance that may be released into the environment either alone or in combination with any other substance from any source or type of source;”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 118

That Bill C-32, in Clause 93, be amended

(a) by replacing, in the English version, line 16 on page 67 with the following:

“surements or monitoring;”

(b) by replacing line 19 on page 67 with the following:

“carry out the purposes of this Part; and

(z) for the purposes of subsection 65(3), the quantity or concentration of a substance that may be released into the environment, either alone or in combination with any other substance from any source or type of source.”

Hon. Andy Mitchell (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 122

That Bill C-32, in Clause 95, be amended by replacing, in the French version, lines 13 and 14 on page 69 with the following:

«violation d'un règlement pris en vertu des articles 92.1 ou 93 ou d'un arrêté pris»

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC) moved:

Motion No. 123

That Bill C-32, in Clause 95, be amended by replacing line 18 on page 69 with the following:

“regulation made under section 93 or an”

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (for the Minister of the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 128

That Bill C-32, in Clause 100, be amended by replacing line 1 on page 74 with the following:

“100. The Ministers may, by”

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.) moved:

Government Orders

Motion No. 130

That Bill C-32, in Clause 100, be amended

(a) by replacing line 15 on page 74 with the following:

“(c) for the purposes of implementing international agreements, add to Part 3 of the Export Control List”

(b) by replacing line 17 on page 74 with the following:

“which is severely restricted in Canada by or under an”

Motion No. 132

That Bill C-32, in Clause 101, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 75 with the following:

“specified in Parts 1 and 2 of the Export Control List in Sched-”

Motion No. 135

That Bill C-32, in Clause 102, be amended by replacing line 32 on page 75 with the following:

“specified in Parts 1 and 2 of the Export Control List in Sched-”

Motion No. 206

That Bill C-32, in Clause 199, be amended by replacing lines 43 to 46 on page 139 and lines 1 to 11 on page 140 with the following:

“an environmental emergency in respect of a substance or group of substances specified on the List of Toxic Substances in Schedule I.”

- (1530)

He said: Mr. Speaker, we are debating the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. I will take a few moments to describe for the people who are watching what we are debating.

This is legislation that was brought forward in 1988 and in the legislation it stipulated that it would come back to the House in five years for review. It came back in the last parliament; however, the bill that was proposed did not gain support and died on the order paper. In this parliament Bill C-32 is the result of the new bringing together of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

- (1535)

It is a large bill. It is comprehensive. It is technical and it contains over 230 pages. What is significant is that there were over 400 amendments introduced at committee stage. Now there are 236 amendments at report stage. There are more amendments than the House has seen to any bill in a number of years according to the clerks.

We will be discussing in the first group of amendments the management of toxic substances, the application of virtual elimination, inherent toxicity and prior informed consent. This is a fairly technical bill and we will be dealing with some of these issues.

I would like to talk about the application of virtual elimination. Virtual elimination means pretty well what it says, that a chemical would be virtually eliminated. However, the difficulty with this bill

concerns the ability to measure. I will be showing my age, but if we go back 20 or 30 years most of us will remember that the ability to measure was in parts per million, then it went to parts per billion, then to parts per trillion, and perhaps now to parts per quadrillion.

Industry requires goal posts. For instance, when building a plant, if there is a nasty chemical such as dioxin, which occurs naturally in forest fires or wood smoke, if that is to be virtually eliminated, industry requires goal posts to be set. If industry knows that it is one part per billion, it can deal with that. Industry will know what it will be dealing with down the road. However, the bill does not say that with respect to virtual elimination. Therefore, we have proposed, along with a number of other people, changes to clarify the issue. Unless changes are made to the application of virtual elimination in the bill, Canada will be out of step with internationally accepted approaches. For example, Germany has numbers.

A witness appeared before the committee who made a very pointed remark. If there is a point of one part per billion and industry steps over it, it can be taken to court. It is very clean cut. However, if there is a very fuzzy goal post of the ability to measure, that could be in litigation for over 10 years. In fact, technology could supersede the ability to measure and it would just muddy the waters.

An enormous disincentive will result when companies are forced to plan for unrealistic results. There are really no environmental or health benefits from this approach. It simply ties the hands of investment in this country.

The Reform Party has put forward 10 motions which deal with the application of virtual elimination. It is interesting, as well, that the government and the Progressive Conservatives have put together 13 amendments to bring the application of virtual elimination into a scope that we can all deal with.

There are a number of amendments put forward by the Reform Party and the government which ensure that specific reference to implementation of subsection 65(3) is maintained in the act when dealing with the application of virtual elimination. Many of the motions accomplish virtually the same thing as our motions. In fact, the reason they are grouped is because they are very similar.

The intent of the amendments put forward by the Reform Party is to eliminate ministerial discretion when determining whether circumstances have been taken into consideration and to emphasize the role of science in decision making.

In 10 minutes one cannot really deal with many of these subjects in depth because of their complexity, but I would also like to deal with prior informed consent, which is addressed by our Motions Nos. 130, 132 and 135. Our amendments would ensure that Canada prohibits the export of substances placed on a list which, by international agreement, are banned or severely restricted substances, rather than allowing the government to prohibit the export of any substance regulated in Canada.

Government Orders

• (1540)

I was really quite surprised that the government did not propose amendments with respect to sections 100, 101 and 102 of the act concerning the implementation of the prior informed consent convention that Canada has entered into. When the government introduced these sections to the committee it was explained that the purpose of these sections was to allow Canada to fulfil its obligations under the prior informed consent convention, which is also known as the Rotterdam convention, which was finalized last fall.

The sections which the government proposed, while they enable Canada to fulfil its obligations under that convention, are far broader than what is necessary for the purpose. I believe that is the crux of the matter. The main point is: How broad do we need this act to be? The act should fulfil the convention. However, it goes far beyond that and gives far broader powers than we feel are necessary. The legislation should not go beyond what the government initially said was necessary.

In Reform Motion No. 90 we suggest that the purpose should be, as was explained to the committee by government officials, for the implementation of international agreements. We agree with that.

Since the international agreement that we are talking about is the prior informed consent convention, we need to look at the scope of that convention. The negotiating process resulted in the PIC convention being applied to banned and severely restrict substances. The term severely restricted is clearly defined in the convention.

We feel that powers should not be created for the government to ban the export of substances without their being sound reasons in the bill. At present there are no sound reasons shown in the bill. Powers such as these, which can be exercised arbitrarily without any guidance from parliament, will create significant investment uncertainty in Canada in the business world.

This uncertainty is particularly important and worrisome for the increasing numbers of companies which have as their primary focus of business in Canada export opportunities. We are well aware that the world is shrinking and that Canada is an exporting country. Therefore, this portion of the bill is very worrisome for many industries in Canada.

Another reason this issue is important is that if Canada is to take a leadership role on environmental issues internationally, which the Reform Party and I am sure most members of the House support, it is important that we are responsible domestically to implement what we negotiate and agree to. To implement something that goes beyond what we agree to in an international convention I do not believe is wise and will be seen by our negotiating partners as irresponsible. We would put at risk Canada's status as an international leader.

We do not want to create unnecessary powers for the government for no apparent reason which go beyond PIC powers and create investment uncertainty. We hope that other parties will agree to this approach and vote favourably to the proposed amendments to sections 100, 101 and 102.

I will conclude at this point. My colleague will continue to speak about inherent toxicity and toxic substances which are also in this group. As I said earlier, it is very difficult to capsule in 10 minutes what is a 232 page bill.

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Bill C-32 and to the many motions that have been put forward within Group No. 1.

As the member opposite has recognized, the motions that we are dealing with today deal with export controls, virtual elimination and focus on toxics. The preamble of Bill C-32, as amended by the standing committee, talks about the phase-out of the generation and use of persistent and biocumulative toxic substances.

Government Motion No. 2 proposes an amendment to make the statement in the preamble consistent with that which is in the bill.

There are also changes on biotechnology and the administrative duties of the bill. As a result of the amendments put forward by the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development, the administrative duties now correctly reference products of biotechnology.

• (1545)

For clarity, government Motion No. 9 retains this reference but places it in a separate clause that recognizes the need to protect the environment by providing for the safe and effective use of biotechnology.

I think all members will agree that the bill in its entirety is focused on making sure that we are producing a win for the environment, a win for the Canadian public and a win for the future health of Canadians. The bill is on the leading edge of environmental protection worldwide. It focuses on pollution prevention, the protection of our environment and the health of all Canadians. It strengthens the environmental protection act, as the member opposite has mentioned, a piece of legislation that came in some five years ago.

One of the key components of the bill is the section on virtual elimination. Virtual elimination means reducing the releases to the environment of a very small number of the most dangerous toxic substances to a level where these releases cannot be measured.

Government Orders

Right now we are talking about 12 substances in Canada that have been found to meet the criteria for virtual elimination. Nine of these substances, one example being DDT, are banned in Canada. Controls are in place or are being developed for the remaining three. There are 23,000 substances in commerce in Canada. It is estimated that over the next number of years 10 or 12 could also be slated for virtual elimination.

Why are we doing this? Even extremely small releases of certain substances to the environment can create problems that are extremely costly or impossible to correct. This is particularly true of substances that are: toxic as defined under the environmental protection act; primarily the result of human activity; persistent, take a long time to break down, if ever; and bioaccumulative, collect in living organisms and end up in the food chain.

A prime example of this is the insecticide DDT, which I mentioned earlier. It was introduced into Canada in the 1940s. It was responsible for causing drastic reductions in many bird populations, especially those at higher levels in the food chain such as gulls, cormorants and bald eagles.

Despite the ban in Canada on all major uses of DDT in the 1970s, today DDT is being detected in the breast milk of Canada's Inuit people. The bill will make sure that we remove these substances from our communities and from the environment in Canada.

The bill is based on the regulatory relief limit that is very precise, the limit that industries will be obliged to meet after this limit is set. That will come after consideration of the health and environment risk to Canadians, of the social and economic situation, and of technical matters. Does the technology exist? Do we need to develop something else?

Sometimes achieving the virtual elimination of these substances will not be immediately feasible. The bill recognizes the need to consider all these matters.

The government amendments to these sections, represented in a whole series of motions, will make it clear that virtual elimination planning and regulatory requirements will be set after consideration of environmental or health risks, as well social, economic and technical matters. This is a common sense approach.

With the special regime for the virtual elimination of the most dangerous and toxic substances, Bill C-32 is on the leading edge.

The member opposite talked about inherent toxicity. To be slated for virtual elimination, a substance must meet the criteria for toxicity in section 64 of the bill. Government Motion No. 88 clarifies ambiguous language in subsection 77(3) to make sure that the only toxic substances are put on the track to virtual elimination. This is consistent with other sections in the bill and the government's commitment to risk-based decision making.

Let us talk about export controls. Government Motion No. 128 is a technical amendment to make it clear that it is both the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health who add a substance to the export control list. This is about stewardship. It is about people being responsible within our borders for what they are producing and what they are sending elsewhere.

I would like to talk for a couple of seconds about some of the opposition motions that are before us. The Bloc Quebecois have several motions that would need the agreement of the provinces before we could move ahead with virtual elimination of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances.

Let us be clear. In 1998 the federal government and all the provinces and territories endorsed the national policy for the management of toxic substances. That policy is reflected in the bill.

• (1550)

Bill C-32 is consistent with the policy which calls for the virtual elimination of persistent and bioaccumulative toxic substances. With the new CEPA, the federal government will continue to work closely with its provincial and territorial partners in taking action to deal with toxics.

The New Democratic Party wants to alter the definition of toxic and to abandon the current practice of making decisions based on risk. The government is committed to a risk-based approach when dealing with toxic substances. Basing our decisions on an assessment of risk to the environment and human health is the internationally accepted way of doing things. Abandoning it would produce no environmental benefit and would put Canada out of step with the other nations with whom we work so closely to protect the environment from the threat of toxics.

Both the Bloc Quebecois and the Reform Party want to return the definition of virtual elimination to that which was originally proposed in the bill. The standing committee heard that the definition of virtual elimination that originally existed was confusing and could have been interpreted in conflicting ways. The government amendments corrected this problem. The definition in the bill is clear and credible.

Ultimately, reducing releases of the most dangerous of toxics to the point where they can no longer be measured is our goal for virtual elimination. Striving for anything less would put the environment and the human health of Canadians at unnecessary risk.

Let us talk about the Progressive Conservative amendments. Substantive gains have been made in this piece of legislation. Since there are several pieces of federal legislation that govern new substances and the expertise is shared across several government departments, it is appropriate that the decision making is in the hands of the governor in council.

Government Orders

A key point of the bill, which some people choose to ignore, is that CEPA sets the standard. Other acts must assess for toxicity to determine if the new substance has the potential to harm the environment or human health.

Let us talk about the Reform cross-referencing amendments to delete all mention of virtual elimination outside the definition in section 65. That would make the goal of virtual elimination unattainable. It would leave the definition of the bill without any corresponding operational clauses. We are not prepared to do that. It would be bowing to industry, to the mythology of some of the paranoia that has existed.

Reform amendments to the export control provisions would weaken Canada's ability to control exports of dangerous substances. It would add "for the purposes of implementing international agreements" and the concept is "severely" restricted. These limit the scope of the sections dealing with the export of toxics. It would take away Canada's ability to control exports of potentially dangerous chemicals unless they were covered by an international agreement.

Reform Motion No. 92 would make it impossible for Canada to control exports of CFCs which are responsible for depleting the earth's ozone layer. It would be kowtowing to industry, it would not be a good thing and it would take us to pre-Reform Party, pre-1985.

The bill is about stewardship. It is about pollution prevention. It is a good bill that is important for the health and environment of all Canadians. I urge all members to support it with the amendments we are proposing.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak to the report stage of Bill C-32, and to have an opportunity to show you just how many shortcomings there are in this bill.

This was my first experience with a clause by clause study of a bill in committee. I must say it was a most disconcerting experience for me, to say the least.

The process was a lengthy one, and introducing and withdrawing hundreds of amendments was very confusing. To top it all off, for a number of clauses, the English and French versions did not correspond. We adopted more than 160 amendments, and no doubt there would have been more if we had not got fed up.

Still today, at the report stage, the hundreds of amendments before us prove without a doubt that this bill needs to be totally reworked, not just changed here and changed there, but totally reworked. Otherwise, we will end up with a bill that lacks rigour, consensus and vision.

Throughout this committee process, I noted this government's flagrant lack of good will. Here we are, stuck with an unfinished

bill for the next 10 years. This is not a process that is undertaken every year.

• (1555)

We in the Bloc Québécois wanted to do this. Here are a few examples to show our good will on this issue.

First, public participation: what a lovely expression. Unfortunately the government is letting cumbersome administrative and legal procedures take precedence over the public's legitimate demand for a healthy environment.

Second, toxic substances: once again, the government is putting off updating the list of toxic substances. It will wait seven years. When will the new substances be analyzed? This is urgent. Why procrastinate?

Third, enforcement: with this bill, the federal government wants to set new rules for the environment. How can it enforce them? Even with the current legislation, it has cut staff drastically. There are fewer inspectors, so there is less enforcement. The government cut the department's budget by several million dollars. It should seek to enforce what is already in force before thinking of extending its power to interfere in areas under provincial jurisdiction.

Some facts must be pointed out. We will recall that, on December 15, 1995, the Liberal government proposed revising the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. The proposal by the Minister of the Environment at the time was the government's response to the fifth report of the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development entitled "It's About Our Health—Towards Pollution Prevention".

This response set out the broad lines of a proposal to renew the federal government's main legislative measure on environmental protection, CEPA. This was a promise made in the red book.

The Bloc opposed the report, and made that perfectly clear by tabling a minority report. Most of the recommendations in the majority report supported the centralizing tendency of the federal government in environmental protection matters.

The Bloc Québécois refutes the theory of the double safety net and contends that the environment would be better served if responsibility for its protection were given to one level of government only.

The Bloc Québécois firmly believes that the provinces, especially Quebec, have greater knowledge of the specifics of their natural environment and are in a position to arouse the interest and encourage the participation of local residents, are more open to the claims of environmental groups, are able to conclude significant agreements with national and international partners and have

indicated their desire to find solutions to environmental challenges and to contribute actively to sustainable development.

The government introduced Bill C-74, but the bill died on the order paper when the election was called in 1997. After the election, the government introduced a new bill, Bill C-32, born from the ashes of Bill C-74, at first reading on March 12, 1998.

It should be noted that the Canadian Environmental Protection Act is required to undergo a review every five years, and that deadline is already past.

Does the renewed Canadian Environmental Protection Act give powers to Quebec and the provinces? Definitely not.

In theory, Bill C-32 recognizes the environment as a shared responsibility between the federal government and the provinces. Unfortunately, all the rhetoric and pious wishes are not matched with action.

The bill does not delegate any power to Quebec or any of the provinces, which is contrary to what true environmental harmonization between the various levels of government should be.

With Bill C-32, now at report stage, the Liberal government is reinforcing the federal government's supremacy in the area of environmental protection.

This bill opens the door to duplication of federal and provincial powers. To this end, the government even dares to hide behind the latest supreme court ruling on an environmental issue, in *P.G. Canada v. Hydro Quebec*.

I will now address the four main changes made to the bill at committee stage.

• (1600)

A new definition of virtual elimination is provided at clause 65.(1). It reads:

In this part, "virtual elimination" means, in respect of a toxic substance released into the environment as a result of human activity, the ultimate reduction of the quantity or concentration of the substance in the release below the level of quantification specified by the ministers in the list referred to in subsection (2).

Before we create new definitions devoid of meaning, we must make sure we can achieve the highest standards in the world. By way of example, the harmonization of federal environmental standards with those of European countries, such as Germany, would be a big step in the right direction.

We could see there was a problem of harmonization among the various positions in the bill referring to virtual elimination. The new definition of virtual elimination has not been uniformly applied to all the clauses concerning this issue. Accordingly the Bloc Quebecois is proposing amendments to respond to these inconsistencies in Bill C-32.

Government Orders

The committee eliminated all references to cost-effective measures the government was to take under Bill C-32. The committee based its decision on the fact that the government did not want to explicitly define the word cost effective in the bill.

In the face of this legal void, the committee decided it was simply preferable to eliminate the term, considering that in the context of sustainable development, it is understood that government measures are to be cost effective. On this issue, the Bloc Quebecois' position was the same as that of the committee. We should delete a term that has not been defined in the act.

Hormone disrupting substance means a substance having the ability to disrupt the synthesis, secretion, transport, binding, action or elimination of natural hormones in an organism, or its progeny, that are responsible for the maintenance of homeostasis, reproduction, development or behaviour of the organism.

The bill now specifies that the federal government shall conduct research or studies relating to hormone disrupting substances for preventive and abatement purposes, to deal with the negative effects of these substances on health.

In this regard, we think the federal government should limit its activities to conducting research and studies in this area. All the other aspects mentioned in the bill should come under the provinces' responsibility.

The greatest concern about Bill C-32 is undoubtedly the issue of harmonization with the provinces. Under the original version of Bill C-32, the federal government was going to act in accordance with the intent of intergovernmental agreements. The Liberal majority softened this requirement by adding the word endeavour before the verb to act.

The Bloc Quebecois maintains that the federal government must always keep in mind the prospect of harmonization with the provinces, to avoid duplication and overlap in the legislation and regulations. By trivializing federal-provincial harmonization agreements, the Liberal government clearly shows that it lacks the will to respect the jurisdiction of the provinces with regard to the environment.

The Bloc Quebecois will table amendments, including one to have the term "endeavour" deleted from the current version of Bill C-32. I hope the government will give us its support.

As for the agreements respecting the administration of the act, clause 9 of the bill provides that the minister "may negotiate with a government with respect to the administration of this act".

Considering all the issues raised, the Bloc Quebecois is opposed to this bill at report stage.

*Government Orders**[English]*

Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to speak to an act respecting pollution. If we stopped at that we would be in great danger.

Pollution in this country was given a free ride for generations and decades. The protection of the environment and human health is the most important part of the act and contributes to sustainable development. That is the weight of this act.

- (1605)

We must respect the toxicity and the dangers pollution poses to our health, our organisms, our plants, our animals, our biodiversity, the air we breath, the water we drink, and the food we eat. Pollution has made its way into our entire being. Therefore we must find strong legislation.

We received a wake-up call in the 1960s when the terms ecology and ecologists came into being, along with the environmental bill of rights for all Canadian citizens, especially our children. That is what CEPA is deemed to be and where it will evolve in the future. It may not have achieved it in this round and it certainly did not achieve it in the first round.

In the first round pollution control was the key word. We tried to control pollution in our air, our water and our soil. Bill C-32 is designed to bring about pollution prevention, to eventually stop pollution.

That is the challenge we faced when we looked at the original draft of Bill C-32 during clause by clause consideration. It was referred to the committee on April 28, 1998. It took us a whole year to review it. Up to now over 800 amendments have been brought forward. This is strong enough message that something was wrong with the basis of the bill.

The committee heard from non-government environmental organizations and health associations across the country. These organizations and countless other groups came before the committee to offer their view that the bill was a biased industry bill designed and drafted for industrial purposes.

Last September committee members asked these organizations how much access they had to the minister. All these health and environmental organizations said that they had limited access to the Minister of Environment. We asked the same question of industry representatives who replied that they had unlimited access to the minister. They were happy with the balance between the environment and the economy as set out in the bill.

Through the whole committee process everybody rolled up their sleeves in a happy forum under the auspices of a good chair. In this

democratic process we tackled the bill through thick and thin. Many amendments were lost and won. We felt the bill stood a chance of getting passed in the House. We looked forward to possibly supporting the bill which would ensure good health for our children and our families and clean air, clean water and clean lands.

We endeavoured to look at pollution prevention. We looked at a number of opportunities to enhance it. One of the issues that came out was precautionary principle, one of the highlights of the bill, which included the term cost effective. Through the committee process we were successful in taking the cost out of effective measures. Cost effective did not take into account that there were health matters. If pollution continues to enter our environment and continues to inflict illnesses on our children there are various costs: the health costs, the loss of work costs, the insurance costs, the cost of securing homes, the cost of buying cleaner water, and the cost of ensuring food is well prepared. These costs are not taken into consideration. The cost for our citizens, the cost for Canadians for clean food, clean water and clean air were not the definition of cost effective.

- (1610)

Cost effective was an industrial measure for controlling pollution. It was uppermost in the government's mind. Lo and behold we tossed out cost effective and included measures, that beyond scientific evidence precautionary measures should be taken.

Again cost effective came back into this round of amendments before the House from the government side. Obviously the industry has put its foot down. We would tell all members and all Canadians who are listening that the cost effective measures do not improve environmental measures. They look after the industry's needs and the industry's costs.

Another issue comes into play, that is virtual elimination which is a new term in law. In essence Bill C-32 is a piece of legislation which will be the law of the land. Virtual seems to be a high tech word. It is like virtual reality. It is not quite there. In my interpretation of virtual elimination we do not really want to prohibit or phase out toxic substances. We will try to do it to a point but there will always be a trickle of toxic substances in Canada.

I was quite startled when the minister said that in law we could not measure zero. That was a real awakening call. It will be a challenge to try to find a legal definition of zero. The closest the government has come up with is virtual elimination.

We lived through this phase of virtual elimination. We accepted where it was going. We kind of understood the integrity of the government, that it would try to achieve virtual elimination in the evolution of the bill and carry forward. However a big part of the virtual elimination is in clause 65(3) where the topic is defined as achieved virtual elimination.

Government Orders

Achieving virtual elimination is the task at hand. Members have proposed amendments to remove the achieving of virtual elimination. It is unacceptable. It does not make any sense for it to be taken out of the bill because achieving virtual elimination was the task of Bill C-32.

Another issue, which I will close on, is the phase-out of the generation and use of toxic substances. There are amendments to take out this part of the preamble and replace it with virtual elimination.

Canadians would understand and sleep better at night if they knew that the preamble of the bill was to phase out the generation and use of toxic substances. In essence the government and some of its members want to have virtual elimination in the preamble.

• (1615)

Mr. John Herron (Fundy—Royal, PC): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to have the opportunity to speak to Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, at report stage. When the member for Davenport talked about this piece of legislation, he referred to it as “a very pioneering bill. It is Canada’s principal bill with respect to the controlled use of toxins in the environment.

It was a very pioneering bill that was first established by the Progressive Conservative Party in 1988 by the hon. Tom McMillan and spearheaded by the former environment minister, the hon. Jean J. Charest. It is in that light that I take great pride in trying to augment this particular bill as we went through the clause by clause process at committee level.

Alarm bells should go off for Canadians when they hear that the bill had over 400 amendments at the clause by clause process and now we are facing over 200 amendments. That is almost 700 amendments. I believe this shows that the bill is flawed in its own right.

After speaking to my colleague for Richmond—Arthabaska, I know he is not all that surprised by this. This is a government, after all, which has not passed one piece of environmental legislation despite the fact that it has been in office for six years. It did pass the MMT bill but that cost Canadian taxpayers \$16.5 million because it was not banned under CEPA, which is what the government should have done in the first place.

The fact that we are cleaning up the government’s work should not come as a surprise to Canadians when it comes to the environment.

I will refer to a couple of issues that fall in Group No. 1, particularly the issue of virtual elimination. We were satisfied that the original definition contained in the bill before it went to committee was workable. It provided for the reduction of releases

to a quantity of concentration below a measurable amount that was at or approaching the lowest level of quantification.

We supported regulations to control the release of substances to define virtually eliminated amount. We also supported the bill’s power under section 93 to totally, partially or conditionally prohibit the manufacture, use and processing of toxic substances. We believe that if the government intended on eliminating use of a substance, it should use the provision. Otherwise, if it intends to virtually eliminate a substance then it should be able to set levels of release by regulation that are virtually negligible.

I would like to mention something that is almost unprecedented in my short time here in the House and, as I understand it, for a lot of people who have been here for quite some time. We are about to make an amendment to an amendment.

The government had a definition in Bill C-32 of virtual elimination before it went into the clause by clause process. The parliamentary secretary tabled an amendment which passed. He is now tabling another amendment admitting the government goofed not once, but twice. I think the government had it right the first time, but at least it had the sense to recognize that. It tabled an amendment just the other day after we had already put in the amendment that corrected it.

We now have two levels of virtual elimination to establish and achieve. It is unclear as currently written which one would be deemed the operable amount. There is first a supreme goal of virtual elimination defined as the ultimate reduction of the quantity or concentration of the substance in the release below the level of quantification specified by the minister in the virtual elimination list.

Level quantification is defined as the lowest possible measured amount. The ultimate goal is to get below that amount.

Then there is this process to help us gradually get there and it is called “achieving virtual elimination”. In this section, the minister prescribes a quantity or concentration of a substance that may be released into the environment. This is very different from “below a level of quantification, which is the lowest concentration that can be accurately measured”. Instead it is a realistic level that industry is required to attain when aiming for elimination.

If the government’s intentions were to make the level set under achieving virtual elimination the objective industry is to pursue, then it should be made clear. My amendments, the amendments of the Progressive Conservative Party, make this process clear. They clean up the change the government and the Reform Party supported in committee.

I would like to emphasize that this mistake was actually supported by not one party but two parties at the clause by clause

Government Orders

level: the government and the Reform. However, both parties have recognized that the original wording was the right way to go.

• (1620)

The government's amended committee language creates uncertainty. This is because there is a gap between a level that is a step below the lowest measurable quantity and a level that achieves virtual elimination by targeting a release amount prescribed under subclause 65(3) which considers social, economic and technical matters. This means there would be a gap between what the law prescribes we achieve and what we actually enforce.

Based on the voting pattern document I received this morning, my amendments on this clause will be put before similar ones introduced by Reform, the Bloc and the government. As a result, given that we want to proceed in a very time effective way, I would be very shocked if the government were to vote against our amendment because it would be voting against its own amendment in a very different way. I would also be shocked if Reform did the same and somewhat shocked if the Bloc did as well.

The definition of virtual elimination, as originally tabled in Bill C-32 before it went to clause by clause, is a better way to go and that is what the Progressive Conservative Party will be doing with its amendment in terms of trying to clean up the government's error.

The bill that was sent to committee included a clause 2.2, which called for the avoidance of duplication and overlap in legislation regulation in areas that involve the protection of the environment and human health. It proposed to resolve any potential disputes by having the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health and the minister responsible for the other act jointly decide whether measures that can be taken under the act are appropriate and sufficient to address the matter.

This was removed from the act during the committee review in favour of introducing separate clauses in appropriate sections of the bill where the potential for overlap and duplication existed.

The new clauses shifted the power to decide which law would prevail to cabinet from the three ministers, except in the case of biotechnology where the Minister of Health and the Minister of the Environment make the decision.

Members may actually agree that my amendment makes more sense. My amendment would actually have the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health and the applicable other minister make a collaborative decision. Those are the ministers who would know their acts the most. It would provide Canadians

with political accountability about who is making decisions, as opposed to sending it to some murky area known as the cabinet.

I have a lot of respect for the Minister of Human Resources Development and the Minister of National Revenue. These are individuals who know their portfolios quite well. However, why would we ask them to make an intervention in a piece of legislation that, quite honestly, they do not study on a day to day basis. That is why I believe it is more prudent for us to have it done by the Minister of Health, the Minister of the Environment and one other. My amendment tries to do that in this very section.

I would also like to point out a couple of other motions that the Progressive Conservative Party intends to support. The first one is the NDP Motion No. 26. It attempts to further entrench the precautionary principle in the administrative duties section of the act. We supported this inclusion of the principle at committee stage and we support this motion which defines what the precautionary principle means for the purposes of this section.

NDP Motion No. 83 attempts to do the same, except this time it defines the reference to precautionary principle referred to in the section dealing with screening and assessment of toxic substances.

There is one motion, which I am a little bit troubled by and which I think Canadians should be very concerned about. It is Motion No. 206 tabled by the Reform Party. This motion, dealing with emergency planning, refers to one of the most severe toxins in existence being slated as a schedule 1 toxin. Once a substance has been slated as being toxic, the government can then ask a particular industry or company to provide a pollution prevention plan. This motion will not allow that. Once a toxin has been slated for fast-tracking to a schedule 1 toxin, the Reform Party wants to wait to have it approved by cabinet.

What concerns me is that the Reform Party believes that cabinet may actually say, "Well, we know this is a very harmful substance, but, gosh, maybe we should not do it anyway". I think the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health should be able to make that call. If it is toxic, it is toxic and it requires a pollution prevention plan.

I know industry is not that concerned about that particular amendment. I would think that if we are protecting human health and the environment, then that would be the right thing to do.

Given that I do not have enough time to speak about the large number of amendments that we have, I am very pleased with the position we have taken in terms of virtual elimination, as it is a workable definition. Given that our motion will be up first, I trust that the Reform Party, the government and the Bloc, which have similar motions that accomplish the same objective, will vote for our motion as opposed to voting for another for purely partisan purposes.

• (1625)

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to be here to speak to Bill C-32 after toiling for a year in committee on the bill. It is great to have it back in the House and to have the opportunity to debate it in a public forum.

As has been mentioned by some members, it has been quite a process. The bill was first tabled in the House on March 12, 1998. We are now 14 months to the day from the time it was first read in the House. We have had witnesses from all aspects of Canadian society. We have had industry, people from the environmental groups and people speaking to us about children. We should listen to everybody in Canada because pollution prevention is everybody's job and everybody's problem.

We dealt with 400 or 500 amendments at committee and now we have 230-some more. This just goes on and on. We debated at length many aspects of pollution prevention in committee. Certain members of the committee wanted to take the bill in one direction and some wanted to take it in another. Quite frankly, we felt fairly comfortable with the bill that was presented in the first place.

It is one thing to try to take a piece of legislation to the nth degree to command and control absolutely everything, but if we do that, I believe we would lose some of the people involved in the process. The bill will limit the use of toxins in our society and in the way we do business. If we are going to alienate the people in the country who are involved in the use of those and take the bill to a point where it is not manageable or not workable, then I believe we are doing more harm to the environment than if we come up with something reasonable.

Balance is a word we have heard a lot of and will continue to hear as we debate the bill. We must have the proper balance. We cannot go too far one way and we certainly cannot go too far the other way. We have to stand back and look at what we are doing on occasion to see if there is a little bit of common sense in what is going on. Canada has to stay in tune with the rest of the world. We have to fulfil some of the international obligations that we have been part of. We also have to be a leader and, in many aspects, we can be.

Over the months that this was at committee, the hardest working person on the Hill was the whip of the Liberal Party. We had people sit and vote in committee who, quite frankly, I had never seen before. They certainly did not know the issues but they did vote. It was an interesting scenario to live through. We saw people at the committee who were talking on telephones, reading newspapers and whatnot. It was unfortunate that had to happen. Our party attended as many meetings as we could. If we look back at the record, we attended most. We were there and took part in the debate.

Government Orders

The Reform Party originally put forward very few amendments because we felt it was a bill that had balance, that could work, and that it was a piece of legislation that would help Canadians.

I will read a little from the preamble to bring back into focus what the bill is intended to do. The bill is an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development. We can all agree with that because it does not split up sections of the environment or sections of human life. It says "the environment" in total and "human health" in total.

My colleague from Macleod, being a medical doctor, knows that human health applies to human life no matter what age or form. Some people may try to indicate that some aspects of our population are more at risk than others, but the bill addresses human health in total. Its declaration and preamble states in part:

It is hereby declared that the protection of the environment is essential to the well-being of Canadians and that the primary purpose of this act is to contribute to sustainable development through pollution prevention.

• (1630)

Sustainable development is an important part of any environmental bill.

Whereas the Government of Canada seeks to achieve sustainable development that is based on an ecologically efficient use of natural, social and economic resources and acknowledges the need to integrate environmental, economic and social factors in the making of all decisions by government and private entities;

That is something we firmly believe in. We have to take into effect the social and economic aspects of any piece of legislation as it goes forward. If we make it too restrictive, then we are going to lose some of the players in the game.

Whereas the Government of Canada is committed to implementing the precautionary principle that, where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation;

We have to remember these issues as we talk about the bill, what is and is not in it and the amendments that are brought forward. It is going to take us a while to get through them all. It gets a little complex as we try to bring in a bill that has some reason and some scope.

One aspect we are dealing with in this group of motions is the use of toxic substances. The government has consistently focused on managing releases of toxic substances and not their uses. Our proposals ensure that the bill is consistent with the relevant toxic management strategies incorporated in the UNCED's Agenda 21, keeping us in step with the rest of the world. This agenda is generally pursued by the international community in its risk reduction activities.

Government Orders

Amendments brought forward by some of the committee members alter this approach by expanding the scope of CEPA from its current focus on emissions to the use of toxic substances. There are 23,000 substances in use; 12 have been classed as toxic. These substances are going to be used. They need to be used. It is the control and keeping them under control and stopping the release that this bill has to focus on. It is not the use that is a cause for concern; it is the improper management and the release of these substances that cause the adverse effects.

Motions Nos. 1 and 13 deal with the use of toxic substances and address these concerns. Motion No. 1 proposes that lines 19 to 21 of the preamble be returned to the original text. That would take the bill back to where it started which was something we were quite comfortable with. The government and the Bloc have proposed motions similar to Motion No. 1 which effectively accomplish the same thing. We have general support to move in the same direction.

Government Motion No. 14 only partially addresses concerns regarding the management of toxic substances. Our Motion No. 13 is preferable to Motion No. 14 which is not adequate and is only a marginal improvement. It is critical that we do not consider use of toxic substances separately from the release of toxic substances as this derogates from the risk based principles that are intended to be the foundation of this bill.

It is going to be quite interesting as we go through all of this. Motions from three different parties which are worded somewhat differently could eventually work out to be the same thing. It is important how the groupings take place.

The other issue is inherent toxicity. Amendments put forward by the Reform Party and the government also address this issue. Inherent toxicity has been left undefined in this bill as a result of the committee amendments. If inherent toxicity is left undefined, it could lead to substances being proposed for virtual elimination without their going through the traditional risk assessment. Our proposals address this.

Our Motion No. 87 ensures that substances that have been determined to be toxic by risk assessment, not by the minister, can go to virtual elimination. Motion No. 87 ensures that the decision making is scientific rather than political. Government Motion No. 88 addresses the same concern. However its amendment does not go far enough.

• (1635)

I will end here because we will have other opportunities to speak as we go through this process. We have eight groupings so we can speak eight times to the issue.

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident from the interventions by the Reform Party that it

wants a weaker bill. It wants a bill that loses its original intent and mandate in a manner which makes it extremely weak.

The words used by the member for Lethbridge is also interesting. He talked about the players in the game and that we must be a leader. The question is in what?

Neither the member for Lethbridge nor his other Reform Party colleague referred to public health once. Their main concern is the quite evident preoccupation with the industrial side of this bill and not with its health side.

We might as well call a spade a spade and make it clear that Reform has been on the wrong tack with this bill from the word go. It has also supported in committee every attempt to weaken this bill as it is doing here in the House today.

The parliamentary secretary to the minister was quite right when she referred in her intervention to this bill being a reasonably strong bill. She went as far as to describe it in very positive terms. That description would only be valid if the amendments by the government at report stage are not carried. If they are, then this bill will be weak and it will not perform the intent that was expressed so well and so clearly by the government in 1995 when it replied to the report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development entitled "It's about our Health".

In the limited time available I will try to address Motions Nos. 2, 14, 67 and 88.

Motion No. 2 would eliminate the words "to phase out the generation and use of the most persistent". "The generation and use" are important words. We put them in at committee. Actually it was "to phase out the generation". We thought in the long term that a bill whose aims are the prevention of pollution and the protection of public health should have an indication of that nature in the preamble. Therefore this amendment should be resisted.

Motion No. 14 is an amendment whereby in the administrative duties of the government the products of biotechnology would be deleted. It is very unfortunate that the government would see fit to present such a motion. It implies that the products of biotechnology should be the domain of just one department, namely the Department of Industry, as if biotechnology is a matter of economic concern alone. That is wrong. Biotechnology touches on a number of values that go far beyond the economic values and concerns of society. Therefore the deletion of the products of biotechnology from clause 2(1)(j) ought to be resisted.

I will move on to an item that has already been raised by others and quite understandably so, namely virtual elimination. We must be very clear in trying to convey to the public what it is all about.

Government Orders

• (1640)

When this bill came out of committee, as it now stands before us before any amendment, the matter of eliminating, so to say in vague terms, toxic substances would be the prerogative of the ministers. The ministers, as the bill reads right now, shall make regulations respecting allowable releases. It is left to the two responsible ministers, environment and health, to make that determination.

The amendment being proposed by the government says that there would have to be a precondition before this could take place. In other words an obstacle is set in the way of the two ministers. Namely the specification by the ministers of the level of quantification for each substance on this famous list called virtual elimination would be a precondition to the making of the regulation. This is a considerable weakening of the clause as it is presently in the bill and when it came from committee.

It is quite clear that we have yielded to pressures, to lobbyists. We have somehow decided to put forward an amendment, and it is most unfortunate that the government would have done that, that is watering down and weakening the handling of the very central issue in the bill of virtual elimination of toxic substances.

Virtual elimination is a central key issue which requires considerable debate and not just the few minutes that are available to us.

The idea that was conceived in committee of the ultimate reduction of toxic substances has disappeared. There is no clear requirement to continue as it is intended to ratchet down the limits of release. The proposed amendment will legitimize the continued use of toxic substances which is a very unfortunate development. Therefore, I would urge colleagues not to vote for this amendment.

Motion No. 88 deals with the question of inherent toxicity. This amendment is extremely difficult to explain in the course of this debate. Again it weakens the bill because it removes the possibility of having access to a faster track for the elimination of harmful substances. It is an amendment that ought to be rejected.

The amendment seriously weakens the work of the committee whose permanent members attempted very conscientiously to find ways of reinforcing the thrust of the bill with the main purpose of the bill in mind, namely that of preventing pollution and of protecting human health. We are dealing here with some very dangerous substances. We are dealing here with a process that requires some clear measures that aim at the long term elimination of substances that are harmful to human health and to the environment.

• (1645)

The committee has attempted to do that. However, a number of amendments in Group No. 1 would weaken that effort and the substance of the bill before us this afternoon.

For these reasons I urge my colleagues in the House of Commons to reject the major amendments in Group No. 1, and particularly the ones that I referred to in my brief presentation.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-32, which is now at report stage, proposes to renew the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

The bill addresses the following aspects: pollution prevention, toxic substances, air and water purity, pollution control and waste, environmental emergencies, biotechnology, federal government operations on federal and aboriginal land, administration and application of penalties, information gathering, guidelines and codes of practice, and finally, public participation.

This act may be full of good intentions, but it is equally full of imprecision.

It must be kept in mind that the study of Bill C-32 started back in the fall of 1998, and ran until April 1999. After 60 sittings, a total of 580 amendments had been submitted during the clause by clause examination of the bill. The committee adopted 160 of them. As a result, the bill is inconsistent in many regards.

The most critical point in this bill is, in my opinion, the lack of harmonization with the provinces. While the original version called for the federal government to act within the spirit of intergovernmental agreements, the government majority softened that requirement by adding the words "endeavour to" before the word "act".

The Bloc Québécois maintains that the federal government must always work within a framework of harmonization with the provinces, with a view to avoiding duplication and overlap of legislation and regulations.

Since Quebec has its own specific nature, we insist on being allowed to speak for ourselves when our interests are at stake. Despite the fact that, in theory, Bill C-32 acknowledges that the environment is a shared responsibility between the federal and provincial governments, in practice it delegates no powers to the provinces.

The purpose of Bill C-32 is to enhance still further the federal government's preponderance as far as environmental protection is concerned. That is the major point on which amendments are required. Otherwise the situation will get worse instead of better.

On the subject of products of biotechnology, the bill establishes a federal safety net and the authority to make regulations for the safe and effective use of biotechnology for environmental purposes. Clauses 104 to 115 apply here.

Government Orders

What does it mean? Where are we in the vital matter of biotechnologies? Who is prepared to educate the public? In what area does the bill require products of biotechnology that meet international standards and are subject to recognized scientific rules? When will we deal with labelling? Who, in the government, will finally take the lead in this matter and not look at biotechnology only in terms of toxicity?

The weakness of clauses 104 to 115 and their approach to the subject of biotechnology is a bit confusing.

There is another aspect of the harmonization of this bill with the provincial governments I consider very important. It is a field of jurisdiction in which the Province of Quebec is at the forefront and needs no help from the federal government. I am referring to the control of water, land and air pollution in agriculture.

• (1650)

Quebec pork producers complete the agri-environmental picture of their farms. Each farm is studied to determine its physical characteristics, level of pollution, production capacity and quantity of input so that the impact of the pork producers on their community is known quasi scientifically. It is easy therefore to correct discrepancies.

This picture will be extended to other farming activities. It is a procedure that is unique in North America and a real agri-environmental realization.

Farmers in Quebec are also required to produce an agri-environmental plan, which is a management tool or an integrated fertilization plan for farms. These plans are done by professionals or farmers who have taken courses and proper training. This is an example of making this community responsible, which has already proven effective.

For all these reasons, we have faith in our provincial government, which is a leader in environmental matters and must be given full latitude in areas under its jurisdiction.

In light of the amendments adopted in committee, the Bloc Québécois opposes this bill at report stage and third reading.

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in any legislation, words are powerful. Through them public opinion and the courts can judge legislation.

However, as powerful as words may be, any piece of legislation is much more than its wording and words. Indeed, any act of parliament is also an expression and a symbol of the primary objective and intent of the government proposing it.

Moreover, any act of parliament includes certain words and provisions, which, because of the pertinence of their meaning and intent, carry a critical significance.

[English]

In the 10 minutes which are allowed to me I can dwell only on a few key elements of the very strong reservations I have regarding certain amendments now before us to Bill C-32, concerning the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, at report stage.

The first strong reservation I have relates to the issue referred to as inherent toxicity. The bill, as it now stands, provides under clause 77 that if the Ministers of the Environment and Health are satisfied that a substance may cause lasting harm because it is persistent and bioaccumulative and that it is inherently toxic to human beings and other living species, the ministers can recommend that the substance be added to the official list of toxic substances and, in some cases, earmarked for virtual elimination.

On the recommendation of big industry, the chemical industry, the mining industry and other sectors of big business, we are now faced with amendments which will make it immensely more difficult for the ministers to act. Indeed, before they can exercise any judgment or discretion as to the danger of a substance, the substance must have already been determined to be toxic or capable of becoming toxic, according to the provisions of the law.

This is a huge departure from the current test. It effectively nullifies the powers of the two ministers to take prompt action on being satisfied that a substance is inherently toxic and thus dangerous for human health and the environment.

• (1655)

For example, under the amendment proposed by big industry, which is now before us, a protracted risk assessment would be required. To quote one of the committee's main expert advisors during the clause by clause study of the bill, this amendment is "very significant". He said "The proposed change would gut the bill of the significant direction taken in this clause toward inherent toxicity". This advisor sat with us throughout the total revision of the original CEPA bill of 1988. He is one of the foremost experts, an environmental lawyer who has sat through all the various revisions, the amendments and the complete work of the committee so far.

I would point out that the inherent toxicity concept was endorsed by the government in its 1995 official response to the committee's report of the same year, entitled "It's about our Health", and was reflected as well in the predecessor to Bill C-32, namely Bill C-74, which died on the order paper prior to the 1997 election.

Government Orders

My second main reservation concerns the concept of virtual elimination of toxic substances. The original wording of the virtual elimination provision contained in the bill when it was sent to the standing committee for study was judged by the government to be too convoluted and confusing, with which we agreed fully. Therefore, under the direction of the Deputy Minister of Environment Canada a new clause was submitted to the committee as an amendment to the original one. It was moved by the parliamentary secretary in committee and passed with the backing of a large majority. I am sure the Reform Party was against it because it was against every provision which related to the protection of the environment and human health when it affected industry. The Reform Party is traditionally onside with big industry, so when I say the backing of a large majority, I am certain that Reform would systematically be against it, as it is against any provision that speaks of human health and the environment.

Now the government wants to amend its own clause. Big business has asked for the amendment and we have accepted significant recommendations of big business and amended the clause accordingly.

I would like to quote excerpts from a letter from a group of industrial concerns which was written to the government and to all MPs of all stripes. This group consists of the Alliance of Manufacturers and Exporters of Canada, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Chemical Producers Association, the Canadian Electricity Association, the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Canadian Petroleum Products Institute, the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, the Canadian Steel Producers, Dow Chemical, Imperial Oil, and the Mining Association of Canada.

This is what they said, among other things:

Unless changes are made, results such as requirements to shut down wood-burning stoves, or municipal waste incinerators in Newfoundland's fishing villages would be the outcome.

No less than the president and CEO of Alcan Aluminum wrote to the government to say, among other things:

—the act could force the closure of all aluminum smelters in Canada.

If that kind of language is not total fearmongering, I do not know what is. This is total fearmongering. As if all aluminum smelters in Canada would close because Bill C-32 would be in force. If it was not so sad it would be a joke.

Time does not permit me to go into a detailed review of the big business amendments proposed, except to say that the current version of virtual elimination in the bill is far better for the environment and human health and should be kept.

Unfortunately, time does not allow me to cover other aspects of other amendments with which I fundamentally disagree in Group No. 1, such as the dilution of the powers of the Ministers of the Environment and Health in favour of decisions made by the cabinet, which was an alternative strongly endorsed by big business.

• (1700)

The Ministry of the Environment forms a part of the economic union committee of cabinet. It is interesting to note that the co-sponsor of the bill, the Minister of Health, sits on the social union committee, a different committee. It carries very little weight compared with much larger and more powerful ministries such as industry and agriculture.

I was involved with the original Canadian Environmental Protection Act since this work started five years ago. It has occupied a significant part of my time since my election in 1993.

When it reached the standing committee I considered Bill C-32 to be a weak reflection of our commitments in the 1993 and 1997 red books. After a large amount of diligent work by all members of the committee, I felt that Bill C-32, as amended in committee, although nowhere as strong as I would have wanted it to be, was a step forward and I fully intended to support it. I still do. However amendments brought by the government have in my view so diluted certain key provisions of the bill that I find myself unable to support the bill if such amendments are passed.

As a deeply committed environmentalist this saddens me greatly, but I dare to hope and continue to hope that between now and then, before all these steps are taken, before Bill C-32 is finally passed, that the bill may be restored to the state in which it is today. I hope that it will not leave that state and that these amendments will be defeated, at least the amendments which make it a weaker bill for the environment and human health. This is my fondest hope, because I certainly wish to vote for the bill if it is in the condition in which it is today. I hope it stays that way.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SECTOR PENSION INVESTMENT BOARD ACT

BILL C-78—NOTICE OF TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, an agreement could not be reached under the provisions of Standing Orders 78(1) or 78(2) with respect to the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-78, an act to establish the Public Service Pension Investment Board, to amend the Public Service Superannuation Act, the Canadian Forces Superannuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superan-

Government Orders

uation Act, the Defence Services Pension Continuation Act, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Pension Continuation Act, the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and the Canada Post Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act.

[English]

Under the provisions of Standing Order 78(3) I give notice that a minister of the crown will propose at the next sitting a motion to allot a specific number of days or hours for the consideration of the disposal of proceedings on the said stages.

Some hon. members: Shame.

* * *

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1999

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-32, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 1.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we just heard the government House leader shutting off debate on a very important pension bill. Before he leaves the House perhaps he will say that he will not cut off debate on the CEPA regulations in Bill C-32. I hope the government will pay attention and understand just exactly what in God's name we are talking about today.

My fear is that the government will cut off debate on this issue as well. It is probably one of the most important decisions facing us in the long term.

Bill C-32 was a piece of government legislation which obviously was not done very well. There were over 800 amendments to the bill. I do not know, but I am sure that has to be a record. It means that the environment department and the government do not care or are not concerned and are completely out to lunch on environmental matters.

• (1705)

I will exempt three members of the Liberal Party from my recent statement. They are the members for Davenport, Lac-Saint-Louis and York North. I happen to know these three members of the Liberal Party are deeply concerned about the environment. I know this because I have spoken to them and I have seen them.

The member for York North, through a lot of hard work and diligence on her part, just organized an eco-summit in the House of

Commons. My comments to her are very sincere. We have heard prestigious people in Canada tell us their concerns regarding our environment, especially when it comes to air quality. I hope she can promise us that she will not allow the government to gut Bill C-32 as it is in its current state. If it is not in that state, I hope she votes against her government on this most important principle for the future of future generations and other species we share the country with.

A classic example of how business and friends of the government are putting pressure on the government in order to change the regulations is the aquaculture industry in Nova Scotia. It issues a paper called "Aquanotes". I could not believe when I read it the other day. It said that Bill C-32 was coming down the pike. The environment committee was concerned about the chemicals, the additives and the pharmaceuticals going into fish products being produced in open net systems. Its comments were: "Watch out everybody, the battle has just begun".

One would assume that a burgeoning industry like aquaculture would want a full environmental assessment and review of its day to day activities in order to protect and to advise the citizens of this country and of nations to which we export seafood that it is a healthy and very good product for them to consume. Why would the industry want to fight against any kind of environmental protection? It is in its best interest to work with environmental organizations and the provincial and federal environment departments to come up with the best solutions for the industry to convince and protect our citizens.

It is incredible that we as a nation have destroyed our inland fish stocks and on all three coasts. Now we are to grow fish in pens. We have absolutely no scientific or biological evidence on how to do it properly and the aquaculture industry fights tooth and nail on every environmental aspect. It is unbelievable that it would want to do that. One would think it would want to work with us in order to come up with long term solutions which will benefit it and our citizens.

I refer to a conversation I had when I participated in an environment committee hearing. Bloc, Conservative, Reform, Liberal and NDP members who participated in the marathon of lengthy Bill C-32 CEPA debates deserve the Order of Canada. On and on and on they went. They were very lengthy. There were some heated exchanges and there were some very long exchanges.

NDP put forward 100 amendments. That is our record. The member for Churchill River, a Metis aboriginal person, is so concerned about the environment that he always tells us in caucus that we have to use the seven generation principle. Whatever we do on this planet today, we must think about the seven generations down the road. What effect will it have on our great, great, great grandchildren? That is very worthy advice. We should all heed that very simple warning from our first nations people.

I asked a question in early April 1998 of the then deputy minister of the environment, Mr. Ian Glen. I asked him whether he had

adequate human and financial resources to do his job properly. Mr. Glen replied “The fair answer, and I think it is becoming abundantly clear to people, is no”. He went to say that was one of the challenges they had within their organization. I bet if I asked that question today I would get an even more resounding no.

The government come in with Bill C-32. It was a mess when it came to committee. The committee in its wisdom put forth 800 amendments. As the member for Lac-Saint-Louis just said, it is not as strong as we would like but in its current form it is a pretty good compromise.

• (1710)

We have discussed the bill with many environmental groups including the Sierra Club, the World Wildlife Fund and others. They say it is not as strong as they would like but it is not bad. It is a good starting point for the future of our planet.

The government will not commit the human and financial resources to protect our country and our planet. That is unbelievable. What will we tell our children? I ask everybody here who has children, grandchildren or nieces or nephews, what they will tell them 20 years from now when they are possibly breathing with the help of an oxygen mask, when they are suffering from forms of cancer we never saw before, or when the rates of asthma have increased? What will they tell them? Will we tell them that we did not know, that we did not understand the problem?

Our lives are good right now but what about our children’s lives? If we cannot think of our children, what are we doing here? This is not a piece of legislation to ignore. It is the most important piece of legislation we have in the House.

I made a statement the other day at the eco-summit because a few years ago when the current heritage minister was the environment minister she was quoted in the *Globe and Mail* as saying that she could not wait to get out of the lowly environment department and get a higher profile. That is what the *Globe and Mail* said a few years back.

Also the other day I asked some very prominent people why in federal and provincial legislatures the environment department is placed at the bottom of the list of cabinet ministers while the finance, industry, treasury board and trade ministers are at the top.

Without the environment these people would have nothing. It should be reversed. Everything around us and everything we do is contained within our environment. I make a passionate plea to all hon. members to turn their thinking around. Without fresh air, clean air, clean soil and water, without the biodiversity of the other species we share the planet with, we are nothing. We are just skin, bones and minerals. That is all we are. If we cannot think in those terms we are doomed in the long term.

Government Orders

The member for Lac-Saint-Louis talked about big industries saying that all the plants would shut down. What a load of bunk. It is an absolute load of crap. I am sorry to say that but the member is absolutely right. It is just a threat that we should ignore. We have to understand that we must make environmental protection as strong as we possibly can.

In my remaining time I wish to thank the following people for their efforts. First I thank Mr. Don Maclean for trying to prevent an expressway through the largest urban park in North America, the Red Hill Creek. He tried to stop that expressway so that people could go from one place to another faster. It would have destroyed the air quality of the Hamilton area and we do not need it.

I also thank Mr. Paul Muldoon, Ms. Elizabeth May of the Sierra Club and Mr. Mark Butler of the Ecology Action Centre. There are many others I could mention. These men and women are dedicated to preserving our environment, to working with federal and provincial governments of all political stripes in order that we can live in harmony with our planet and we can share our resources for seven generations down the road.

If we do not, as many other people have mentioned before me, we will be doomed. That will be the end of it because without a proper environment we can kiss our ass goodbye.

Ms. Paddy Torsney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. A lot of people have a lot of things to say about the bill and one of the things I would hope is that people would be accurate. The member opposite has just referenced quotes from the *Globe and Mail*—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): That is debate. That is certainly not a point of order.

Mrs. Karen Kraft Sloan (York North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have worked on this legislation since 1994 and it has been a long five years. I can attest to that.

We have before the House not just a set of amendments but a fundamental decision on the direction in which we will take the country with regard to environmental and health protection.

In this place we are the elected representatives of a free and a democratic nation. This is a privilege and a responsibility which we must take very seriously.

• (1715)

We have a huge responsibility to honour, respect and protect those things that Canadians cherish the most. The preservation of the natural environment and the protection of human health are two such things that Canadians feel very deeply about.

A dear friend of mine has said that the issue of the environment will be the defining issue of the 21st century. I say to my hon.

Government Orders

colleagues in this place that over the course of this debate and the ensuing vote on the amendments to Bill C-32, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, what we say and how we vote will define us.

I want to address one of the issues that an hon. member has already raised and that is the amendment to make changes to section 77(3), which deals with the removal of inherent toxicity. The government response in 1996 agreed with the standing committee that virtual elimination can be proposed for substances that are inherently toxic. Bill C-74 in 1996 also agreed with that. When the current bill, Bill C-32, came before the committee it also agreed with this point.

I made a lot of arguments on the issue of including inherent toxicity within the CEPA toxic definition. I was told that that was unacceptable and it could be handled in other ways, for example, in section 77(3). Therefore, I am very concerned that inherent toxicity has been taken out of this section. In the words that have already been uttered in this place by someone who has worked as a consultant and an environmental lawyer on this very legislation, this proposed amendment is very significant and would gut the bill of the significant direction taken in this clause toward inherent toxicity.

Two other issues that I would like to address deal with Motions Nos. 1 and 2, the phase-out of generation and use, and the motions dealing with virtual elimination.

The original definition of virtual elimination, as worded in Bill C-32, was seen to be too convoluted, conflicting and confusing to be effectively implemented. Under the advice of the Deputy Minister of Environment Canada, the government moved to amend the wording of virtual elimination in Bill C-32. This change adopts word for word the definition used in the 1995 toxic substance management policy, a policy adopted by the government in a multi-stakeholder process.

I would like to underscore for the House that it has been acceptable to industry for the past four years, yet in recent weeks and months industry lobbyists have mounted an assault on this provision.

The new amendment to Bill C-32, if accepted, would diverge from the toxic substance management policy. Virtual elimination, as defined in the bill, will not shut down plants as asserted by industry. If this policy has been in effect for the past four years, why is investment not flooding out of this country? It is not.

I would also like to remind colleagues that while we are making decisions on a national piece of legislation, the effect of our decisions on virtual elimination will affect an international process that we are currently undergoing around the issue of persistent organic pollutants.

The title of this bill is the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, an act respecting pollution prevention and the protection of the environment and human health in order to contribute to sustainable development. This is not a sustainable development bill as asserted by the Reform Party. Get it straight, guys. This is a bill about the protection of the environment and human health. It only contributes to sustainable development. It is not a sustainable development bill.

The motion that deletes "generation and use" from the preamble will make it difficult to prevent pollution. By focusing only on the reduction of the release of pollution, it will make it difficult to work toward preventing pollution. Disasters such as Bhopal and other minor but more frequent incidents such as accidental discharges and spills result from the misguided notion of relying on containment only.

• (1720)

Various international toxic initiatives which have been taken, for example, by the UN, the OECD and the North American Commission for Environmental Co-operation, recognize that this is folly. They are moving toward use reduction and not just focusing on release.

Pollution prevention is a stated policy of the government. The bill, as it is before the House, with the inclusion of the reduction of generation and use, would better ensure pollution prevention. Its approaches, as I have mentioned, are closer to what is happening in the U.S. and Europe. If we allow this amendment to go through simply focusing on release will not be good enough.

I would ask hon. colleagues to consider how they want to define themselves and what it is that they want to stand for. If we want a bill that actually works toward the protection of the health of Canadians and the environment of Canadians we have to defeat the amendments that weaken this bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland): The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment, earlier on a point of order, sent me a note requesting that if the member for Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore has a citation with regard to a quote of the present Minister of Canadian Heritage, perhaps he would make that available to the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak to Bill C-32.

I would like to begin by congratulating my colleague, the member for Jonquière, on the excellent work she has done in recent weeks on this issue. As the former environment critic, I passed on to her all the material I had.

Having frequently discussed the bill with her, I think the member for Jonquière has done a good job of incorporating the concept of

sustainable development favoured by the United Nations commission on the environment and development.

This fundamental concept, developed and put forward by Norway's Prime Minister Brundtland, clearly states that any economic development must now take environmental concerns into consideration. It is important that this be noted.

Whenever it has taken a position on environmental issues, the Bloc Québécois has always borne in mind this fundamental concept that economic development must respect the environment. The member for Jonquière covered it well during her statements in committee.

Today, I am proud to take part in this debate. Basically, Bill C-32 introduces provisions to implement pollution prevention, new procedures for the investigation and assessment of substances, and new requirements with respect to substances that the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Health have determined to be toxic.

The list of such substances is extensive and a few examples are in order. Investigators will be given new powers and there will be new regulatory measures to deal with offences.

A few months ago, some sensational statements were made. A number of senior officials of the Department of the Environment wondered very openly—and this was mentioned by the member who spoke before me—whether their department could still monitor offending businesses, so draconian had the cuts been.

• (1725)

Having sat on the standing committee on the environment with some of my colleagues from across the floor, I remember the eloquent representations that were to be reflected in the report tabled by the committee. This is a report that was rather staunchly defended by committee members a few months ago.

The report pointed out the lack of resources available to investigators. Today, it is said, we want to improve the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, commonly known as CEPA. However, it is regrettable that the Minister of Finance is not here today, as we undertake the debate to renew that act. It should be pointed out that investigators are not given the means to do their job properly. This is deplorable, if we basically want to ensure better environmental protection.

The question we must answer on this side of the House as representatives of Quebec is what powers will the renewed CEPA delegate to Quebec and the other provinces in Canada.

Although in theory Bill C-32 recognizes that responsibility for the environment is shared between the federal government and the provinces, in practice it delegates no powers to them. And this runs

Government Orders

counter to real environmental harmonization between the various levels of government. Bill C-32 unfortunately aims at strengthening the federal government's preponderance in the field of environmental protection.

This centralization runs counter to the clearly expressed wish of the Quebec National Assembly to participate fully in the environmental assessment of any project on its territory. The bill is also in flagrant contradiction with the spirit of the harmonization process launched between the federal government and the provinces. This is why the Government of Quebec has pulled out of negotiations, and is looking further into this promising process.

The bill thus opens the door to duplication of federal and provincial powers. The federal government is justifying its interference in Quebec's areas of jurisdiction by invoking the recent supreme court decision with respect to Hydro-Québec. This case has always been contested by Quebec. All the courts that ruled on it, including Quebec's highest court, the Court of Appeal, declared the federal government's order invalid. Only the supreme court, with its unitary vision of Canada, overturned the Quebec court rulings.

Bill C-32 also contains a number of new features. For instance, the government wants to replace the existing federal-provincial CEPA committee with a new national advisory committee. This committee would consist of one representative each from Environment Canada and Health Canada, one representative from each province and territory, and up to six aboriginal representatives. This committee will advise the two federal ministers on the drafting of regulations, the management of toxic substances, and other matters of mutual interest.

We cannot understand why the bill clashes with the harmonization the government claims to have as a priority.

Let us not forget that Quebec refused to sign the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment agreement on January 29, 1998. When the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment met at that time, Quebec Environment Minister Paul Bégin refused to subscribe to that agreement, as long as the conditions called for by Quebec are not met by the federal government.

These conditions include recognizing that Quebec has primary jurisdiction in certain areas, under the Constitution.

• (1730)

The federal government has made a firm commitment to amend the federal legislation. This means Bill C-32, the purpose of which is to amend the Canadian Environmental Protection Act.

In addition, Quebec and the federal government have signed a bilateral agreement with respect to environmental assessments. As well, the minister—

Private Members' Business

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but time has run out. When debate resumes he will have two minutes left in which to complete his remarks.

[English]

Mr. John Herron: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

I am quite concerned. Just a few moments ago we were advised that there will be a briefing tomorrow at 11 a.m. in Room 215, Wellington Building concerning Bill C-32. I was under the impression that anything the government might want to say or not say with respect to this legislation would actually be said in the House of Commons.

The Deputy Speaker: I am afraid that does not sound like a point of order to me. I have to say to the hon. member that briefings around here are commonplace. I am sorry, I do not think there is a point of order there.

I am proposing that we proceed now to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should defend section 43 of the Criminal Code in the courts and should invoke the notwithstanding clause of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms if necessary.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure to speak to Motion No. 528, a motion that would protect parents and their children from state intrusion.

The motion says that in the opinion of this House, the government should defend section 43 of the Criminal Code in the courts. If the government does that, then all is fine and well and we may carry the day with that. It should also be prepared to invoke the notwithstanding clause of the charter of rights and freedoms if necessary. We believe that vigorous defence of section 43 of the Criminal Code in the courts would not even require that.

Under current law parents are allowed to use physical correction to discipline their children, as long as it is not abusive and is reasonable under the circumstances. The relevant statute is section 43 of the Criminal Code which reads as follows:

Every schoolteacher, parent or person standing in the place of a parent is justified in using force by way of correction toward a pupil or child, as the case may be, who is under his care, if the force does not exceed what is reasonable under the circumstances.

Prior to the enactment of this section of the code there was no legislation placing limits on the use of physical correction, nor were there any government agencies to protect children from abuse.

It was precisely to protect children from abuse that section 43 of the Criminal Code was passed into law. Now thanks to section 43, parents cannot physically abuse their children in the name of discipline. As long as the police and the courts do their jobs, child abusers will be prosecuted under the law. In my view they ought to be, to the very full extent of the law and right up to the supreme court if necessary.

It is very ironic therefore that some people who want to remove section 43 from the Criminal Code argue that it only protects parents' rights when in fact parliament's original intent in framing section 43 was to protect children. These so-called child advocates have totally missed the point. They have missed the wise intention of parliament in giving us this part of the Criminal Code.

For that reason section 43 strikes that necessary balance between the rights of parents and the rights of children. On the one hand, parents must have the freedom to fulfil their responsibility to their children and to society to raise their children to be moral and decent people who respect others. On the other hand, children have the right to be free from physical abuse and bodily harm.

Section 43 strikes that appropriate balance. It is a good law that was well conceived, which has served its purpose well and continues to serve us well today. That is why I find it very disconcerting that some children's rights advocates want to see section 43 declared by the courts to be in violation of the charter of rights and freedoms.

• (1735)

This past fall a group which was thrown together very quickly called Justice for Children and Youth submitted an application to the Ontario court, general division asking the court to declare section 43 to be in violation of the charter and therefore unconstitutional. This case will be heard sometime in the coming months. If this group succeeds in having section 43 struck down, the results would be absurd and totally unacceptable in our country.

First of all many good and loving parents would be made into criminals overnight and could be charged under the Criminal Code. That would be a disgrace to our judicial system. The public gets frustrated enough when they hear about bizarre court rulings as we have had in Saskatchewan or B.C. or elsewhere, rulings that pose a threat to their freedoms and the well-being of their families.

If section 43 of the Criminal Code were to be struck down, the massive intrusion of the state into the private sphere that would

result boggles the mind. Trudeau said that the state has no business being in the bedrooms of the nation, but anyone who removes section 43 will be moving the state right into the nation's family rooms. That would be tragic. The state makes a lousy parent and the state should not presume to tell parents how best to shape the moral character of their children as long as abuse is not involved.

That is why I have introduced this motion calling on the government to defend section 43 of the Criminal Code in the courts and to invoke the notwithstanding clause of the charter of rights and freedoms if necessary. We believe that would only be a last resort. If it does this vigorous defence of section 43 in the courts we will prevail.

The aim of this motion is to enable caring non-abusive parents to do the best job possible of raising their children to be responsible well-adjusted individuals and members of society.

Section 43 actually protects the rights of parents to raise their children in accordance with their moral and religious beliefs about effective child rearing. It protects the rights of parents to raise their children in accordance with their personal knowledge of the unique characteristics of their children. It also protects the rights of parents to raise their children in accordance with their understanding of how best to discipline children and to gain from their parents, to gain from other training and to gain from their own experiences during childhood.

The motion before us today accomplishes this goal in two ways. First, it requires that the government defend section 43 of the Criminal Code in the courts, to defend it vigorously and to use the best law resources in that defence. Second, in the event that one or more court rulings strikes down section 43, then the motion would commit the government to invoke the notwithstanding clause of the charter of rights and freedoms. Notwithstanding a court's decision to strike down the law, section 43 would then remain the law of the land.

After the Shaw decision in British Columbia on the right to have child pornography, I think that parliamentarians more than ever understand and realize that parliament has an obligation to protect Canadians from nonsensical judicial rulings.

While parenting has always been a challenge, raising children to be responsible and law-abiding members of society is more of a challenge today than ever before. The surge in violence during past decades testifies to this. The recent shootings in high schools in the U.S. and Canada have horrified all of us. Now is not the time to handcuff parents in their role as moral guides.

For all of these reasons, I have brought forward this initiative. I will read it into the record again:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should defend section 43 of the Criminal Code in the courts and should invoke the notwithstanding clause of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms if necessary.

Private Members' Business

I seek the unanimous consent of the House to have the motion before us deemed adopted and passed at this time.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the motion be deemed adopted and passed at this time?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the rest of my time to address some of the arguments that are used by—

The Deputy Speaker: It is normal to move a motion at the end of the member's speech, but since it was a request for consent I will allow him to continue.

• (1740)

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: I would like to take the rest of my time to address some of the arguments that are used by those who oppose any form of physical correction. We might hear some of those arguments today from different members.

For example, how will this group, Justice for Children and Youth, argue in court against section 43? Maybe some of the very statements we will find in a somewhat empty way coming from the other side of the House today.

First, Justice for Children and Youth will argue that section 43 violates the charter of rights and freedoms because it discriminates on the basis of age. It will point out that because adults are protected by the law from assault, children should be protected from physical discipline.

The problem with that argument is that a swat on the bottom that gets a toddler's attention but which does not bruise or do physical harm is hardly analogous to an assault by one adult against another. In the case of adults, the intent is to do harm and the victim often winds up in the hospital. In the case of discipline by loving parents, the intention is simply to offer a negative consequence or, we might say, feedback for persistent misbehaviour and the child is in no way physically harmed by the discipline.

Second, when it gets to court this advocacy group is going to argue that physical discipline instead of changing a child's behaviour for the better causes aggressive tendencies in children. The assumption is that the child will imitate mom and dad. If mom and dad use physical discipline, the child who receives that discipline will start hitting others. When this argument gets made, we are going to see the absurd in the court system.

Academics who do research in the field of pediatrics are currently engaged in a debate over the effects of physical discipline on children. Does it improve compliance among children or does it

Private Members' Business

increase aggressiveness? That is the question being asked by academic people. The debate can be highly technical. It is clear there is no scholarly consensus that has emerged in all the issues. In fact, many scholars agree that there is a woeful lack of research being done in this area, prompting some of them to call for greater attention and research.

The point is that this debate in academic halls is still very much in its infancy. Yet in the near future that debate is going to shift from the academic journals into the courts. A judge with no study and no academic background in this area is going to be hearing conflicting interpretations of research results and will have to make a decision. This shows just how absurd the situation with our courts has become under the charter.

Any interest group citing supposed research studies can walk into a courtroom and try to convince a judge that research shows that this or that is the case and that the charter is being violated. It is really an abuse of the court system, something the court system was never intended for, with judges being asked to settle academic research questions. That is the role of parliament. That is the role of this place. That is the role of committees in calling expert witnesses before committees when there is time for that kind of thing. Judges are not to make laws; they are simply to rule on the laws that are in place.

What does the research say about the effects of physical discipline on children? Does physical correction have positive outcomes or negative outcomes? Has it led to improved behaviour in children or has the misbehaviour continued accompanied by new aggressive tendencies? In one sense the researchers have come to contradictory conclusions, as I have indicated. Some studies have found negative outcomes, others positive.

I would like to describe why the conclusions have varied so much by referring to the work of Dr. Robert Larzelere, of the University of Nebraska medical school. He published in the *Journal of Pediatrics*, one of the most important resources on this very topic. He undertook a literature review of studies published in scholarly journals in the last 30 years. He studied 35 relevant articles.

Something rather important for us to note is that many of those studies, in fact the sum total of 24 of them, did not leave abusive dysfunctional family situations out of the research. In fact it came down to only being 11 of the studies that excluded abusive family situations. Of these 11 that left abusive family situations out of the research altogether, six of those studies showed beneficial outcomes, four of them showed neutral outcomes and only one showed negated outcomes.

That suggests that when used properly by parents who truly love their children, physical correction has positive results and no negative results. Based on these studies, Dr. Larzelere was able to be specific about the kind of physical punishment that brings beneficial results. On average he found that in a loving, responsible, functional home situation there were beneficial results when corporal correction was used less than weekly.

• (1745)

There were beneficial results when corporal correction was used at non-abusive levels of severity. There were beneficial results when it was used by parents who were not physically violent against family members, for example a father beating a wife or vice versa.

There were beneficial results when it was used without a potentially damaging instrument. With corporal correction there were beneficial results when used from ages two to six. There were beneficial results when it was used privately, not in public. There were beneficial results when it was used with reasoning and explanation.

There were beneficial results when it was used with a moderate level of child distress. As well, there were beneficial results when corporal correction was used primarily as a back up for other methods of discipline. This back up threat made reasoning and time out more effective, so the need for physical punishment decreased over time.

Beneficial results occurred when corporal correction was used by loving parents who were positively involved with their child and had child oriented motivations. It was not about the parent. It was about the rearing and the constructive raising of that child.

Corporal correction did not increase the child's fear of parental discipline. It was beneficial when parents co-operated with each other in discipline responsibilities and did not use verbal putdowns. Corporal correction is also beneficial when parents change their main discipline method to grounding when their children got older.

Based on those 11 studies that excluded abusive family situations, physical correction was seen to have positive results in six of the studies, neutral results in four, and negative results in one.

I would contend in view of this information that many of the studies had some flawed methodology weaknesses. Of the 35 studies, in fact 24 did. Of the other 11 studies it was found that on the basis of positive, responsible parenting in other ways there was positive benefit.

In my summary at the end of the hour I will refer to some follow-up research done by Marjorie Gunnoe, some very extensive confirmation of these findings. Again I ask for unanimous consent for this motion to be deemed adopted in the House today.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the motion be deemed adopted?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government has no difficulty with a great deal of the hon.

Private Members' Business

member for Wanuskewin's address. We do have difficulty with the introduction and the tail of his motion of a subsidiary proposal of constitutional change. That is something I will address a little later.

In relation to section 43 of the Criminal Code, it is very clear that Canadian criminal law does not condone or authorize the abuse of children. Section 43 in its context is merely a limited defence to a charge of assault. There are several key points which we should emphasize. It only applies to a parent, teacher or person acting in the place of a parent and only in respect to a pupil or child under that person's care. The person is only permitted to use this defence if force was used for the purpose of correction. A person who uses force in a fit of rage or in order to hurt a child cannot claim section 43 as a defence. Finally, on the issue of proportionality, the force used must be reasonable in the circumstances.

A court asked to consider applying section 43 in any given case would look at the nature of the child's behaviour or action calling for correction, as well as the age of the child, the severity of the punishment, including any injuries suffered by the child.

When determining whether the force used is reasonable the standard is the community standard of reasonableness. There is a warning that if one goes beyond these limits one may find oneself before a criminal court, and in appropriate cases criminal prosecution will be pursued.

It is on the more general issue that we felt we should add some comments to what the hon. member for Wanuskewin said. Law-making in Canada follows Jeremy Bentham's euphemism that law is not made by judge alone; it is made by judge and company. There is a continuum in the law making process. Judges, university law schools, law reviews and the legal profession have put in their criticisms. To a very considerable extent our courts have developed a highly nuanced relationship with the rest of the legal company. Courts very rarely say tout court, that is out, that is illegal. They offer suggestions for changes and modifications and the sensible response of a ministry of justice is to consider these, to take them into account and to come back afresh.

• (1750)

This is ordinary legislation. It is not constitutional law. It can be changed, as can any court decision on it, by subsequent legislation if parliament thinks so fit. This is in fact a fairly normal operation with criminal law today.

The legal company involved in monitoring the Criminal Code is very large and very well informed. It has contributed significantly to the progressive evolution of our criminal law.

On the notwithstanding clause I should express the reservations which I advanced in an earlier debate concerning the B.C. decision, the intermediate court decision in the child pornography case.

First, there seems to be a certain misunderstanding of the history and the nature of the notwithstanding clause. Perhaps this is understandable if we consider that the premiers who insisted on putting it into the charter of rights may again be said not to have been fully aware of the constitutional implications of what they were dealing with. There were not very many constitutional scholars among them.

As it stands, the notwithstanding clause is a prior issue. It is addressed to a government introducing new legislation. One can put it in there if one wishes, but Mr. Trudeau said that it would be a tragedy if any federal parliament decided to use the notwithstanding clause in that way.

As the House knows, the only significant use of it has been in a fit of haste, the reaction of the premier of Quebec toward what he felt was the way the gang of eight premiers behaved in relation to the adoption of Constitution Act, 1982, and the charter of rights. We would regard it as a regrettable step backward if the federal government were to use the notwithstanding clause. There are other ways.

This is not the United States Supreme Court where there is an unbridgable gap or barrier between the courts and Congress, and where one has to get a constitutional amendment, essentially, to overturn a judicial decision. Hon. members will be aware that when the United States court outlawed income taxation on constitutional grounds it took a constitutional amendment to override that.

Our situation is different and, in relation to the criminal law, if parliament should think that the court has misconstrued the careful balance, the pragmatic balance that it has made in relation to section 43, it is open to parliament to make amendment. It is open for the legal community as a whole to offer the amendments.

In that context we would reaffirm that the notwithstanding clause is, and I think this was the view of Mr. Trudeau, a constitutional aberration. I would reaffirm that it is wrong to use it, as has been suggested with very little care or thought, as a method of appeal from a judgment of an intermediate court as was proposed in relation to the British Columbia judgment. The appeal process must go its way.

This legislature, this parliament, which is a vestigial court in its own right by the way, is bound by doctrines of comity and mutual respect to co-ordinate institutions of government. It would be quite inappropriate for this court to attempt to meddle with a decision that is being appealed. It would be discourteous. It would be, in a very large sense, unconstitutional.

I would suggest to the hon. member, who is very thoughtful and informed in this area, that we should concentrate on the substance of the bill. We believe section 43 will withstand challenge. The government is committed to defending it in the courts. If there are judicial decisions cutting down its scope, we will study them with

Private Members' Business

care and the proper respect due to the co-ordinate authority and we will bring our suggestions to the House.

I thank the hon. member again for his intervention. On the substance of his remarks on criminal law, the government finds it co-ordinates very much with what we have been suggesting in relation to this bill. On the larger question I would hope that on reflection he would agree. We understand the sentiments he is expressing, but the notwithstanding clause is not the way.

• (1755)

Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to speak to Motion No. 528. I am always honoured to follow the lead of the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra who I think has added, in his very articulate and vastly insightful way, to the debate today.

I am pleased to have an opportunity to address the motion which defends section 43 of the Criminal Code and invokes the notwithstanding clause of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms when necessary. I suppose that when necessary clause defines the issue to some degree.

Is there a need? Is there a pressing concern that would require this to happen? That in and of itself is something that could be debated for some time. I am not questioning the merits of what the hon. member has done by bringing the issue forward. It is my feeling and the feeling of my party that this debate is useful to clarify and perhaps reinforce section 43, in particular for the sake of many parents and teachers who deal with the challenges of raising and educating today's youth.

Parliament has in its wisdom enacted such a section of the Criminal Code. I would go further and say that it has been consistently upheld by our courts at the provincial supreme court and Supreme Court of Canada levels. Consistently case law suggests that it has been upheld.

There are instances of which hon. members have been made aware or perhaps personally encountered where the degree of force has been brought into question as to how much or how far a parent or person acting in the stead of a parent can go in correcting a misbehaving child or youth.

Again I do not mean to trivialize the issue in any way by saying that this is not a wildfire epidemic which is sweeping the country. I am not aware at least of any issue of spanking taking place throughout the country that has resulted in a major court challenge or in repeated community disruption.

The wording in the section defines the issue, and that is reasonableness and community standard. These words are encom-

passed in the Criminal Code. They define how far a parent or a person in a parent's place can go in disciplining a child in response to a misbehaviour or perhaps an action taken by a child. I do not feel that section 43 is in any jeopardy at this time.

The hon. member also brought forward certain studies and psychological and methodological evidence which is also helpful in the debate to define just how far a parent can go and the reaction or the response of that child to physical correction.

As well it helps to define the fact that this is not a situation where we are talking about child abuse. I do not believe the line is that grey at the present time. There are instances where quite clearly the corrective methods undertaken are disproportionate and very injurious to a child.

The hon. member referenced the fact that there were instances that one can envision when harsh words and a berating attitude or a barrage of language can be perhaps even more painful and have more deleterious and lasting effects on a child than, for lack of a better word, a simple physical corrective measure where a child is stopped physically, for example, from picking on a younger sibling or partaking in what is deemed to be a dangerous activity; a teacher takes a child firmly by the arm and marches him or her down to the principal's office; or one simply removes something from the child's possession if it poses a danger to himself or herself or another child.

These types of physical corrective measures are envisioned by section 43 of the Criminal Code and certainly the type of measures to which my hon. colleague refers in his remarks. All of that to say that I do not see the line as being that blurred when one applies the reasonableness and the community standard test in place currently in the Criminal Code.

• (1800)

When physical injury results, when marks are left on a child because of the overreaction of a parent or a person in authority, that would cross the line. When that occurs and matters, through the natural course, wind up before the courts, and there is an opportunity for a judge to review the evidence and the circumstances, this section is put to the test.

It is understandable that there is concern about this. However, I would suggest once more that this is not a matter which is in need, at least at this point, of taking what I would suggest in the context of the greater debate would be a disproportionate response, that being the use of the notwithstanding clause.

By invoking the notwithstanding clause, as was referred to by the hon. member opposite from Vancouver Quadra, the pith and the substance of doing that would be tantamount to a parent overreact-

Private Members' Business

ing and responding in a very disproportionate way and using a far too extreme form of response or violence to what a child has done.

I do not mean to diminish what the hon. member is trying to accomplish, but even the reference of the notwithstanding clause in relation to this section, I suggest with all respect, diminishes the importance of what this section is really intended to do in the context of our Constitution and in the context of the application of it to our criminal law.

We have seen cases that have come forward quite recently, such as the case of the Queen and Sharpe and the Queen and Feeney, in which there is perhaps a need for discussion in the context of what those cases dealt with. When it comes to the protection of children from exploitation through pornography, when it comes to the rules and the laws of search and seizure that empower police officers in pursuit of criminals that have engaged in very violent activity, those are recent examples for which one might envision the invoking of the notwithstanding clause.

For those not intimately familiar with this, what it would do is essentially strike down a judge's decision and delay or put into abeyance the significance of the ruling for a period of five years.

In the greater context, I reiterate with all respect that using this type of constitutional power in the context of this section would be extremely ill-founded and ill-timed.

Turning back to the substantive debate, what is being discussed is the use of corrective proportionate response in the disciplining of a child. It is fair to say that in these very trying and troubling times, for youth who are in need of an early start and proper direction in their lives, there are occasions. Mr. Speaker, you may have been subjected to a spanking at some point in your life, as well as other members present. I am sure that it made an impression, but not the type of impression that would leave a mark on one's physical person. We are talking about the type of impression that leaves a person with the feeling that perhaps they have done something wrong and that they should not engage in that type of activity.

When we talk about this type of physical corrective measure we have to be very prudent in encouraging people to do it on the one hand, but at the same time we do not want to exaggerate the impact this would have on a child.

When we talk about this section of the Criminal Code, we want to be careful not to dismiss the issue of child abuse because that is something that is not sanctioned by section 43 of the Criminal Code. It is there to ensure that children are protected, but that parents and those acting in the place of a parent are permitted in certain very specific instances and factual circumstances to exercise discretion and the implicit responsibility that they have to physically correct a child, and often to do so for the protection of that child.

• (1805)

I am very supportive of the efforts the hon. member has made in bringing this matter to the floor of the House of Commons. I am very pleased to take part in the debate, but I would again suggest that this is not a Criminal Code section that is in jeopardy currently. It is not a Criminal Code section that is in danger at this time of being struck down by any current litigation of which I am aware. The issue itself bears discussion and it will continue to be respected by our judiciary and by those in the country who hope to and who will uphold the laws of the land.

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise to speak to Motion No. 528, which reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should defend section 43 of the Criminal Code in the courts and should invoke the notwithstanding clause of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms if necessary.

What exactly does Section 43 of the Criminal Code state? It deals with the correction of a child by force. It states:

Every schoolteacher, parent or person standing in place of a parent is justified in using force by way of correction toward a pupil or child, as the case may be, who is under his care, if the force does not exceed what is reasonable under the circumstances.

Therein lies the rub, "what is reasonable under the circumstances". We know that what may appear reasonable to one person may certainly be unreasonable to others.

We oppose this motion. We feel that, if anything, section 43 should be repealed, whereas this motion talks about maintaining section 43. We feel that it should be repealed because it is a 19th century law that was first codified in 1892 which legally sanctions physical violence against children. It should be repealed, not preserved.

Section 43 has been used as a successful criminal defence by parents who have hit their children with straps, belts, sticks and extension cords, causing bruises, welts and abrasions. People have used this defence in court to justify that behaviour toward children.

Children are the only class of Canadian citizens who can legally be assaulted for their correction. We do not hit adults to correct them. We gave up years ago using the whip to correct adults, but for some reason we feel that we can assault children to correct them.

People have argued that this does not have any adverse effect upon children. We agree that it is obvious children have to be taught and socialized, but the legal right to hit them as a method of training is wrong because it is contrary to basic human rights. It

Private Members' Business

promotes violence as a legitimate response to conflict and it leads to physical and emotional harm to thousands of children each year.

They can talk about all the studies they want. People can pick the studies they want to support their point of view. I am going to give a very real example of how such physical activity, allegedly to correct a child and probably done by the people involved thinking it was reasonable under the circumstances, affected one individual in Canada, and I am sure he is only one among many.

A constituent wrote to me. I checked with him before coming here tonight to ask if I could talk a bit about his case. He said "By all means. Use my name if necessary", but I will not use his name. This young fellow was adopted in 1956 and lived in a small village in Nova Scotia. He talks about his early childhood when he had a very severe bed wetting problem. What was his parents' response to this bed wetting problem? They would spank him to try to cure him of it. That was their strategy. Instead of curing it, it got worse.

At the age of five he began school. He talks about the principal as being a huge, six-foot, four-inch tall monster, with a stern face and a very cold personality. He tells us that this person would discipline him. He had only been in school a couple of weeks when he received his first strapping. He said: "Boy did it hurt. It made my father's spanking feel like child's play. I stood there with my hand out and I was given 15 straps on each hand. I was bawling my eyes out and screaming at the top of my lungs. The louder I screamed, the harder this person strapped".

• (1810)

Finally it got so bad he said "I pissed my pants. After the strapping I was sent back to class in my wet pants until it was time to go home". When he got home his mother said "Well, you must have done something to deserve it". He was then given a spanking for wetting his pants. This was all sanctioned under the code. He was spanked. The mother was enraged and said "He is not only bed wetting now but he is also wetting his pants".

This continued until the end of grade one. Then he moved into grade two. In grade two his principal was a bulky man, about 230 pounds and five feet eight inches tall and made his previous principal look like a boy scout by comparison. The same thing happened. He was strapped almost daily. He said "I was strapped approximately 60 to 70 times in that year and my spirit was definitely broken". To make matters worse, the bullies in his class would chase him home and beat him up.

He said "At eight years old I was a tortured, scared little boy, very quickly filling with hatred and anxiety and wishing I was dead". He talks further about how this kind of abuse continued in the school system, condoned by the law the Reform Party would like to maintain and buttress up.

He said "Life had become unbearable and I remember praying to God on many occasions to let me die and end this insanity. It had come to the point where every day after school I would run out of school as soon as the bell rang and head straight for the woods behind the school and work my way through the woods in order not to be seen by people and to be beat up by these bullies. Every morning as the class sang O Canada I would be strapped for running home through the woods rather than walking home in an orderly fashion".

It is a matter of interpretation when people talk about what is reasonable and unreasonable. I am sure the school authorities of the day would argue that they were using reasonable means to train these children and to bring them up in a proper way so that they would behave properly. We see this activity as far from reasonable, but people want to maintain this kind of activity.

Over the period of four years he was strapped 300 to 400 times. When he turned 13 years old, in order to gain acceptance from his fellow classmates, he turned to alcohol and smoking pot. It became an addiction. This was the effect of this kind of discipline and activity in his life. I am sure there are many people out there who find themselves in similar circumstances and who over the years have experienced what has been correction by force.

There are contemporary parenting courses and publications on child rearing and discipline that give effective and practical advice on non-violent alternatives to spanking and hitting. Sure it takes a little bit more work.

My hon. friend from the Conservative Party said that it was necessary sometimes to have to discipline a child in this way. We have to find other ways to discipline our children so we are not hitting them. When we hit a child it in turn teaches them to hit others and we see it accelerating.

Look at some of the activities taking place today in the school system and some of the actions of children right across the country where they have no respect for other people. Part of it is probably because they have not been respected as a person. We do not respect a person when we are so much larger than they are and we grab them when they have no defence and physically shake or spank them.

The bottom line is we must always ask ourselves how would we like to be treated? Would we appreciate someone grabbing us and spanking us? Perhaps some people would. In all honesty no one wants to be overpowered by someone bigger than themselves. They do not want to feel helpless and defenceless while they are physically struck. This is what we are talking about.

We have to look at other means of disciplining our children. Give them guidance, give them love, give them direction. Set an example that they would want to follow rather than show them that

Private Members' Business

it is okay for someone bigger than they are to hit them in order to correct them. We must ask ourselves are we treating people in the way we want to be treated?

The Reform Party pays great lip service to family values and the importance of children, but it does not appear to care about protecting children from the physical and emotional pain of violent abuse which is currently safeguarded by section 43. In advocating the preservation of this section that justifies and rationalizes corporal punishment, the Reform Party is ignoring the fact that current conditions are intolerable.

There were 4,229 substantiated cases of physical abuse investigated in Ontario alone in 1993. Attempts to discipline by corporal punishment were suspected in 85% of the substantiated cases. People oftentimes start out lightly disciplining but as the child gets a little more stubborn, all of a sudden the parent gets a little more forceful and what started out perhaps as a gentle spanking ends up being much worse.

• (1815)

I urge all members of the House to look realistically at this. They should not try to justify it because of what may have happened to them in the past, and say "Well, I was spanked and I am okay". They should look realistically at what it is doing to children and be honest with themselves and decide to oppose the motion and all forms of physical violence to children.

The Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member for Wanuskewin speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Wanuskewin, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in my wrap-up comments I will refer to some remarks made by colleagues on different sides of the House.

I will first remind members that section 43 has not been in place many years. My colleague to my immediate right, or to the left on the political spectrum, does not appear to be aware of when section 43 came into being.

Physical abuse by an individual some 30 years ago is the very reason that section 43 was brought in, because there was no protection for children. There were no agencies in place and this was the kind of thing that was put in place by well intentioned lawmakers so there would be protection for children.

It would also seem that some of the members around the House are not aware of the agenda of the United Nations, and specifically the convention on the rights of the child. It would appear from the comments of the last speaker that he certainly is supportive of that.

Canada sends delegates to the convention on the rights of the child posturing that they represent the Canadian position but without having any debate in the House. After having tried to

smooth, sneak or stealth their views by individuals overseas, they come back to try to browbeat us by saying that the position of Canada ought to be a small select group of NGOs trying to get this through at United Nations meetings.

Contrary to what the Progressive Conservative Party member said, that there was no threat at present, I remind him of a case coming up in the general division of the Ontario courts.

The government, through the court challenges program, has given money to this group to challenge section 43. This is not something in some distant era but something of concern before us right now, which is being funded by the government.

The member cited a number of different cases being investigated in Ontario. However, at the end of the day it was found that only a couple of allegations could be substantiated. It was decided that what had been alleged by individuals in Ontario had not occurred.

Studies that found negative outcomes did not take into account the original frequency or severity of the child's behaviour that required some discipline in the first place. In other words, if a child had a severe behavioural problem, and discipline or punishment was not having any positive results, it did little good to later blame bad behaviour on the physical punishment when in many cases the bad behaviour was there to begin with. That would be like blaming cancer on radiation treatment. It is true that radiation may not have cured the cancer but that does not mean it causes it. The cancer was already there.

I referred to the recent confirmation of the very extensive studies by Dr. Larzelere, or at least his review of the studies. I also referred to the study done by Marjorie Gunnoe that provides important confirmation of those findings. On the basis of her work she has stated that positive or negative outcomes do not result from physical correction per se but rather from the meaning a child ascribes to the discipline.

She suggests two plausible ways that children interpret spanking. First, it is a legitimate expression of parental authority. Second, it can be an act of interpersonal aggression.

• (1820)

If children perceive discipline as an expression of parental authority, there will not be, I state again there will not be, negative outcomes. However, if they perceive discipline as an act of aggression, then there may be negative results.

Marjorie Gunnoe's scholarly and very thorough work underscores the fact that there are no dangers in loving homes in which the child knows that mom and dad are disciplining in a careful, responsible, loving manner and purely out of a desire to shape character.

Private Members' Business

It has been a privilege to speak to this motion. At this point I again seek the unanimous consent of the House to have the motion before us deemed adopted and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

[*Translation*]

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

Accordingly this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.21 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 12, 1999

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Chronic Immunological and Neurological Diseases	
Mr. Perić	15059
Trade	
Mr. Obhrai	15059
Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Day	
Mr. Scott (Fredericton)	15059
Canada Health Day	
Mr. Patry	15060
Thérèse Martin School in Joliette	
Mr. Laurin	15060
Team Canada	
Mrs. Jennings	15060
Taxation	
Mr. Solberg	15060
North American Free Trade Agreement	
Ms. Carroll	15060
Semaine québécoise de la famille	
Mrs. Gagnon	15061
HMCS Eastview	
Mr. Clouthier	15061
Fifty Ways to Leave Your Jailer	
Mr. Lunn	15061
Windsor—St. Clair	
Mr. Limoges	15061
Nursing	
Ms. McDonough	15062
Health Care	
Mr. Herron	15062
Fédération de l'âge d'or de la Mauricie	
Mr. Rocheleau	15062

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Taxation	
Mr. Manning	15062
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15062
Mr. Manning	15063
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15063
Mr. Manning	15063
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15063
Miss Grey	15063
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15063
Miss Grey	15063
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15063
Minister of Human Resources Development	
Mr. Duceppe	15064
Mr. Pettigrew	15064
Mr. Duceppe	15064
Mr. Pettigrew	15064

Mr. Gauthier	15064
Mr. Pettigrew	15064
Mr. Gauthier	15064
Mr. Gauthier	15064
Immigration	
Ms. McDonough	15064
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15065
Ms. McDonough	15065
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15065
National Defence	
Mrs. Wayne	15065
Mr. Bertrand	15065
Mrs. Wayne	15065
Mr. Bertrand	15065
Taxation	
Mr. Solberg	15065
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15066
Mr. Solberg	15066
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	15066
Minister of Human Resources Development	
Mr. Crête	15066
Mr. Pettigrew	15066
Mr. Crête	15066
Mr. Pettigrew	15066
Mr. Pettigrew	15066
Health	
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	15067
Mr. Rock	15067
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	15067
Mr. Rock	15067
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	
Mr. Turp	15067
Ms. Marleau	15067
Mr. Turp	15067
Ms. Marleau	15067
Health	
Mr. Elley	15067
Mr. Rock	15067
Mr. Elley	15068
Mr. Rock	15068
Copyright Board	
Mrs. Lalonde	15068
Mr. Manley	15068
Motor Vehicle Safety	
Mr. Malhi	15068
Mr. Dromisky	15068
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Cummins	15068
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	15068
Mr. Cummins	15069
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	15069
Publishing Industry	
Ms. Lill	15069

Ms. Copps	15069
Ms. Lill	15069
Ms. Copps	15069
Canadian Militia	
Mr. Price	15069
Mr. Bertrand	15069
Mr. Price	15069
Mr. Bertrand	15069
The Nursing Profession	
Mrs. Redman	15069
Mr. Rock	15069
Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. Lunn	15070
Mr. Anderson	15070
Office of Energy Efficiency	
Mr. de Savoye	15070
Mr. Vanclief	15070
The Environment	
Mr. Laliberte	15070
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland)	15070
Royal Newfoundland Regiment	
Mr. Doyle	15070
Mr. Bertrand	15070
Fisheries and Oceans	
Mr. Lunn	15070
Mr. Anderson	15071
Fisheries	
Mr. Bernier	15071
Mr. Anderson	15071
Devco	
Mr. Mancini	15071
Mr. Vanclief	15071
National Defence	
Mr. Doyle	15071
Mr. Bertrand	15071
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	15071
Points of Order	
Minister of Finance	
Mrs. Ablonczy	15071
Grey Whale Fishing Licence	
Mr. Lunn	15072

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

International Treaties	
Mr. Reed	15072
Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Bélanger	15072
Committees of the House	
Official Languages	
Mrs. Finestone	15072
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Bélanger	15072
Justice and Human Rights	
Mr. Maloney	15072

Justice and Human Rights	
Mr. Maloney	15072
Terry Fox Day Act	
Bill C-512. Introduction and first reading	15073
Ms. Beaumier	15073
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	15073
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Bélanger	15073
Petitions	
Gasoline Additives	
Mrs. Ur	15073
The Senate	
Mr. Nystrom	15073
Marriage	
Mrs. Ablonczy	15073
Fisheries	
Mr. Bernier	15073
Marriage	
Mr. Iftody	15073
The Senate	
Mr. Solomon	15074
Mr. Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	15074
Fisheries	
Mr. Stoffer	15074
Child Sex Offenders	
Mr. Stoffer	15074
Canada Post	
Mr. Stoffer	15074
The Senate	
Mr. Riis	15074
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Bélanger	15074
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Bélanger	15075

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999	
Bill C-32. Report stage	15075
Speaker's Ruling	
The Speaker	15075
Motions in amendment	
Mr. Gilmour	15075
Motion No. 1	15075
Mr. Mitchell	15075
Motion No. 2	15075
Ms. Girard-Bujold	15075
Motion No. 3	15076
Mr. Gilmour	15076
Motion No. 13	15076
Mr. Mitchell	15076
Motion No. 14	15076
Mr. Laliberte	15076
Motions Nos. 26 and 61	15076
Mr. Gilmour	15076
Motion No. 62	15076
Ms. Girard-Bujold	15076
Motion No. 63	15076
Mr. Mitchell	15076
Motion No. 64	15076

Mr. Herron	15076
Motion No. 65	15076
Mr. Gilmour	15076
Motion No. 66	15076
Mr. Mitchell	15076
Motion No. 67	15076
Mr. Gilmour	15076
Motions Nos. 68 and 71	15076
Mr. Laliberte	15077
Motion No. 83	15077
Mr. Herron	15077
Motion No. 84	15077
Mr. Gilmour	15077
Motion No. 85	15077
Mr. Mitchell	15077
Motion No. 86	15077
Mr. Gilmour	15077
Motion No. 87	15077
Mr. Mitchell	15077
Motion No. 88	15077
Mr. Herron	15077
Motion No. 89	15077
Mr. Gilmour	15077
Motion No. 90	15077
Mr. Mitchell	15077
Motion No. 91	15077
Mr. Herron	15077
Motion No. 93	15077
Mr. Gilmour	15077
Motion No. 94	15077
Mr. Mitchell	15077
Motion No. 95	15077
Mr. Herron	15077
Motion No. 96	15077
Mr. Gilmour	15077
Motion No. 97	15077
Mr. Herron	15078
Motions Nos. 101 and 108	15078
Mr. Gilmour	15078
Motion No. 109	15078
Mr. Mitchell	15078
Motion No. 110	15078
Mr. Herron	15078
Motion No. 111	15078
Mr. Gilmour	15078

Motion No. 112	15078
Mr. Mitchell	15078
Motion No. 113	15078
Mr. Herron	15078
Motions Nos. 115 and 117	15078
Mr. Gilmour	15078
Motion No. 118	15078
Mr. Mitchell	15078
Motion No. 122	15078
Mr. Herron	15078
Motion No. 123	15078
Mr. Pettigrew	15078
Motion No. 128	15078
Mr. Gilmour	15078
Motions Nos. 130, 132, 135 and 206	15079
Ms. Torsney	15080
Ms. Girard-Bujold	15082
Mr. Laliberte	15084
Mr. Herron	15085
Mr. Casson	15087
Mr. Caccia	15088
Ms. Alarie	15089
Mr. Lincoln	15090

Public Sector Pension Investment Board Act

Bill C-78—Notice of Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Boudria	15091
-------------------	-------

Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999

Bill C-32. Report stage	15092
Mr. Stoffer	15092
Ms. Torsney	15093
Mrs. Kraft Sloan	15093
Mr. Bigras	15094
Mr. Herron	15096

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Mr. Vellacott	15096
Motion No. 528	15096
Mr. Vellacott	15097
Mr. McWhinney	15098
Mr. MacKay	15100
Mr. Earle	15101
Mr. Vellacott	15103

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