



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 154 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Friday, April 11, 1997

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

CONTENTS

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

The House of Commons Debates are also available on the
Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 11, 1997

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

THE DEPARTMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleagues, I am now prepared to rule on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley on Friday, March 21, concerning the actions allegedly taken by officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration.

I would like to thank the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, as well as the hon. member for St. Albert for their comments in this matter.

[*English*]

The hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley claimed that on the morning of March 21 officials of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration refused to allow her to attend a briefing on changes to the immigration investor program. The hon. member argued that, by making this information available to the media before members of Parliament, the department acted in a way which constituted a contempt of Parliament as well as a breach of her parliamentary privileges.

I have reviewed the facts surrounding the incident, and after further consultations, my understanding of the matter is as follows: a notice was issued to the media by the office of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration announcing that the minister would be holding a press conference regarding the immigrant investor program in the National Press Gallery theatre at 10.15 a.m. on Friday, March 21. The notice further specified that the press conference would be preceded by a technical briefing by departmental officials at 9 a.m.

It was also confirmed to me that the National Press Gallery applies certain restrictions on the number of people permitted to attend a press conference in the theatre. Yet no such restrictions

exist for briefings which, I am told, are frequently held in the theatre by government departments. Finally, the Chair was informed that the briefing in question was “off the record,” which meant that it would not be televised in the closed circuit system of the House of Commons and, consequently, could not be viewed by members of Parliament.

[*Translation*]

In the case which is presently before us, the Chair must address two issues. I will first deal with the issue of whether or not there has been a breach of privilege insofar as the member was denied access to information by departmental officials. I will then examine the claim that the actions of the department constituted a contempt of Parliament.

[*English*]

On December 1, 1992 when a member complained that the media had been given information by the government concerning financial assistance to Canadian Airlines when the same information was denied to members of Parliament, Speaker Fraser ruled page 14360 of the *Debates* there was no question of privilege. He also reminded the House that:

Privilege is properly raised only when something has happened that makes it impossible or nearly impossible to carry out the obligations that a member has as a member of this House.

On December 15, 1987, a member objected to the fact that the government had established a press lock-up and briefing regarding a proposed agricultural program and that members were denied access to the information. Speaker Fraser's ruling which can be found at page 11788 of the *Debates*, stated that this was not a prima facie question of privilege because it did not impinge on the member's ability to carry on his duties as a member of Parliament.

In the matter submitted by the member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, the Chair cannot find that she has been obstructed in the performance of her parliamentary duties. The question raised did not involve access to parliamentary proceedings, either in the Chamber or in a committee meeting room. Ultimately, as the hon. member pointed out in her presentation, the officials offered to give her the same briefing after question period.

On the issue of contempt, I would refer again to Speaker Fraser. In a ruling given on October 10, 1989, Speaker Fraser said:

Government Orders

“Broadly speaking, contempts are offences against the authority or the dignity of the House of Commons”.

• (1010)

Does the fact that the media was given information before it was going to be made available to the member constitute a contempt of the House of Commons? At page 125 of the 21st edition of Erskine May, in chapter 9 dealing with contempts, it is stated:

The House will proceed against those who obstruct members in the discharge of their responsibilities to the House or in their participation in its proceedings.

It seems to me that members of Parliament were not denied information or obstructed in their duties in the House. There was, after all, a press conference scheduled for that same morning and it was broadcast on the closed circuit television system of the House, making it accessible to all members. The Chair finds it difficult to conclude that the actions in question were an affront to the authority and dignity of the House.

For the reasons previously stated and in light of the precedents dealing with similar matters, I do not consider that this is a *prima facie* case of privilege.

The Speaker has no control and should have no control over such events, whether it be the manner in which they are organized or how access to them is managed.

The hon. member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley may have a valid grievance which she may wish to pursue elsewhere; however, procedurally the matter has been settled in that it does not amount to a breach of parliamentary privilege, nor does it constitute a contempt of Parliament.

I thank the hon. member for having brought this matter to the attention of the Chair.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY ACT

The House resumed from March 20 consideration of the motion on the amendments made by the Senate to Bill C-5, an act to amend the Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act, the Companies' Creditors Arrangement Act and the Income Tax Act.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to the order made April 10, the question is deemed to have been put, and the recorded division is deemed to have been deferred.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The division on the motion stands deferred.

* * *

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed from April 8 consideration of Bill C-17, an act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other acts, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and of Motion No. 2.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to a justice bill. It is nice to see a plethora of justice bills coming in here at the last minute because of the cacophony of noise that has been raised out in the field. That is for the benefit of the minister who, I am sure, is attempting now to fix some of the things that somehow slipped through in his department with loopholes that have had some very negative results.

I think the minister knows about those and is aware that there has been a botch-up in the drafting. We brought in a couple of amendments to try to fix some bills last week after we were well into the process. Somebody in the department was not doing the work and we have been trying to fix things up.

We are, as we get closer to the election, trying to deal with issues such as victims rights. That has suddenly become a priority item. We are trying to deal with fixing the conditional sentencing provisions of some bills now. We have always realized that conditional sentencing should not be an option for a judge who is considering a serious violent offence. It is still an option, which is unfortunate.

However, the minister is bringing in all these bills: C-17 now, C-27 likely on Monday, debating the victims bill of rights in committee this week, and dealing with all the issues that have been on the table for two or three years. Finally, on the cusp of the election, the epiphany has struck. The conversion is a bit on the road, not of Damascus, but perhaps to the next election. I think we

Government Orders

are going to see quite a bit of this discussion about the justice system, how to fix it, what should it entail and so on.

We have been trying to emphasize in these debates on the justice system the need for some guiding principles. Whether it is called the charter of rights for victims, it should be a guiding set of principles that would direct judges, parole boards, people drafting legislation, on what should be considered as they draft legislation or directives for their employees. The justice system should make sure that victims have the standing they require and make sure they do not fall through the cracks.

• (1015)

In my riding a lady beaten unconsciousness and her body was further beaten for a couple of hours. It was actually the noise of the beating that got the police involved. Thankfully the woman survived. Her eyes were swollen shut for a couple of weeks. She was black and blue. It was a wonder she survived.

The fellow was charged with attempted murder but then charge was dropped because it is so difficult to prove. It was a sad case. The guy got off with nine months in jail.

The woman felt her rights had been compromised. I sent a letter to the minister about the need to do something about the part of the code dealing with attempted murder. I also wrote to the attorney general of British Columbia who agreed with me and asked to have the issue put on the agenda of the joint meeting between the attorneys general and the minister to see if there was some way the charge of attempted murder can be proven. It almost never successfully prosecuted. It is very disturbing.

This lady came to see me in my office pointing out that something needed to be done. The guy got nine months in jail for beating on an unconscious body. What tipped off the police was the blood stains on the ceilings and walls when they got to the door. That is how much he beat on her. Attempted murder could not be proven even though he used every conceivable object to beat her.

I raise that case because it is a horrible one. I had to deal with it. The guy was sent to prison and a red tag was put on his file saying that the victim should know where he is at all times. I guess the red sticker fell off the file and the guy was transferred to a minimum security prison 20 miles from the lady's home in the Chilliwack Valley in my riding. It is about a three or four hour walk to the lady's home from that jail. She found out about it only because a guard tipped her off. She immediately went into hiding. There are no fences. It is a minimum security institution, not a federal institution, that I am talking about.

The woman has been in hiding, has changed her name and done everything she could to try to protect herself. She says that every

time she asks for assurances from the justice system that the man will not have access to her, or at least she will know where he is incarcerated, she is assured it will happen and then it does not happen. He phones her from jail.

The woman needs some protection. When we talk about the guiding principle of protecting the rights of the victims that is what we are talking about. She needs that assurance. She should not have to come to see me. She should know that her rights are being protected so that she is not endangered and not in fear.

She is in absolute, hopeless fear for her life. I need to assure her that we are working on it and that we will push forward with some sort of bill of rights for victims which tells them that we more worried about them than anything else and they do not have to live in fear. When she comes to me for that assurance and I cannot give it to her she is very discouraged.

Another case which was raised in question period in the last while was again in my area, in Abbotsford. The Ursel case has been well thrashed out here. It was about someone who was abused sexually and the justice system did not seem to provide a straight punishment clause for that guy. We are not worried about rehabilitation here. We want that guy punished and society protected. It did not happen in that case.

The justice minister should know there are approximately 10,000 signatures of people who are upset about that rapist and are now lobbying day and night with petitions and letters to editors and so on trying to have that judge removed from the bench. Now they are attacking our justice system. That again is a very negative trend. We need to deal with issues that protect our judges. We have to give them the tools and restrict them from using the freedom they have been given to so misjudge a case that the whole justice system has fallen into disrepute. I like to think I could protect our judges, leave them with their autonomy and not get into that fray.

• (1020)

What do I say? That lady has been in my office too. She is distributing the petition. She has a very active group of people. Thousands and thousands of people have signed the petition saying that the judge has to go. That is not the right way to do it. We do not want to start petitioning against judges and kicking this one out because we did not like his ruling. The judge needs his autonomy. We cannot give him the degree of freedom we have under conditional sentencing which allows him to do that.

There is another case in the Peace River area. A fellow threatened to kill his wife. He was estranged from her. They had lived common law for some time and had a couple of children. They separated. He moved away, got together with another lady and had some more children. They were well separated.

Government Orders

He was not paying his child support and there was some acrimony about that. Finally he got disgusted and drove 300 or 400 kilometres to her home. He broke down her door, raped her, beat her and left her unconscious on the floor in her kitchen. Of course they caught him. They knew who had done it because they had a history of squabbles. The judge ruled under conditional sentencing—and Bill C-41 gave him the right—no time in jail for that crime because he might miss a child support payment.

What are we supposed to say to that? What would the parliamentary secretary have me tell the woman? The man drove 300 miles with malice aforethought to kick in her door, rape her, beat her and leave her on the kitchen floor. Then the judge said that if he put him in jail he would miss child support payments. He was given no time in jail, a conditional release. There is something wrong with a system that does not put the rights of the victim ahead of the rights of the guy who is making child support payments. There is something wrong in our system that it does not provide for some sort of protection, a victims bill of rights or something to allow people to know that when some heinous violent sexual assault happens they can be sure minimum time will be served.

What about community protection? That lady is part of the community. The guy beat her, raped her and left. He is 300 kilometres away, exactly where he was the night he got drunk and did it to her the last time.

What are we supposed to say? I say the justice system needs to give a guiding set of principles to the whole mishmash of the justice system, whether it is the code, the legislation, the regulations, the parole board or whatever. The guiding principle should be that the rights of the victim have to be protected. It is not happening yet. It has been talked about. I am tantalized by the talk just before the election, but I have not seen it in 3.5 years. It has not received the emphasis we need. We will be on the campaign trail soon. It will be raised at those meetings.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is Motion No. 2. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

An hon. member: On division.

(Motion No. 2 agreed to.)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

• (1025)

The Deputy Speaker: When shall the bill be read the third time? By leave, now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Rock moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I just spoke on report stage and was happy to detail some of the broad concerns I have with the justice system and some of the emphasis I would like to see changed within the whole application of justice in Canada.

All too often I am hearing a very disturbing trend in coffee shop talk that they are going to take matters into their own hands. It is our job as parliamentarians to make sure that does not happen. Vigilante justice is not the answer to injustice in the land. A proper justice system is the answer.

I have been a member of a party that has raised the mantra of victims rights to a new level in Parliament. We have talked about the need for that change in emphasis. The emphasis should not be on the rehabilitation of criminals. It should be on the rights of victims.

I find myself time and again having to calm people down. I could inflame the situation easily in my riding. I could go over the deep end. It is easy to do. It is easy to get angry. There are any number of cases in which I can do that. I find myself trying to calm people by saying vigilante justice is not the answer. They will get themselves in trouble. This is not the wild west. We have to move past that. However they are right to be annoyed with the system.

The other day Clifford Olson was asking for some changes to his situation. He wanted more access to the media and so on. The ruling of the judge in denying the application was that he felt it was in the best interest of Mr. Olson's rehabilitation that the right not be extended. That was his concern in the ruling. He said it was best for the rehabilitation of Mr. Olson that he not have access to the media because it gets him into a kind of demagoguery situation and all that.

Government Orders

The rehabilitation emphasis in the system has gone a bit overboard. Clifford Olson will never see the light of day. He is in there forever. He will die in jail. He will not get out. That is not the concern. The concern of the judge, because of the guiding principles that have come through the justice system in the last 20 years or so, was rehabilitation of the guy: what kind of education he needed, what kind of courses he could take and so on.

Mr. Olson will not get away with it. He will not be able to manipulate his way out of jail. We all have seen cases of people who go to their case workers and ask what hoops they have to jump through to get out. They are not concerned about rehabilitation. They are concerned about their access to the outside. They will work down the list. They will go to peer counselling. They will join AA. Many people in jail say they will become religious—and I am of the Christian faith—if it means a red star or a green star. They do not care much what religion it is. Sometimes they are very insincere, but they will do what they can to jump through the hoops.

It is very sad to watch, when we are hoping for true change and true rehabilitation not only of their actions but of their hearts, them manipulating the system to see if they can please enough parole officers and enough boards to get themselves out the Pearly Gates or through the Pearly Gates depending on their stage of life. The emphasis has to change because society demands it.

• (1030)

Recently I saw a documentary on a South American country about the middle class suburbs. Every single one had bars on the windows, a wall around the house, the broken shards of glass embedded in the concrete on the top, spools of wire and so on.

In my community there are alarm systems, there is a community watch, people are putting extra locks on their windows and so. It is now incremental at an incredible rate what people are doing to protect themselves.

In North America private police and private security firms now outnumber government paid police officers. There are more people paying privately for protection than we can provide to them through the federal provincial systems. They are saying they cannot trust the government to do the job anymore. When they protect themselves charges will be pressed against them.

Three or four weeks ago in British Columbia there was a case where an elderly Kelowna man was in his house with his wife and a young man in his twenties came to the door and proceeded to try to kick the door in. The elderly couple in their seventies were about to become the victims of a house invasion. Do we tell the man to dial 911 and put his chin strap on his bike helmet and sit there and get ready to take it? That is what the justice system says.

This man stepped out and said “I am not going to take it. My wife is here, she cannot run. I am 72 years old”. He got the baseball bat out and he took it to this guy. We all say let the police do it, try not to be alarmed and sit in your easy chair and hope he does not kill you in your retirement. Enjoy your retirement years.

He did not do that. This 72-year old man said he was not going to take because this guy was coming in to his house in broad daylight to beat the ever lovin’ snot out of him and his wife. And so he took a baseball bat to the guy, and good for him. I do not encourage vigilante justice but what are we suppose to tell people when their lives are in danger?

An hon. member: Then he is charged with assault.

Mr. Strahl: That is right. Then he is run through the wringer of the justice system and people say “maybe this guy is a bad apple and we have to prosecute the guy who is protecting his home and his wife from a 20-year old home invader”.

I have another case in my riding, and I am sure all members deal with these. A lady and her father came in to see me. She is about 30 years old. An ex-husband, common law relationship, stalked this lady for two years after the break-up of their relationship. For two years he sent threatening letters. He said: “I’m going to get you. I’m going to kill you. You’ll never see the light of day”. He kidnapped her once, took her down to the river to shoot with a gun he had in his hands and he took the rifle butt to her. She wrestled the gun out of his hands and flung the gun into the Fraser River. So he just beat on her for a while. I am sure he was going to shoot her and throw her corpse in the river. He was convicted and he is doing time and he may be getting out next month.

While he was stalking this lady he phoned her, threatened to kill her and followed her around from work. That is terrifying to any person and especially to a single woman. At night he would come to her home with a butcher knife and tap on her plate glass window. She opens the drapes and there is this guy tapping on the window with a butcher knife, smiling at her.

• (1035)

This went on for two years. She reported every incident to the police. Nothing happened. The police said that until he actually assaulted her they could not do anything. The police tried. I will give them credit, but the laws are so weak that they could not do anything about the situation.

After the assault, the man got out and caught her again going to work. Thankfully her children were at their grandparents’ home. He chased her around and around the car, in front of 50 witnesses. She was screaming for her life. He caught her and he stabbed her repeatedly. The onlookers did not know what was going on. He

Government Orders

stabbed her until her body went limp. The onlookers finally jumped the guy and wrestled him to the ground.

He was charged with attempted murder. The charges were dropped. They could not prove that he had tried to kill her because he only stabbed her seven times. She lived through the attack. I do not know how she lived. He must have missed all of the vital organs.

Imagine this. The woman and her father came to see me in my office. She had her act together surprisingly well. She could talk about the incident. She told me the story. I did not know what to say. I was without words. The justice system had not protected the woman. Worse than that, I did not know what to say to her father. He was a regular guy. He was about 55. He was a regular Joe. He was a nice guy off the street. He sat across from me and he said: "Mr. Strahl, in July this guy is going to get out. When he gets out he is probably going to assault my daughter again. When he gets out and taps on my daughter's window with a butcher knife, I will kill him". I said: "Sir, if you do that you will spend 25 years in jail. It is malice aforethought. You have threatened him. You said you would do it. You will go to jail for 25 years". He said: "That is fine. What am I supposed to do, Mr. Strahl? He is going to kill my daughter". I said: "I would do the same thing".

The system has to change. Victims rights should be more predominant. It has to change. I have to be able to go back to that lady and say "we are going to change it and we are going to fight in this place until it is changed".

They might issue press releases from the other side which say there is not a problem, but I am not going to change my mind. I am going to attempt to help that lady and too many others like her.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill C-17 for the last time. It is unfortunate that there are two amendments which are completely unrelated to Bill C-17 which have been piggybacked on to the bill. That was done with the unanimous consent of the House because all members of the House supported the amendments which were brought forward. Bill C-17 was the medium through which those amendments were put forward, but the amendments are totally unrelated to the bill. I am going to direct most of my comments to the original bill.

Bill C-17 contains a significant number of updates and improvements to the administration of law which are long overdue and which we support. The efficiency of our police officers and our courts will be aided through a number of the amendments contained within Bill C-17.

• (1040)

Sections 4(6) and 4(7) of Bill C-17 will allow a peace officer to provide a statement of service without having to seek out a justice of the peace or notary to have the service sworn.

This change will improve police efficiency, reduce the workload of justices of the peace and redirect their expertise to where it is needed.

Similarly, section 145(5) and a number of subsequent sections of Bill C-17 will permit any peace officer to release an accused on a reconnaissance. Currently only the officer in charge can do so.

This amendment improves police efficiency by negating the necessity to bring in the officer in charge for a mere procedural action.

We fully support the changes in this bill that would enhance the way police would be able to conduct their business. We also support the portion of the bill which strengthens the proceeds of crime legislation by ensuring that criminals do not retain the profits of their crime.

Initially we opposed Bill C-17 because, as most Canadians are aware, Reform is vehemently opposed to measures that lessen rather than strengthen penalties for serious offences.

Today, however, we are reluctantly providing our support because we have confidence in the provinces that support these measures and confidence, as it has so indicated, that the crown will in the most serious of cases proceed by way of indictment by following a sentencing protocol.

We believe the justice minister was less than forthright with Canadians about the full impact of Bill C-17. The minister has touted the merits of this bill in that it modernizes the law and streamlines court proceedings but he has been noticeably silent about the reduction in penalties for certain very serious offences.

Although Reform supports the administrative changes contained within Bill C-17 I mentioned earlier, I would be remiss if I did not say this bill is a nebulous inconsequential piece of legislation which will be of little significance to the enhancement of the safety of Canadians, their children and their property.

Canadians are very concerned about their personal security and that of their families. These administrative changes will do nothing to protect Canadians from murderers, rapists and other sadistic criminals who roam our streets and enter our homes.

Bill C-17 cannot prevent serial child killer Clifford Olson from playing out his charade. Bill C-17 does not deny killers the right to early release.

Only a bill repealing section 745 from the Criminal Code can deny Clifford Olson and others from seeking early release, but the minister did not bring in a bill of this nature. Instead, he brought in Bill C-45 which still grants Clifford Olson and other first degree murderers an avenue for early release.

By doing so, the justice minister with the support of his Liberal colleagues, has forced the families of murder victims to relive their terror over and over again.

Government Orders

Bill C-17 will not stop Robert Noyes from sexually molesting another child. The former Ashcroft teacher admitted to abusing more than 60 children. As a dangerous offender, he was sentenced to an indefinite period of incarceration on 19 sex related charges.

Now the justice system has turned him loose. In June the National Parole Board granted Noyes escorted temporary leave and if that went well, Noyes was to be eligible for unescorted leave with day parole in February 1997. To date I have not heard whether he has been successful.

Only a bill like the one proposed by my colleague from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley requiring the examination of sex offenders by two psychiatrists will keep Noyes locked up where he belongs.

Bill C-17 will not alleviate the fear of Canadian parents that their children could be abducted, sexually molested or killed in any of our communities or on our streets.

The justice minister's news release at the time of the introduction of this bill stated that these amendments illustrate further progress on the government's safe homes, safe streets agenda. This is absolute nonsense. It is simply not true.

How does someone make safer streets and safer homes by reducing the penalties for crimes such as the forcible confinement of individuals and being unlawfully in their homes?

Canadians want substantive change within the justice system. They want pieces of legislation that effectively enhance public safety. They want legislation that sends a clear message to criminals that if they do the crime they must do the time. Canadians want legislation in the hope that it will deter ruthless thieves from entering and destroying the sanctity of their homes.

• (1045)

Canadians want a bill which repeals section 745 of the Criminal Code. They want the justice minister to vote in favour of victims and victims rights. They do not want a minister that upholds and protects the rights of criminals to the detriment of the law-abiding, peace-loving citizen.

In 1995 the minister voted against private member's Bill C-226, which would have extinguished the right of first degree murderers to a parole ineligibility hearing after serving only 15 years of a life sentence. Canadians do not want the minister giving killers a glimmer of hope. They want killers behind bars and they want them there for a minimum of 25 years: not 15 years, not 20 years. Canadians overwhelmingly want murderers behind bars for the full length of their sentences.

What is the value of a human life to the justice minister, the Prime Minister and the Liberal government? Is it just 15 years? That is what they are telling the people of Canada. They are telling

Canadians their laws are enhancing public safety. Nothing could be further from the truth.

On August 12, Clifford Olson was eligible to apply for a parole ineligibility hearing and in March, thanks to this government, this multiple child killer gets his day in court at the expense of taxpayers. The minister saw on the day that Olson once again made the national news how Canadians truly feel about his tough on justice amendments to section 745. The justice minister just recently witnessed the horror all Canadians experienced on March 11 when Clifford Olson once again was granted, courtesy of the Liberals, the opportunity to flaunt his sadistic crimes.

Olson is not the only eligible murderer. On July 10, Ralph Ernest Malcolm Power applied for early parole on his first degree murder conviction. In 1981, the 28-year-old Power, an ex-con out on mandatory supervision beat 20-year-old Sheryl Gardner's face to a bloody pulp with a hammer. He confessed he was attempting to stun her just a little so he could rape her. Power was caught and arrested for the murder of Sheryl after attempting to kill another woman.

The Minister of Justice should have brought in a bill that would keep Clifford Olson, Ralph Ernest Malcolm Power and many others behind bars. Why is the Minister of Justice not listening to the victims of violence and the Canadian Police Association? Why has the minister not repealed section 745? The Minister of Justice should be dealing with crime first and then administrative matters, not vice versa.

In the wake of the horrific crimes against Leslie Mahaffy and Kristen French, capital punishment is resurfacing as a major issue with Canadians. The evidence is growing that if Canadians were given the opportunity to vote in a binding referendum on capital punishment, an initiative the Reform Party supports, Canadians would choose to sentence our most ruthless and sadistic killers like Paul Bernardo and Clifford Olson to death. The Liberal government refuses to give Canadians this opportunity.

Canadians welcome Bill C-55, the dangerous offender legislation, but they want it strengthened and they want the minister to end statutory release. They want to end the automatic release of prisoners after serving only two-thirds of their sentence, even when science indicates these people will commit further crimes. Malanie Carpenter who was kidnapped, raped and murdered is one of the latest victims of this kind of Liberal mentality.

The minister promised to bring in an omnibus bill encompassing these two initiatives which would significantly enhance public safety. Instead we got Bill C-55, which falls short of Canadians' expectations. All Canadians have been given in the last year are half measures or bills like Bill C-2 and Bill C-42 which amend the Judges Act, Bill C-9 which re-instituted the law commission and now Bill C-17. Bill C-27, which we do support because it deals with child prostitution and stalking should have pre-empted all of

Government Orders

these bills. All Bills C-2, C-42, C-9 and C-17 do is make life a little easier for those involved in the justice system. They do not and will not make Canadians safer.

In fact Bill C-17 may give Canadians more reason to be concerned about home invasions because the Liberal government through Bill C-17 has lessened the punishment for this Criminal Code offence. That is why we give our support reluctantly to this bill.

• (1050)

Bill C-17 reduces maximum sentences and changes strictly indictable offences to dual procedure offences. The redesignation of offences from indictable to dual procedure permits and encourages judges to consider those offences as less serious and therefore permissive of a lesser punishment to include mere financial penalties.

While most of these offences are non-violent, with the exception of forcible confinement, they do involve intrusion into the sanctity of our homes and forgery which may deprive our most vulnerable citizens, our seniors, of valuable financial assets.

According to Statistics Canada, in 1994 break and enter accounted for 15 per cent of all Criminal Code offences while 25 per cent of all Criminal Code offences were for property offences. Eighty-one per cent of break and enters involved forced entry. Property was damaged in 71 per cent of the cases and property stolen in 81 per cent of the cases.

Instead of expressing concern and outrage over these figures, the Liberal government is now saying these offences deserve a lesser penalty. These offences, which infringe on the financial and mental security of Canadian citizens, are going to be dealt with more leniency because of Bill C-17.

Unbeknownst to Canadians, the Liberal government has been slowly moving in this direction over the course of its mandate, a direction we are opposed to because not only has it not been sanctioned by Canadians, it may very well lead to an increase in crime, not a reduction, which is what we in this party seek as do most Canadians.

A shift of this magnitude in how we punish or—should I say in a politically correct manner—how we hold criminals accountable for their actions should be reviewed and then approved by the public.

Bill C-41, which has now been in force for a number of months, introduced alternative measures: alternatives to incarceration, alternatives in fact to a court hearing. This portion of Bill C-41 was overshadowed by the hate crime part of the bill which gave added protection under the law to a category of citizens including those classified by sexual orientation, an undefined term.

If asked today, I am confident very few Canadians know that the Liberal government has provided the means for a whole host of criminals, including sex and other violent offenders, to do community work rather than spend time in jail.

It is most unfortunate Canadians were not aware of the full scope of Bill C-41 which was described by the Canadian Police Association in the following manner: "Bill C-41, with few exceptions, is unwieldy, complicated, internally self-contradictory, duplicitous and what is worse, all of it completely unnecessary for anyone of any knowledge of or use for the common law heritage of Canada".

We would not have objected so vehemently to the alternative measures section of Bill C-41 if the government had specified which offences may be applicable to alternative measures. We could support the use of alternative measures for specific non-violent offences, to reduce expensive court procedures and incarceration. However, no such specifications appeared in Bill C-41.

The Reform Party submitted an amendment to Bill C-41 that would have exempted violent offenders from alternative measures. However, the Liberals on the justice committee killed that amendment.

Since the proclamation of Bill C-41, which also encouraged the courts to use conditional sentencing, at least two convicted rapists and others are walking free on conditional sentencing while their female victims are afraid to leave their homes. That is unacceptable. I hope the minister will bring in an amendment to the Criminal Code that will restrict conditional sentencing to non-violent offences so that rapists do not walk free like the two in British Columbia.

I would like to draw to the attention of the House the sections of Bill C-17 which concern us. The present law dealing with forcible confinement of a human being makes this offence an indictable offence with a maximum sentence of 10 years which classifies this as a very serious offence.

Under Bill C-17 the severity of this offence will be lowered significantly. The maximum penalty will still be 10 years but it will become a dual procedure offence which may be processed by either indictment or summary conviction. This means that under a summary conviction procedure, this offence can be reduced to a maximum sentence of 18 months or only a fine of up to \$2,000.

Section 348.1(e) of the Criminal Code regarding breaking and entering for places other than a dwelling house is also changed to a dual procedure offence and the maximum sentence will be reduced from 14 years to 10 years under indictment. Not only that, but it can be tried by summary conviction with a maximum penalty of 18 months or simply a fine. What does this say to society? What does it say to the criminal?

S. O. 31

• (1055)

The offence of being unlawfully in a dwelling house, Criminal Code section 349(1) has also been changed to dual procedure with imprisonment of up to 10 years or processed by summary conviction. Currently, unlawfully being in a dwelling house is an indictable offence with a maximum imprisonment of up to 10 years.

Similarly, section 367 of the Criminal Code regarding forgery and section 368(1), uttering forged documents, will be amended to dual procedure offences with imprisonment of up to 10 years or processed by summary conviction, whereas the current punishment is indictable only with imprisonment of up to 14 years.

It is these sections which initially had us opposed to Bill C-17. As stated earlier, we remain concerned that these Criminal Code amendments will signal to the courts that these types offences are to be treated in a less severe manner than is currently the case. As we know, the decision on whether to proceed by indictment or by summary conviction is made by the crown. It is with this fact in mind, and following consultations with some provinces which provided us with the assurance that in most of these cases the crown will still proceed by way of indictment, that we reluctantly provide our support today for Bill C-17.

Canada is facing rising crime rates, particularly violent crime, raising fears regarding personal safety, escalating costs to administer justice and to house prisoners and to top it all off a growing debt which severely limits spending.

The task of the federal Minister of Justice to deal with these problems in unison will be difficult but not insurmountable. Bill C-17 is not at this time part of the answer. It does not address the increase in crime in Canada and it does absolutely nothing to confront the causes of crime.

Therefore, we will support Bill C-17, an inconsequential piece of Liberal legislation, but we do so regrettably for the reasons given.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak on Bill C-17. I am encouraged by the statements that my colleague from Crowfoot has made in reference to this bill concerning its shortcomings and the fact that we will be supporting it reluctantly. I too have very deep concerns about some of the provisions of the bill.

I have paid some attention to the shortcomings in the area of the reduction in maximum sentences. That really concerns me. As a police officer for 20 some years in the city of Calgary police department I have experienced what reductions of sentences actually do in the courts. There seems to be a trivializing of sentences that are delivered when parliamentarians start tinkering around and reducing the maximum terms allotted to some offenders.

I look in particular at section 279(2) which deals with forcible confinement. When is the section on forcible confinement often

used? What kind of offender is charged with such an offence? For the most part it deals with the rapist, the sexual abuser, the person who has intent to kidnap or to hold against his or her will someone. It is most often a female or a child that the offender has attacked or is attacking.

• (1100)

In Bill C-17 the government introduced a reduced sentence lowering an indictable offence which had a provision of 14 years to one of 18 months and making it a dual procedure. A minimum sentence of 18 months can be delivered if the courts proceed by way of summary conviction.

Rape or sexual assault is a very serious offence. Yet the government has trivialized a good portion of the number of charges of forcible confinement laid in sexual assault offences.

Another provision in Bill C-17 comes under section 348(1). Breaking and entering a place other than a dwelling house is now considered a dual procedure offence with a maximum of 10 years. Again it has been decreased.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member will have the floor immediately after question period when we resume debate on this matter.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

MAPLE SYRUP SEASON

Mr. Larry McCormick (Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues in the House to visit my riding of Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington during the maple syrup season.

The sap is running and communities right across the three counties are transforming this liquid into the most delicious syrup ever tasted. Everyone who is tired of the sloppy sidewalks and dirty snows of the urban streets in March and April is invited to the pristine outdoors of Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington to tour a sugar bush, watch the syrup being made, and taste the flavour of spring on pancakes or in the form of maple candy.

The maple leaf is our symbol. Maple sugar is the ultimate flavour of Canada. Although members might suggest my opinion is biased, I invite them to take the taste test. They will receive a warm welcome from my constituents. They should come and taste the

S. O. 31

best of nature's treats. They should come to Hastings—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington this season.

* * *

[Translation]

POLYVALENTE CHARLES-GRAVEL

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay, BQ): Mr. Speaker, *Le Gravillon*, a newspaper published by the polyvalente Charles-Gravel in Chicoutimi, is among the winners of the merit award for French in education. The paper received the award from the conseil pédagogique interdisciplinaire du Québec in the secondary school category. *Le Gravillon* has become well known for the quality of French in its articles and editorials, all of which are written by students at the Charles-Gravel secondary school.

Under the supervision of teacher Martin Tremblay, *Le Gravillon* has over the years become a tool for promoting the French language, while mobilizing the school's resources and energy to offer a quality product.

Three cheers for Martin Tremblay's team and for the students at Charles-Gravel.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH SUPPLEMENTS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents practise preventive health care using herbs and other natural health supplements, but the Liberal government wants to criminalize these law-abiding Canadians by arbitrarily reclassifying herbs and natural health foods as drugs. This sets in motion an expensive and time consuming testing process that will remove access to health supplements for many Canadians.

Health food stores are being raided, products confiscated and stopped at our borders, and consumers are denied access to products they have enjoyed for years. That happens even though there is no scientific evidence whatsoever that the products have ever produced harm and there is no reason for these actions.

The burden of proof should be reversed for these products. Health Canada should be required to demonstrate that they harm human health and well-being before it imposes restrictions in their trade or consumption. Reformers say call off the Liberal government's health police and give Canadians freedom of choice in health care because foods are not drugs.

* * *

MEREDITH DOYLE RINK

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Meredith Doyle Rink arrived home in Truro last week boasting a bronze medal from the World Junior Curling Championships in Japan. Every country set their sights on Canada. The

Canadian team was the team to beat. Although Canada lost to Scotland in the semifinals, the girls played extremely well and defeated the United States team five to two to bring home the bronze.

The team produced a number of all star players and was considered a model of youth sportsmanship on and off the ice. Members of the Meredith Doyle Rink served as excellent ambassadors for Canada.

I ask all members of the House to join with me in thanking and congratulating the team on its excellent performance and its awesome world victory.

* * *

• (1105)

MAGDALENA FILIPOWICH

Mr. Walt Lastewka (St. Catharines, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it was April 16, 1897 in a small village in Austria when a little girl was born to Pauline and Thomas Kowalchuk. They named her Magdalena.

Magdalena sailed to Canada with her family in 1903 and they settled in Tiny, Saskatchewan. In 1915 Magdalena married Michael Filipowich. The couple built a small, two-bedroom home in Swan Plain, Saskatchewan, where they had 10 children. The little house still stands as a reminder of the hard work and dedication of one of this country's great families.

Magdalena has lived in my riding of St. Catharines since 1956. She now boasts 37 grandchildren, 85 great-grandchildren and 24 great-great-grandchildren.

This Sunday, Magdalena Filipowich and her many friends and family will celebrate her 100th birthday. I want to join with them in this special celebration and say to Magdalena happy birthday, congratulations and God bless.

* * *

[Translation]

TOYS PROMOTING VIOLENCE

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Martine Ayotte, is putting together the world's biggest puzzle. This is a very special puzzle where each piece in fact consists of a petition to ban toys that are an incentive to violence.

So far, this initiative by a mother of five children has resulted in 26,000 signatures, and there are more to come. The purpose of this courageous initiative is to prevent the manufacturing, importation, marketing and advertising of toys which carry instructions that are clearly an incentive to violence.

Next month, Mrs. Ayotte will be at the House of Commons to put together all the pieces of this impressive puzzle. On this occasion,

she hopes to make the government aware of her initiative to push for appropriate legislation.

I fully support Mrs. Ayotte's initiative, and I would urge members of all parties to do the same. On behalf of my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois, I want to commend this woman on the imaginative way she is trying to improve our society.

* * *

[English]

NEW LISKEARD CUBS

Mr. Benoît Serré (Timiskaming—French River, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in extending my sincere congratulations to the New Liskeard Cubs, a AAA midget hockey team that captured the Ontario title on April 6, 1997. I am proud of these young hockey players for their hard work and team spirit. It is the second consecutive year that the Cubs won the Air Canada central region championship.

The Cubs have a long tradition of excellence in hockey. Residents of the tri-towns in my riding are proud this team will represent Ontario at the Air Canada Cup National Championship Tournament which will be held in New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, later this month.

[Translation]

I am proud of the success of the New Liskeard Cubs, one of the hockey teams in our riding. I am sure the team will make all Canadians proud when it participates in the national championships.

* * *

[English]

AQUACULTURE

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, B.C. produces 5,000 tonnes per year of oysters. This provides high paying jobs.

France imported 100 tonnes of oyster broodstock from B.C. 15 years ago and is now producing 150,000 tonnes per year or 30 times greater than the production of B.C.

The aquaculture industry continues to be bogged down by counterproductive federal rules and bureaucracy. Shellfish production needs to be moved to an advocacy ministry such as agriculture. The federal aquaculture development strategy of 1995 has never been adopted by DFO. The current attitude and practices of DFO and DOE are costing west coast jobs, jobs, jobs, big time.

This has led to calls for provincial jurisdiction. This is probably the only answer unless there is a federal attitude transplant.

S. O. 31

I ask the respective ministers to get with the program to allow the industry to prosper.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. George Proud (Hillsborough, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion over the impact of the new employment insurance system. I just want to set the record straight.

The government has acted in a responsible and prudent manner. Seasonal workers have not been compromised. The Atlantic Liberal caucus ensured that seasonal workers were protected.

Unfortunately after EI went fully into effect in January a problem surfaced which affected all Canadians. Again the government acted on recommendations that would protect seasonal workers.

The solution will work. Small weeks are counted for eligibility but are bundled for calculating benefits. This change gives claimants the best of both worlds.

I doubt there are many who would argue that reforms were not needed. The changes implemented help Canadians. Every hour counts. More people will be covered and many will qualify quicker. More important, they are better active measures to get Canadians back to work. The new system is good news.

* * *

• (1110)

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING

Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Edmonton East is home to six vibrant healthy co-operative housing communities. Each is unique. Each serves a valuable social purpose. Each provides an economic benefit to all Edmontonians.

Edmonton East co-operatives provide stability, safety, independence, privacy, affordability, diversity, equality and dignity to both advantaged and less advantaged families.

At a recent public forum someone expressed these benefits beautifully:

For the first time in my life I belong to a place I feel safe, know my neighbours, make a positive contribution, live in a community where there is space to grow a family, to have a yard, to have a pet and to be protected from adverse market forces.

Artspace provides our disabled with cost effective independent living.

Acoxal provides newcomers to Canada with the language, skills and job training needed to positively contribute to Edmonton's economy.

Sundance and Riverdale provide safe affordable communities to raise happy, healthy children.

It is imperative that our government ensure the long term viability of co-operative housing.

*Oral Questions***GUN CONTROL**

Mr. Ivan Grose (Oshawa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I will raise an issue close to my heart, gun control.

Having just returned from Europe where I was repeatedly congratulated on our government's courage in enacting a bill to restrict the ownership of firearms, I am utterly amazed at the flip flop of the New Democratic Party on the issue.

I have always had grudging admiration for the party of M. J. Coldwell and Tommy Douglas and its reputation as the conscience of the Canadian nation. It is with extreme sadness that I see its descent into political expediency.

I beg members of this old and formerly honourable party to rethink their attitude on this issue at their upcoming convention. My plea applies not only to members of the House but to aspirants for election to the House including the candidate in my home riding.

Let us preserve our distinct society as opposed to our neighbours to the south. In Canada guns are bad. In the U.S.A. guns are good.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MIRABEL AIRPORT

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members from the Lower Laurentians, including myself, are disappointed, but more determined than ever to continue the fight for the long term survival of Mirabel airport, following the appeal court decision concerning ADM.

All the efforts and energy invested by people from that area over the past weeks will not have been in vain. The public is rallying strongly in favour of Mirabel. It is up to us to do everything we can to find solutions.

In Quebec City, work has already begun, with the creation of the joint commission on the future of Mirabel airport, and we should be pleased. The Liberals, who have landed us in this mess, should get moving as well.

The region's Bloc Québécois MPs urge the public not to give up, but instead to redouble its efforts to have traffic transferred back to Mirabel. People in the Lower Laurentians should not be held hostage by the Liberal government.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, fisheries management in Canada has reached a new low. In spite of massive expenditures by DFO the Atlantic groundfishery is in ruins, capelin stocks are dangerously low, Pacific salmon stocks have fallen

dramatically, and now the Bay of Fundy scallop beds are all but wiped out.

It is getting so bad that the portfolio of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will soon be changed to just the minister of oceans because we are fast running out of fish.

Digby scallop fishermen who have families to feed and mortgage payments to make want to know what the minister will do for them. Is the minister prepared to shoulder his responsibility and make responsible and rational management decisions?

Scallop fishermen in Digby who have been occupying DFO offices for the past eight days want answers. They want to know that they will be able to earn a living in an industry that they pioneered 75 years ago.

* * *

PARKINSON AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House and all Canadians that April has been designated Parkinson Awareness Month by the Parkinson Foundation of Canada. In addition, April 11 marks World Parkinson Day.

Parkinson is a chronic brain disorder. It is the most prevalent movement disorder and one of the most common neurological disorders affecting some 100,000 Canadians.

The Parkinson Foundation of Canada was established in 1965. It is made up of more than 100 chapters and support groups nationwide.

• (1115)

The foundation is dedicated to funding research into the cause, treatment and ultimate cure for Parkinson; providing training, counselling and workshops for patients, caregivers and health care providers; developing and distributing material; and heightening public awareness about Parkinson.

I invite the House to join me in wishing the Parkinson Foundation of Canada and its many volunteers a very successful Parkinson Awareness Month and World Parkinson Day.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Yesterday, before the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Canada refused to co-sponsor a Danish resolution condemning human rights violations in China. Yet, since the massacre in Tiananmen Square, Canada had never failed to co-sponsor

Oral Questions

similar resolutions. Canada has apparently given up defending human rights internationally.

In light of the fact that China is systematically, blatantly and continually violating human rights throughout its territory, and particularly in Tibet, can the minister tell us why the Canadian government did not support Denmark's action, which condemns the failure to respect human rights in China?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have not refused. The hon. member is totally wrong in his statement.

A resolution was tabled by Denmark with a number of co-sponsors. We are still looking at the question of whether we would be a co-sponsor but we have not refused in any way. It is a matter under consideration.

The Prime Minister already said a few days ago, if the hon. member had paid attention, that they would be examined by a meeting of cabinet ministers probably at the beginning of next week.

In the meantime we have also indicated our intention to vote for the resolution. The Prime Minister said that in Washington in his speech Wednesday. The hon. member should check his facts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for the past seven years, China has succeeded in blocking any vote concerning its human rights violations. But the real vote, the one he is talking about, is when a country sponsors a resolution.

Is the minister telling us that, with all these changes, these things he will be deciding about in the future, and so on, Canada has caved in to the blackmail and threats of political and trade reprisals from this country?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said. We were faced, as was everybody else, with a decision by the French to break the consensus established by the European Union, the major sponsor of the resolution.

That certainly changed the circumstances in which one would want to look at the resolution. Because of the trip to Washington and other activities, we did not have the opportunity to have a cabinet meeting on the matter. The Prime Minister indicated that there would be a meeting at the beginning of this week at which time we would make a decision.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it has only been going on for seven years, so I can understand that the minister has not had the time to hold a meeting of his officials.

I find the responses of the government and of the minister this morning most puzzling. If I understand the minister correctly, Canada seems to have abdicated its traditional role as defender of human rights. Otherwise it would have cast its real vote by now, and we would know where it stands. As things are now, we do not know where it stands and are still waiting, despite the importance of the issue.

By refusing to stand up to intimidation by China and by putting the defence of international human rights on the back burner, does the minister agree that Canada is a party to the imprisonment of Chinese political prisoners, and to the detention of the 11th Panchen Lama, the chief spiritual adviser of Tibet?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member is trying to inflame and to exaggerate his position. Unfortunately the hon. member is basing his premise on sheer ignorance.

If he had paid attention rather than to a headline but to the facts, he would know that last week I was in China. I met with Chinese officials. I raised the issue of human rights. I raised the issue of political prisoners. We put them on the table.

Canada maintained a continual constant opinion that we would raise those kinds of issues directly with the Chinese and we did. It is too bad the hon. member does not have the fortitude and the resolve to make the same kind of commitments we are prepared to make.

* * *

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

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

We know that Canada played an important role in the world movement of sanctions against apartheid in South Africa. At the beginning of this month, the UN Human Rights Commission published a report in which it urged the international community to take steps to combat violence against women, such as rape and trafficking.

Can the minister tell us the measures he intends to take in response to the publication of this report, which reminds us that violence against women is still considered a form of entertainment or a normal practice in a number of countries?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we certainly share very much both the spirit and the intent of the resolution in Geneva. There are several ways of follow it through. Certainly one would be to ensure that in our domestic situation we take all steps possible. The Minister of Justice has already indicated in the House several times this week that we have a number of initiatives to combat violence against women, in fact violence against all people.

I think the commitment made by the minister is a clear example of the way we want to act domestically.

A second initiative we can take is to work internationally to ensure that there are covenants and that through the work of CIDA and other groups we work within those countries to provide assistance and programs that will assist women and combat violence against women.

[Translation]

Mrs. Maud Debién (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that many countries with which the Canadian government has dealings are directly implicated in this serious problem of violence against women.

Does the minister intend to denounce these countries during his upcoming international dealings and in his trade relations with these same countries, and thus maintain the leadership role that Canada has always played with respect to human rights?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can answer that by way of example. Canada was very instrumental in working with Indonesia for the establishment of an independent human rights commission which is taking on those individual cases by the support we give.

In the discussions we held recently with Cuba on human rights issues, we have agreed to co-sponsor a major meeting in Havana to deal with the questions of rights of women and rights of children.

I have made it very clear and very explicit in the statement on Canada's human rights approach that we believe the most effective way of promoting democracy, human rights and the protection of basic civil liberties is to promote and support those working within the countries to provide the changes within those countries. That is the central trust of our policy.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday during question period the justice minister read a letter from the president of CAVEAT, Mrs. de Villiers, while responding to a question about conditional sentencing and the case of rapist Darren Ursel.

By doing so, is the justice minister saying to the House and the victims of this country that Mrs. de Villiers and her organization support a law that allows a convicted rapist to walk free?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thought the response spoke for itself.

I was asked yesterday about the position of the government in relation to victims. The allegation has been made all week by the hon. member and his colleagues in the Reform Party that the government either does not understand or has not acted in the interests of victims in the criminal justice system.

My purpose in referring to the letter from Priscilla de Villiers, the president of CAVEAT, was to demonstrate that one of the most respected spokespersons for victim rights, who has suffered her own personal tragedy and has turned from that tragedy to make something constructive come out of all that, has looked at the record of the government and has said we have made significant change, that we have demonstrated a willingness to listen and a willingness to act.

I said yesterday, as I say today, that when the people of Canada come to make their choice between the Reform Party and the Liberal government as to who to believe on the issue of victim rights, I believe they will turn to respected and credible third parties such as CAVEAT.

The people of this country will have no difficulty deciding that this is a government which has acted and the Reform Party is absolutely wrong.

• (1125)

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the justice minister's reading of Mrs. de Villiers' letter in the House yesterday indicates clearly that the minister remains committed to a law that allows rapists and child sex molesters to walk free and has attempted to defend his position by leaving the impression that the victims of crime support this law as well.

If this impression is wrong and the minister does not really support rapists and violent offenders walking free, will the minister move immediately to amend the Criminal Code to restrict conditional sentencing to non-violent offenders?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points.

First, no one would suggest for a moment that anyone, whether it is this government, CAVEAT, I or any other responsible person, favours anything but prison for those who commit serious violent crimes.

My reference to the CAVEAT letter was and is in relation to its commentary on the performance of this government in relation to victims and their rights under the law.

On the subject of conditional sentences, the Criminal Code already contains serious penalties, including life in prison, for those who commit serious violent crimes such as sexual assault, aggravated sexual assault and the like. It is already in the criminal law.

If a court somewhere makes a decision about a sentence in a specific case, if the prosecutor believes that sentence is inappropriate an appeal can be brought and argued and that result may well be changed. It depends on the judgment of the court.

The reference this week has been to a specific case in British Columbia which is before the court of appeal. I ask the hon. member to let the court do its job. The penalties are already in the code. If the penalty in this case was inappropriate the appeal court has all the power to correct that result.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, conditional sentencing has been used in a host of violent cases across this country where the offenders are walking free. It is not simply the case of Mr. Ursel. There are a host of child molesters and violent offenders walking free because of the loophole this justice minister has left in the law through Bill C-41.

Since the justice minister likes to hear and read what victims have to say, I would like to read the words of Jana Rosenfeldt, the sister of one of Clifford Olson's victims:

Actually we met with the justice minister last year. He had a chance to stop this. He basically spit on all the graves of all these kids.

That is how a victim really feels about this justice minister and his great concern about victims of crime.

I ask the justice minister one more time will he do the right thing and amend Bill C-41 to plug the loophole that allows the courts to let rapists and violent offenders to walk free? Will he bring that in? We will support it.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, there are already penalties in the criminal law to provide for lengthy imprisonment, if necessary life imprisonment, for those who commit serious violent crimes.

Monday of last week I proposed and all parties agreed, including my hon. friend, an amendment to the conditional sentence provision that will require the courts to look at sentencing factors in general, including denunciation, when deciding whether conditional sentences are appropriate.

In terms of the hon. member's reference to graves, the party opposite makes it very difficult to engage in rational debate. If its members have succeeded in anything this week it has been to fortify their position as a party of the narrow edge, a party of the extreme, a party that prefers slogans over substance, a party that

prefers rhetoric over results. They have made themselves the spectacle this week.

* * *

[Translation]

MIDDLE EAST

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Tension continues to mount in the Middle East where, yesterday, the Israeli defence minister warned that, if friction between Palestinians and the Israeli army continued, Israel would have no trouble taking back Hebron or any other Palestinian city.

Since this statement could inflame the situation and irreversibly topple the peace process arising from the Oslo accords, can the minister tell us what actions Canada intends to take to maintain peace in the Middle East?

• (1130)

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned about the increasing tensions in the Middle East. We continue to call on all parties to find ways of following the peace process established by Oslo of reconciling differences, of living up to their commitments.

Canada is the chair of the working group on refugees. It is the one working group that came out of the larger peace process that is still functioning. We will be leading a mission into the Middle East shortly to see if we can bring the parties together to work specifically on the refugee issue.

That area is perhaps the most burning source of tension and instability. If we can bring progress about by bringing the parties together on the refugee issue it may contribute in its own way to providing a sense that solutions are possible.

[Translation]

Mrs. Monique Guay (Laurentides, BQ): Mr. Speaker, does the minister intend, in light of the new context, to renew Canadian opposition to the Israeli plan to build new Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have always said that any attempt to bring those settlements about runs contrary to the resolutions of the United Nations. We have constantly stated that and our position has not changed.

*Oral Questions***JUSTICE**

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on June 15, 1995 this government invoked time allocation to ram its sentencing bill, Bill C-41, through the House.

Reformers supported the Canadian Police Association in calling for the rejection of this ill conceived piece of legislation. We feared judges would use conditional sentencing inappropriately in cases of violence. Our worst fears have become victims' worst nightmares.

The Bill C-17 amendment the justice minister just referred to only cautions judges to use this so-called tool appropriately. It does not prevent them from using it in cases of violence.

Will the justice minister now admit his mistake and take corrective action to ensure conditional sentencing is never used again in cases of violence?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the conditional sentence provision provides on its face that the court must take into account the safety of the community, the danger to the community, before deciding whether a conditional sentence is appropriate.

By virtue of the amendment that all parties agreed to this past Monday we will add words that require the judge before considering a conditional sentence to take into account the usual factors, including deterrence, denunciation and protection of the community.

The Criminal Code has over 800 sections. Many provide expressly for terms as long as life imprisonment for those who commit crimes of serious violence, including sexual assault and aggravated sexual assault. The tools are there. This government does not sit in the courtrooms to decide cases or pass sentences. It provides the law. The law provides well to deal with violent crime.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on November 4 last year I drew this minister's attention to the misuse of Bill C-41 in three cases involving violence against women. He chose to ignore the facts. One week later, on November 12, Judge Harry Boyle turned Darren Ussel free into the community.

Had the minister acted then rather than mock the question, this travesty of justice need not have occurred.

I will ask the minister the very same question I asked him almost six months ago. Does he believe conditional sentencing, no jail time, is appropriate for rape?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker.

If the hon. member looks at the cases he referred to last November, he should look at the appeal court decisions from those

results. If the hon. member is suggesting that any time a judge somewhere in Canada makes a sentencing decision that he does not agree with we should pass another law, then he does not understand the criminal justice system.

Judges are to apply the criminal law which includes penalties up to life in prison for serious violence, including sexual assault and aggravated sexual assault. The tools are there. They are spelled out in the code for the courts to apply.

I urge the hon. member to reconsider what the purpose and nature of the criminal justice system is.

* * *

● (1135)

[Translation]

U.S.-CANADA TAX TREATY

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

The Bloc Québécois welcomes the fact that Canada and the United States have reached an agreement on amendments to the tax treaty between our two countries. However, retroactive payments will not be made until the agreement is ratified by the Senate.

Is the minister prepared to pay an advance to people on low incomes who will otherwise have to spend nearly two more years deprived of 25 per cent of their U.S. pension income?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I previously said that we need to set up a system because of the rather complex administration involved. We have already taken the requisite steps to ensure that, if an agreement is not reached in time for the U.S. Senate to be able to act, we are prepared, once the system is set up, to make payments on an interim basis.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ): Mr. Speaker, am I to understand from the minister's reply that he thinks it would be normal for a person whose sole income amounts to \$10,000 annually to receive some compensation so that he will not have to live on \$8,000 a year for two years, while waiting for retroactive payments because of an unfair tax treaty?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): No Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member did not understand the answer.

I said we needed to set up a system in order to have the data required to make these payments. Now if there were some delay in the U.S. Senate and the system is ready to go and we have the data, then we will make these payments. So the delay is not due to a matter of principle on our side but is purely administrative.

Oral Questions

[English]

MILITARY BASES

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in question period the Minister of National Defence told the House that Canada was involved in negotiations with the United States over the clean-up of abandoned military bases across this country. Now we have learned that there are not any negotiations taking place and none planned for the future.

Why did the Minister of National Defence mislead the House?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. member is in the grip of this monumental question that was resolved last fall. The fact is an agreement has been achieved with respect to the clean-up of a number of bases, including distant early warning systems at Argentia, Goose Bay and a couple of others. However, it is a contingent agreement because it still remains to be dealt with by the American government.

What we are looking at is, hopefully, that there will be a resolution on the basis of this tentative deal, but we are still making sure that there is progress toward a final resolution which will include the decision of the Government of the United States through the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadian taxpayers are being stuck with a \$500 million tab to clean up American garbage. I cannot believe the subject did not come up when the Prime Minister was smiling for the cameras and sipping white wine with his close friend Bill Clinton.

We would appreciate the straight goods this time. Will the government force the Americans to clean up their own mess or will Canadian taxpayers be stuck with toxic waste and a \$500 million tab?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think the only thing toxic is whatever the hon. member is sniffing.

What we are trying to achieve here is an arrangement whereby the American government takes some responsibility for a situation that has developed over the last 40 or 50 years.

The hon. member may have a slight capacity of recall that there was a second world war. Subsequent to that there was a cold war, during which time American military establishments were set up in various parts of the country.

We have come a long way in trying to negotiate a deal with the American authorities to assist us in the clean-up of a number of these sites.

The number he referred to, specifically the \$500 million figure, was not a number put forward by the Canadian government. It was a number that may have been put forward by someone else. The \$100 million U.S. that has been agreed to, contingent on approval by the American Congress is, we feel, a significant improvement over what anybody else has been able to negotiate with the Americans subsequent to their deployment to various parts of the world.

• (1140)

I know if the hon. gentleman took on this cause and went to Washington to meet with his friend Newt Gingrich and others, he would scare the hell out of the Americans and would get whatever he wants.

* * *

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence.

Before the Easter recess, in answer to my question about employment insurance benefits for members of the reserve, the Minister of National Defence said he would let us know as soon as possible why members of the reserve did not pay premiums for service in class A or for contract jobs with a duration of less than 30 days.

Could the minister finally explain why members of the reserve are excluded from the Employment Insurance Act, while all other workers are not?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for the question he asked a few weeks ago.

I would like to point out, however, that all employees are not necessarily covered by the act because if I am not mistaken, the Sûreté du Québec is not covered, since the Quebec government decided it would be better for employees of the Sûreté not to be covered.

However, since the hon. member raised a matter I thought was very important, we looked to the whole picture. Since it is a fundamental principle to ensure that all Canadians who have a job have access to the employment insurance program, we are now changing the regulations at the Department of National Defence to give members of the reserve access to the employment insurance program, even for a period of less than 30 days.

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, once again the Bloc Québécois has made major gains. We are often in the House to push this government to do things, and we do that on a regular basis.

Oral Questions

Since the minister agrees that the government should change the regulations for members of the reserve, will he promise that he will take action as soon as possible, in other words, by the end of this month?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will do everything we can to act as quickly as possible.

My only regret is that the hon. member is surrounded by people who once sat on this side of the House as members of the Conservative government, including the leader at headquarters in Quebec City, and all these people let this situation go on for many years. However, we will act a lot quicker than the hon. member may think, and I want to thank him for recognizing the fact that we reacted appropriately to a problem that had to be dealt with.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Laval West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, not so long ago, the minister responsible for the infrastructure program announced the federal government's offer to continue the program for a year. Provinces have been signing agreements for a number of weeks now.

Could the minister tell the House how negotiations are going with Quebec?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the Government of Canada has reached an agreement with the Government of Quebec on continuing and expanding the infrastructure programs.

Under this agreement, \$185 million dollars from the Government of Canada will be spent on municipal infrastructures over the next twelve months, and we hope to create over 5,000 jobs with this expanded program. It will enable municipalities to put in place the infrastructures that are vital to all Quebecers.

* * *

• (1145)

[English]

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Government Operations tabled its report on contracting yesterday. The report was particularly critical of the government and found that Treasury Board was not following its own rules. It was found that fully 37 per cent of contracts worth over \$3.2 billion were sole source or non-competitive contracts.

In the red book the Liberals promised accountability and integrity in government. What do we see? Millions of taxpayers' dollars

being squandered by the government. It is not following its own Treasury Board policies and guidelines regarding the awarding of contracts.

My question is for the minister responsible for Treasury Board. Will the minister guarantee that Treasury Board will follow its own rules with respect to the awarding of contracts and, in particular, drastically reduce the number of contracts awarded without going through the competitive bidding process?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this committee of the House has been doing what we believe is very good work for about two years. The members submitted a preliminary report in the fall of 1995. We agreed with quite a number of their recommendations.

In fact, already we have put in place a number of measures to implement these recommendations. For instance, in order to increase the number of contracts that went to competitive bidding the threshold was lowered from \$30,000 to \$25,000. The new bidding procedures have been tightened. The monitoring is much stronger. We are waiting to see the other recommendations in the final report in order to act on them as quickly as possible.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the minister is tinkering around the edges. He has not dealt with the meat of the issue. We are talking about \$9 billion in contracts. That is nearly 10 per cent of total government spending and yet the government has not addressed the key issues.

The committee report recommends that Treasury Board address four areas of abuse by the government: sole source contracting, contract splitting, contract tailoring and contract amendments. These abuses fly in the face of government policy and are contrary to the standards of fairness and transparency that Canadians expect from their government. The committee report calls for strong sanctions to be imposed to prevent such abuses from continuing in the future.

Will the minister guarantee to Canadians that his department will follow the committee recommendations and put an end to contract splitting, contract tailoring and excessive contract amendments?

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first, more than 60 per cent of the contracts that are concluded are concluded according to rules that involve competitive bidding. The great majority of these contracts are clearly recognized as being efficient, fair and under proper procedures.

In the circumstances that were mentioned by the committee we have recognized that in certain cases the recommendations make a lot of sense. As I mentioned, we have already implemented a number of these measures. We will now study the other recommendations. We have, I believe, 90 days to respond. We will

respond to all these recommendations. When they make sense we will implement them.

* * *

[Translation]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

In the report to the Prime Minister entitled “Leadership and Management of the Canadian Forces”, there is a common thread to the reforms proposed by the Minister of National Defence. They do not touch anything that sets the army apart, well out of public view, and that affords it government complacency.

Why did the minister refuse to act on the recommendation by Professor Albert Legault that civilian and military companies be integrated and the ombudsman accountable to Parliament?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we tried to take into account a number of recommendations that came from a lot of people, not just Professor Legault.

I would point out to my colleague that, as regards the system of military justice and the operation of the military police, we will be establishing a tribunal to oversee the activities of the military justice system and to look into complaints about the system. This is completely outside the chain of command of the Canadian forces and outside the bureaucracy of the Department of National Defence. It will report directly to the Minister of National Defence.

However, as is generally the case, because he has no regulatory power but rather the power to verify and encourage so that the appropriate changes are made in cases where the system has treated individuals unfairly, the ombudsman is to report, as is often the case, to those persons in a position to make the necessary changes.

• (1150)

In the case of National Defence, the ombudsman’s reports will be made public as will those of the tribunal I have just mentioned. This will, I think, ensure a transparency heretofore unknown in the organization of the Department of National Defence.

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the military police and the ombudsman, who will both remain under the authority of the chief of staff, and the minister’s refusal to review the army’s traditional role, including its readiness for combat, lead us to conclude that the minister’s reform is nothing more than window dressing.

Oral Questions

Does the minister not agree that, in fact, his reform accords full and unconditional amnesty to the chief of staff of the Canadian armed forces and treats all those guilty of murder and of covering up all the events in Somalia as innocent, without any formal decision? Does the minister realize that he is proposing not only amnesty, but total amnesty?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.): No, Mr. Speaker, but when I come face to face with incomprehension, I certainly realize it.

There is no doubt that some of the 65 recommendations we made in fact concern a number of the points the hon. member has raised. However, I would point out to him that the recommendations on the military justice system and the operation of the military police were prepared and submitted to the Prime Minister and the government without a single letter being changed. The recommendations are the result of work presided over by a former chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

I think the hon. member should make sure his facts are right and that he understands what he is saying when he refers to the recommendations on the military justice system and the military police. Because when the time comes to judge the content, I believe the opinions of the hon. member will be measured against the ability of the former chief justice of the Supreme Court of Canada.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Canadians are up in arms. The government is pursuing a course to ban commonly used herbs and medicinals that people have been using safely for decades.

Would the Minister of Health get his priorities straight and allow people to use these substances without restriction?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the member is so exercised. Health Canada is discharging a responsibility that he would impose on it and which he would want all Canadians to ensure it fulfilled, specifically to ensure that all products that come on the market claiming a medicinal function be both safe and effective.

Second, he is well aware that Health Canada already has a committee in place to study all such herbal products. Over 100 of them are approved on an annual basis. Surely the member would not want Health Canada or any other body to release products on to the market before they have been tested for efficacy and safety.

Oral Questions

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, no party is more committed to the health of Canadians than the Reform Party, and that is a fact.

The hon. member needs to be corrected. I am talking about substances that people have been using for decades, substances which are found in our own bodies, like tryptophan.

The health minister first wants to ban cheese and now he wants to ban vitamins. I suggest that he get his priorities straight. While Canadians are dying on waiting lists, this is what the government is doing.

Will the minister get his priorities straight and allow people the choice in health care that they deserve?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all choices are, in effect, good choices if they result in a consequence that is healthy and productive.

The member opposite would surely not ask us to allow a product like Ephedra into Canada. It was widely allowed into the United States.

• (1155)

For example, in Texas over 500 reports of adverse reactions have already been reported. Or comfrey, which has been identified as a causing agent of liver diseases and deaths.

We could go on on this list but it is important—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton—Gloucester.

* * *

[Translation]

MONTFORT HOSPITAL

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Mike Harris and his Conservative government are slashing Ontario's hospital services. They are trying to lay the blame on the federal government, citing cuts to the province's transfer payments.

Of the large hospitals slated for closure, three are in the national capital, including the Montfort hospital, the only French language teaching hospital in Ontario.

[English]

Would the minister inform the House who is really to blame and responsible for shutting down hospitals, especially the only francophone teaching hospital in Ontario?

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the answer is to be seen in the actions of this government in comparison with the government in question.

First, in 1996 the budget delivered on what the provinces had asked for specifically: stable, predictable and secure cash transfers. In the 1997 budget, an additional \$150 million in investment for the future of health care was added in the health transition fund to take Canada into the 21st century. That is in addition to funds that had been already put in place for other health related measures including prenatal nutrition, community action programs for children.

I caution all members in the House to put that in the context of what is going on in Ontario where the government had the opportunity to impose tax cuts or to close—

* * *

[Translation]

**PARC TECHNOLOGIQUE DU QUÉBEC
MÉTROPOLITAIN**

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for the Federal Office of Regional Development-Quebec.

Last March 8, 23 days before the end of the fiscal year, my colleague, the member for Louis-Hébert, reminded the Secretary of State for the Federal Office of Regional Development-Quebec that his government had not yet kept its promise to turn over a quarter of a million dollars in funding to the Parc technologique du Québec métropolitain. Last March 26, the Minister of Industry told the Sainte-Foy chamber of commerce that the amount would be only \$150,000.

How can a minister who says that the jobs of the future will be built on savoir faire and knowledge break the government's promises like this, by depriving the Parc technologique du Québec métropolitain of financial resources, the very purpose of which is to create jobs in the high tech sector?

Hon. Martin Cauchon (Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will confirm what my colleague, the Minister of Industry said: this government has focused on job creation based on businesses in the new economy.

As for the Parc technologique du Québec, it was created and exists in large measure because the Canadian government supported it from the very beginning. We recently stepped in with an additional \$150,000, which seems to have satisfied the people of the Parc technologique.

However, I would just like to mention that the Parc technologique du Québec is a paragonovernmental corporation belonging to the Province of Quebec, and I think that members of the official opposition are knocking on the wrong door. I think the Canadian government has more than done its part for the Parc technologique and we are happy to have done so. They can try knocking at the door of head office now.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

AQUACULTURE

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the task force on aquaculture appointed by the Prime Minister has finished its field work and submitted its report in January.

When is the report going to be made public? Why is the government sitting on it and losing valuable time?

Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is absolutely right that the report is finished. I have had a look at it. We are studying it and when we are ready to act, we will.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. David Iftody (Provencher, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of agriculture. Jobs and education are just as important to rural Canadians as they are to people living in urban centres.

Can the minister tell me, regarding the government's jobs strategy, what benefits are planned to be available for those Canadians living in rural Canada?

Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the last budget provided about \$275 million in tax benefits to help all students and parents to defray the costs of post-secondary education.

• (1200)

Second, my department is developing a national agricultural scholarships program and is committing about \$1 million over the next two years to provide 30 masters and doctoral awards per year in agricultural related fields.

Third, within the national system of internships, which is being supported by the government, there is a science horizons program to assist young Canadians interested in finding first jobs related to the agricultural sciences. That is a part of the internship strategy.

Finally, we have a summer fair program by which we will be providing Canada kiosks at some 164 rural locations across the country. They will be managed on a local level by 4-H members across the country.

* * *

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Deputy Speaker: I would draw to your attention the presence in the gallery of His Excellency Javier Solana, Secretary General of the Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 11th report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Monday, April 7, 1997, your committee has considered Bill C-46, an act to amend the Criminal Code (production of records in sexual offence proceedings), and your committee has agreed to report it with amendments.

FINANCE

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Standing Committee on Finance has the honour to present its 10th report.

In accordance with its order of reference of Monday, June 17, 1996, your committee has considered Bill C-37, an act to implement an agreement between Canada and the Russian Federation, a convention between Canada and the Republic of South Africa, an agreement between Canada and the United Republic of Tanzania, an agreement between Canada and the Republic of India, and a convention between Canada and Ukraine for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, and has agreed to report it without amendment.

A copy of the minutes of proceedings related to this bill is tabled.

* * *

BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. Ian Murray (Lanark—Carleton, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-401, an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy for Canada).

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce my private member's bill entitled an act to amend the Broadcasting Act (broadcasting policy for Canada).

The bill would change the mandate of the CBC to include in its responsibilities the duty to "contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity". This obligation was originally included in the CBC mandate but was removed by the previous government.

I strongly believe that the CBC is a national institution which helps more than any other to foster understanding among Cana-

Routine Proceedings

dians which in turn contributes to the development of national unity. I think its mandate should support this fact.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

DISABILITY BENEFITS

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have the opportunity that was denied me the other day by the government to present a couple of petitions.

I have two petitions. In the first one, the petitioners pray and request that Parliament introduce mid-term disability benefits legislation which allows working Canadians who suffer from a debilitating illness or injury to receive continuous sickness benefits in the following form: 15 weeks of unemployment insurance, mid-term disability and Canadian disability pension plan.

• (1205)

TAXATION

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the second petition I would like to present today, the petitioners urge all levels of government to demonstrate their support of education and literacy by eliminating the sales tax on reading materials.

The petitioners ask Parliament to zero rate books, magazines and newspapers under the GST. As the provinces and Ottawa are considering harmonizing the sales taxes, reading materials must be zero rated under the provincial sales taxes as well as GST.

HIGHWAYS

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have several petitions that I would like to introduce today.

In the first, 28 petitioners call on Parliament to urge the federal government to join with the provincial governments to make a national highway system upgrading possible beginning this year.

TAXATION

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): The second petition, Mr. Speaker, is one on “don’t tax reading”. It has 103 signatures and I concur with the comments of the petitioners.

PEDOPHILES

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): I have several petitions, Mr. Speaker, dealing with pedophiles.

In the first one, the petitioners call on Parliament to eliminate the right of convicted pedophiles to be let out of jail on bail pending an appeal.

The second petition on pedophiles deals with a registry and states that Parliament enact legislation to establish a pedophile registry.

AGE OF CONSENT

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the third petition calls on Parliament to amend the Criminal Code of Canada to set the age of consent at 18 years of age except within a husband and wife relationship so as to provide protection from exploitation and abuse.

JUSTICE

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions dealing with two strikes legislation. They have 273 signatures.

The petitioners call on Parliament to enact two strikes legislation requiring everyone who is convicted for the second time of one or more sexual offences against a minor to be sentenced to imprisonment for life without eligibility of parole or early release.

Also, for anyone awaiting trial on any such offences mentioned in the petition, the petitioners pray that such a person be held in custody without eligibility for bail or release in any form or any manner until the case is concluded in a court of law.

TAXATION

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today I have the privilege to present more petitions on “don’t tax reading”.

The petitioners ask Parliament to zero rate books, magazines and newspapers under the GST. They also ask Parliament and the provincial governments to zero rate reading materials under the proposed harmonized sales tax.

These petitioners are from Edmonton, from Rocky Mountain House and other parts of Alberta. This is very important and I hope the government takes it seriously. We should not be taxing reading material.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. George Proud (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-17, an act to amend the Criminal Code and certain other acts, be read the third time and passed.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary Northeast has 37 minutes remaining in his intervention.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I was relating some of the shortcomings of that bill. I dealt with section 348(1) of the Criminal Code, breaking and entering a place other than a dwelling house for which the maximum sentence is being reduced from an indictable offence only to a dual procedure one, having a maximum sentence of 10 years.

I was relating a situation that occurred in Calgary. It was a shop break-in. Several offenders had entered the shop in the early morning hours of a weekday. While they were conducting their activities within that shop, the owner, a recently arrived immigrant to Canada, had come into the shop to do his work. Unbeknownst to him three culprits who had entered through the roof were in the store. When he walked in he was immediately confronted by the three shop breakers, one of whom was armed.

• (1210)

There was a physical confrontation and the shopkeeper was shot in the neck. He was a breath away from dying. The culprits scattered. Some climbed back on to the roof, the point of entry. One ran through the parking lot. Fortunately a call was placed to police and a nearby cruiser responded. The police response was so immediate that two culprits were trapped on the roof. The third culprit ran through the parking lot firing his gun as the police approached him. It was a semi-automatic weapon.

There was the offence against the owner of the shop and charges were also laid as a result of the culprit firing at police officers. Fortunately no one else was hit. There was a good resolution to this incident. For one reason or another the police never returned fire although they had every opportunity to do so. Maybe they looked at the conditions around the site at the time and did not return fire for that reason.

That is a very serious offence, a shop breaking. It can be looked at as a property offence which is the way it has been classified. It is unfortunate that the government seems to be looking at those offences as being rather minor in nature. As a result of that view we see a change in the legislation that trivializes the offence by it being reduced with its maximum sentence diluted.

Government Orders

There was a shop breaking. Armed offenders entered the premises. A confrontation ensued because a man who had contributed to society got up a little earlier than normal and went to work to look after his books and a few other items. He confronted these subjects and almost lost his life.

As far as I am concerned shop breaking is a serious offence. So is house breaking. However, the maximum penalties will now be reduced to a dual procedure. They can be proceeded with as summary conviction offences which may yield just a few months in prison.

To my way of thinking and in the eyes of a lot of Canadians, culprits like that should get the maximum penalty just for that offence. Now it has been reduced. It should be an indictable offence. Even if the crown proceeds in that fashion the maximum time delivered will be 10 years which is not acceptable.

Another thing will happen in this case. The charges will all go forward: discharging a firearm in a public place; attempted murder; and all forms of criminal charges adequate to this offence. They will be presented in court. As in most cases of this nature where multiple charges are laid, the courts will look on the charges in the following fashion. The most serious charge is attempted murder, the second most serious is shooting at the police officers and the third is the shop breaking itself.

• (1215)

Those three charges will go forward and most likely the most serious penalty will be allotted to the attempted murderer, as it should be, but all the rest, even though they may yield four, five or however many years the court deems necessary, will serve their sentences concurrently. In other words, they will all be served at the same time, as opposed to consecutively. Seldom do we see the courts ordering consecutive sentencing. I find that a little unsettling because it is so common in our courtrooms today.

Charges such as shop breaking, a breaking and entering offence other than in a dwelling house, have been reduced in scope. Frequently charges for shop breaking are reduced. I have a concern about the provision in section 348(1) which would reduce maximum sentencing.

The member for Crowfoot has been diligently following this bill. He is very much aware of its ramifications. He clearly pointed out the fact that our party would have voted against this bill. However, other provisions have been thrown into the legislation which make it almost necessary for us to support it.

Section 349 deals with being unlawfully in a dwelling house. Again it is a dual procedure which has a maximum sentence of ten years. It is an indictable charge. We are talking about a dwelling house in which people live. It is their castle. It is their refuge. The charge concerns an uninvited person being in the house. It is a situation which occurs frequently. The person may not even give a

Government Orders

reason for being in the house but will only face a maximum sentence of ten years.

I was a police officer. The hon. member for Crowfoot was in a similar type of career. He struggled through 14 years and saw some very significant happenings when it came to the things that some people will do to others. I know that people are very unsettled when someone walks uninvited into their home and disturbs the possessions they cherish. I am concerned about the reduction in the sentencing for being unlawfully in a dwelling house. There is no reason an uninvited guest should not get the maximum penalty.

I see that the parliamentary secretary to the justice minister is in his seat. I do not know if he understands what I am saying, but when it comes to breaking into a house, the victims do not forget that there was an intruder in their house. They never forget it. It is very unsettling for them, especially if the intruder touched their possessions.

It has happened to me. Some of my police paraphernalia was stolen from my home by an intruder. I know how it feels. I want to point out that for female members of a family it is very disturbing and they never forget. They have to wash all the clothes because somebody uninvited intruded in their privacy.

• (1220)

When it comes to a dwelling house I see the need to keep offences much higher than most. It is so important that people get the message that the government intends to protect what they own, their refuge, the only refuge that really no one else is permitted to enter apart from members of the family or those who have permission to do so. That is my concern about this part of the bill.

There are other provisions in the bill. One is dealing with forgery. Again it is being reduced from 14 years to a maximum of 10 years.

Prior to my election to the House I was a commercial crime investigator. I have been involved in some major cases of embezzlement, fraud and misappropriation of funds. I have seen numerous people lose their livelihood over the greed of others who had been hired or who were in partnership with them in businesses. It troubles me to see again someone who has committed such a crime and who can lay a complete business to waste because they were in a trusted position and then get away with a lower sentence.

I refer to a statement that was made in one of the government reports. It was the intent of the government to modernize the Criminal Code in these areas. What on earth does modernizing the Criminal Code have to do with reducing the sentences on very important sections of the Criminal Code? What on earth does that have to do with modernizing it?

Mr. Kirkby: Reformers do not understand modernization.

Mr. Hanger: The parliamentary secretary cannot grasp what is being said here. The courts have taken this trend, and a lot of it is because of appointments from the government to many of the judges within the court of Queen's bench appeal court and the supreme court and the pressure coming to bear to change some of the sentences delivered.

That is not what the people in this country want. They are crying out, calling out, for stiffer sentences. Take the troublemaker off the street, not turn him out earlier, not reduce his sentence and especially with violence and those areas where there is a potential for violence. With break and enter there is always the potential for violence.

I know many people do not talk about the fraud side of things but there are hundreds of millions of dollars lost every year in credit card fraud. That would certainly address the point of organized crime.

Organized criminals have engaged in this activity big time. They are the most abusive and intrusive form of criminal into the whole area of credit card fraud and deceit through other means. It stretches into unemployment insurance fraud and welfare fraud in the organized criminal mind.

When the drafters of the Criminal Code brought these sections into being they were very much aware of what had to be done. The legal minds of the day were concerned about organized crime. What would it take to shut down an organized criminal? I know the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice may not be aware that some of these fraud criminal rings operate on an international scale. It is international crime with hundreds of millions of dollars in credit card fraud alone. They obtain cards and they can actually change the data on the strip on the back of the card. This is a very sophisticated, organized type of criminal. It certainly has an impact on the community and society. Who pays for it all? We do. We pay for the service charges at the bank. We pay for the purchase of those goods that are never recovered. We pay the price at the stores because everyone builds into their price list the losses incurred because of this organized criminal element. These sophisticated crimes should be addressed by a maximum penalty that is higher instead of lower.

• (1225)

We talked about the greatest shortfall of the bill, the reduction of maximum sentences in the Criminal Code. The real reasons Reform will have to support the bill are two provisions that the justice minister put in at the last minute.

There is the conditional release where violent offenders are actually given conditional sentences, some of them for rape. Some did not even go to jail. The other one is the victim impact statements on section 745. They were not mandatory. In Bill C-41

Government Orders

the government granted victims the right to give their statement and then in Bill C-45 took the right away.

Seeing the error of its ways, the government brought in the two quick amendments to Bill C-17 which have nothing to do with the original bill, but the subsections are essential and Reform has chosen to support the government on the bill.

On section 745 under the Criminal Code, the faint hope clause, there has been so much talk about the faint hope clause over the years and especially since many of these first degree murderers are now eligible for application for a hearing. There has been a lot of controversy surrounding this.

The government introduced legislation that tinkered with it. It now requires the unanimous consent of a jury to reduce the killer's request for a reduced sentence.

I want to talk more about victim impact statements. However, I think we should look at some other facts before we get into that aspect. Let us look at the judicial review decisions as of mid-1995. In total there were 46 judicial reviews. I looked at the record of those making application for early release. I am talking about first degree murderers. Of the 46 killers who had their sentences reduced 11 killed women. Some were their wives. Some were acquaintances. Some were female children.

• (1230)

The government talks about what it wants to do when it comes to supporting women and giving them opportunity. There is nothing wrong with that, but I have to question the government when it comes to looking at the cold hard facts.

Why would a government want to allow killers who deliberately took the lives of someone else to be released back into society? They prey on moms, wives and children. As of mid-1995, 11 of the 46 applied. Another 8 killed police officers. A police officer has a significant role in society, as do mothers. As the statement goes, the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Let us think of the power of that statement about mothers. It is a powerful statement. One day children have significant influence on society.

Of the 46 applicants, 11 females were murdered by these killers, 8 police officers were murdered by these killers and 3 children. The applicants had reduced sentences.

I would like to have those statistics brought up to date. What is the record from mid-1995 to today? I could add one or two more to the list who killed police officers and had their sentences reduced. How many more women and how many more children were killed? The government is intent on letting them out. It could have stopped

that once and for all by repealing section 745. Ultimately we should be talking about repealing section 745.

The statistics send a shiver up my spine, to think this is what society is doing. There is no punishment. Speaking of punishment, it used to play a very prominent role in the judicial system. It was essential. There was a different understanding of what had to happen. That different understanding dealt with the view of the Liberal thinker of what a man is capable of doing and of what would stop him from doing it.

The role of government is to protect those who have done good in society and to punish those who have done wrong. That is what order is all about. It is about punishing those who do wrong to correct their behaviour. Only punishment can do that.

The model of rehabilitation is struggling. It has fallen into the mud. It has failed society. Yet the Liberal mentality of the day continues with rehabilitation as the way to correct problems when it comes to offenders.

• (1235)

In 1976 the Liberals abolished capital punishment against the wishes of the vast majority of Canadians. I was never consulted or asked for my opinion. Nor was anyone in my community whom I know of. It was a unilateral action taken on the part of the Liberal government to get rid of that section of the Criminal Code.

In 1962 the last person was hanged in the country. It was the form of capital punishment of the day. In 1976 it was completely abolished. Also 1962 was the last time corporal punishment was administered. Since 1962 violent crime has increase over 400 per cent.

Let us look at the big picture because it tells the story. Since 1962 there has been over a 400 per cent increase in violent crime. I do not buy the story—nor do most police officers and others who analyse the crime situation—that crime is going down. It is going down only in the short term.

Since 1962 there has been over a 500 per cent increase in property crime. I think 1962 is a very significant date. Not 1976 or 1984. The last time corporal punishment and capital punishment were administered was in 1962. It was ripped away from the people. They were never consulted. Since that time we have been paying the price. The list of victims increases as time goes on.

It is now to the point where our jails are full. Prisoners are being turned out quicker than we can put them in. They are being turned out without them being rehabilitated. This is a very common occurrence. Rehabilitation does not work. This is a deep concern.

We heard lately questions being put to the minister about ongoing victimization. My colleague from Fraser Valley East has

Government Orders

been very pointed with the Minister of Justice. I am ashamed to say the Minister of Justice in his replies will never address the concern about what is happening. We want to stop victimization.

Only a small element of criminals involve themselves in this kind of activity. It is only 6 per cent to 8 per cent, so let us target the 8 per cent.

I was interested in the statistics and the reaction to the three strikes and you are out legislation in California. I have communicated a great deal with the gentleman who initiated that bill. Two valid strikes and any one criminal offence after that puts the criminal away for life. That bill was passed. The citizens of California wanted it. They were tired of their sons, daughters, moms and dads being shot, mutilated and killed in every fashion. They got behind Mr. Reynold as he introduced that citizen's initiative. It was passed through their legislature and became law.

• (1240)

That was three years ago. Since then violent crime has gone down. They targeted 6 per cent or 8 per cent of the most violent criminals in their society, took them off the street and put them away for life. It did not fill their jails up to overflowing. They had to build one or two more but it is beginning to show results. It is beginning to protect people.

We talk about section 745 and wanting to turn killers out. Where the justice is in that? It is not there. We argue about how the victim impact statement will be presented in the courtroom. It is sad to see victims watching their statements being torn apart by a judge and judge telling them that they are editorializing, that those sections of their statements have to be removed and that they cannot be emotional. They want to take emotion out of the whole process.

I would be emotional if my wife, my son or my daughter were killed. I do not blame them for being emotional. I want them to be emotional because it is an emotional situation to have a loved one ripped away.

We are arguing about the statements when the government should be completely removing the section and allowing for the total closure on behalf of victims. They should not have to contend with another hearing and another hearing and another hearing. It would be over. It would be done with.

Bill C-17 certainly will go forward. We will support it. We will give its provisions the benefit of the doubt and allow the provision overlooked by the justice minister to go through. The bill is so flawed and so abusive to those who do not deserve to be abused that I have a difficult time supporting it. We should be repealing the section completely. We should be removing it from the books.

I have sat in several hearings to listen to statements given by victims. Some cannot even go to court. Some have a difficult time

going to court so they have the prosecutor or someone else read it. The difficulty for me was to see those victims struggle with that and to watch judges tear their statements apart and sanitize the whole courtroom with filtered evidence. Reports were submitted by so-called experts who could never be questioned or cross-examined.

I have a parole report in my briefcase which I will not get into right now. It is devastating to see condensed versions of reality or the truth. They are paraphrased and placed into a court record with hardly any opportunity for questioning or cross-examining. So-called experts come up conclusions to justify the existence of their testimony to ensure a reduced sentence from the jury. The jury sits in a sanitized courtroom. I do not think that is justice at all. The truth is not being heard.

Again I put on the record that Reform will support the bill reluctantly, but our fight to have this section repealed and truth in sentencing initiated, that is a sentence delivered is a sentence served and life means life, will not rest until such is accomplished.

• (1245)

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak on the motion to read Bill C-17 a third time. During the course of debate on this bill there has been a considerable number of subjects discussed which did not necessarily relate to the subject matter of the bill. I will restrict my comments for the most part to the issues discussed in the bill.

Some may remember that Bill C-17 was originally introduced as Bill C-118 on December 14, 1995. At that time it was noted that it continued the work of Bill C-42, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1994 which had been adopted the year before. Bill C-42 was very well received. Provincial and territorial governments through their justice ministers have asked us to get on with producing a follow-up bill to continue the reforms and improvements to our criminal procedure law which were begun in Bill C-42. I believe Bill C-17 does just this. It appears the provinces are appreciative of this and are eager to see it passed.

When the bill was in committee a letter from the attorney general of New Brunswick was tabled. The purpose of the letter was to urge the committee members to seize the opportunity to make a number of significant improvements to our criminal justice system. It is worth referring to this letter more extensively in order to show how important our work in Parliament can be to the provinces that are responsible for the administration of the criminal law.

The hon. Paul Duffie, attorney general of New Brunswick, wrote to the chair of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs on September 17 and indicated that he wished to stress the importance of the proposed amendments contained in Bill C-17

Government Orders

and New Brunswick's particular interest in a number of its provisions.

He went on to indicate the following: "The bill's provisions can be broken down into a number of broad categories. The first category is those which enhance public confidence in the criminal justice system and here I refer to the statutory basis allowing police officers to take by warrant handprints, fingerprints and teeth impressions from suspects; expanding the release provisions that can be imposed by police officers to include such basic requirements as abstaining from alcohol or drugs, reporting as required and prohibiting the possession of firearms; retaining at the option of the crown trial jurisdiction in provincial court so that a limited category of offences could be dealt with expeditiously".

The letter identified a second category of provisions, those intended to make the Criminal Code more effective and efficient. Mr. Duffie then identified provisions aimed at broadening the scope of prehearing conferences, which will give judges more leeway to deal with preliminary issues, thereby narrowing the number of issues at trial and reducing trial time; replacing jurors who are unable to perform their duties, eliminating delays which can occur by restarting the trial; providing a precondition for the court appointment of counsel so there is a means test imposed, ensuring that the public purse is used to only assist those who cannot legitimately afford counsel.

With regard to the third category mentioned in the provisions intended to fill perceived gaps in the Criminal Code, he referred to the need for an offence for those accused who failed to comply with release conditions imposed by a police officer and those who make unauthorized use of credit card data, those who forge or falsify credit cards, those who possess a device for unlawfully obtaining computer devices and those who participate along with the driver in the theft of a vehicle for joy riding.

• (1250)

As a fourth category, the attorney general of New Brunswick identified those provisions intended to achieve compliance with court decisions. He referred to the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada in which the court interpreted the drinking and driving law so that the statutory presumption on blood alcohol has become less effective in contested cases, as the crown is currently obliged to call expert evidence to extrapolate the reading back to the time of driving and has determined that an arrested accused who is detained by police pending a court appearance must be brought before a judge within 24 hours of arrest.

Provisions in this bill will address these problems. He noted, in particular, that the technologically amendments in Bill C-17 would allow the provinces to use modern communication methods to conduct remote appearances, using one or two judges to cover the province, thereby greatly reducing the number of weekend courts which, with their limited human resources, are taking their toll on all of the participants. It is also quite costly to set up weekend courts in each region of the provinces.

The fifth category identified by the attorney general of New Brunswick contained provisions aimed at advances in technology to modernize procedures. He then referred to those provisions that would eliminate the need for a personal appearance in a court by police officers and accused persons for various administrative matters at various stages of the court process, including at the bail hearing, at the preliminary hearing and at the trial. Those provisions would enable investigators to make effective use of the new DNA warrant and general warrant procedures in major crime investigations by applying for and obtaining warrants using modern communication methods.

The sixth and final category includes provisions which try to improve evidentiary procedures. He mentioned the provision that would eliminate the necessity of calling witnesses to establish uncontested elements of certain events by providing affidavit evidence and the provisions that would allow the presentation of expert evidence through written reports, unless otherwise directed by the court.

The attorney general concluded by noting that there are many more provisions contained in this bill, all of which are intended to improve the workings of the criminal law of Canada. He stated that there is a window of opportunity for legislators, after due consideration and informed debate, to enact these measures which, in his view, will enhance criminal law enforcement, facilitate court proceedings, modernize the provisions of the Criminal Code and enhance public confidence in our justice system.

It is clear that this bill is important for the territories and the provinces. Indeed it is a good example of co-operative federalism in an important area where the federal government has the responsibility to enact criminal law and the provinces have the responsibility to administer it. I urge that the bill be passed as quickly as possible.

There were a couple of amendments which were put forward by the government for the purposes of clarifying existing legislation.

First, Bill C-17 was amended to change paragraph 742.1(b) of the Criminal Code by making it explicit that in addition to the judge being of the view that serving the sentence in the community would not endanger the community, which was in the provisions for conditional sentencing, the sentence also had to be consistent with the fundamental purpose and principles of sentencing set out in sections 718 to 718.2. Such principles include the principle of denunciation, deterrence and the protection of the community. While implicit before, it was felt that it was important to make the application of those principles very explicit.

• (1255)

Over the past several months it has been the practice of the Reform Party to refer to specific cases which may be decided before the courts which in the view of the Reform Party are

Government Orders

incorrect, as is the case when every new piece of legislation is introduced.

Court decisions, provincial or Queen's bench or supreme court, differ from one another. The vast majority of the cases are decided correctly but there are exceptional cases where the public may be of the view that the case was incorrectly decided or the crown was of that view. Then the crown seeks an appeal of those decisions, and the defence can also appeal, when it is of the opinion that the decision is incorrect.

The appeal then goes to the court of appeal then to the supreme court and guidelines for the use of such sections are set out and are considered and delineated carefully. As the judicial process carries on, there is a clarification and improvement in the setting out of conditions under which conditional sentencing will operate. Each time there is a court decision which indicates that certain considerations are appropriate or if there is disagreement it is subject to appeal and improvement by the court superior to the one in which the decision was made.

It is probably not appropriate to simply take exceptional cases and make them the rule. Out of the 1000 cases that are decided, 999 are decided in an appropriate manner and are never mentioned. But the one that may not happen to be decided in that fashion is the one the Reform Party raises in an attempt to cast the whole justice system into disrepute.

With respect to this amendment, certainly conditional sentencing as it only applies to those criminal activities for which a sentence is two years or less, people are incarcerated by provincial governments. Because this is an administration of a justice issue, all the provinces were consulted, regardless of political stripe. While there may well have been some differences as to details, a broad consensus certainly existed that a change of this nature needed to be made. Certainly those familiar with the legal system see the jails of the land filled with people who are dangerous but also those who posed no danger to the community, who did not commit violent crimes. It was the desire of the provinces and the federal government to ensure that when people commit violent crimes there ought to be room in correctional facilities for them and that the space ought not to be taken up by people who would not pose a risk to society.

It is a mechanism of the conditional sentence that rather than allowing violent offenders to enter the jail and then days later because of lack of space being removed, it allows for non-dangerous offenders, people who have not committed violent crimes, to serve their sentence in the communities and more space will be freed up for those violent offenders, those who commit abhorrent crimes within the community. Therefore the community will be even more properly protected.

I would suggest that the conditional sentence is one mechanism that allows greater safety in communities by ensuring that for

people who commit violent crimes there will be room in our correctional facilities, thus ensuring they are there for an appropriate length of time.

• (1300)

The second amendment is with respect to victim impact statements and section 745 hearings. When Bill C-41 was introduced it was silent on when the victim impact statement provisions would become effective. This amendment merely seeks to clarify that and make certain that victim impact statements, if the victim wishes to make one, must be accepted by the court after the passage of this bill. That very briefly sums up the provisions of Bill C-17 and the amendments.

I want to make one more comment. I noted with interest when the hon. member from Calgary, the critic for the solicitor general, indicated that since California put in a three strike law the crime rate has gone down. He used that as an argument to suggest that if the crime rate is going down what is being done in California must be working and we should do it here.

I would like to inform the hon. member that over the last four years the crime rate in Canada has gone down, due largely in part to a broad range of initiatives. First, the initiatives taken by the government to toughen and strengthen the Young Offenders Act, the criminal law and other related criminal statutes. More amendments and more changes to improve and toughen the criminal law have been made by this government than had been made in the history of this nation. That is certainly part of the reason.

Another part is that the government has worked hard to increase jobs and economic opportunities for people. That is a very important factor in reducing the crime rate. As well, the government has introduced many important initiatives on the social front to ensure social justice. That too is of importance in reducing the crime rate; removing the underlying causes for crime.

I would like to wrap up and thank the hon. members for hearing me these few minutes on this bill. I hope this bill will receive prompt attention, will be quickly passed and that it will receive expedient and quick consideration by the other place so it can be brought into force as soon as possible for the benefit of all Canadians.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the hon. parliamentary secretary to the justice minister.

First, has the justice department or the member ever researched the three strikes legislation in California? I point out to the member

that I have been doing that on a regular basis for approximately one year. I have received interesting statistics on what is happening.

I am going to dispel one statement that is often used on the government side in reference to the three strikes legislation. It targets 6, 7 or 8 per cent of the criminal element. The most violent, habitual, intrusive, abusive type of people are by far mostly the male population. What it spells out is this. An individual commits an offence, he is charged and he is sent away. He serves the major part of his sentence. The second time he offends, it is spelled out to him very clearly that if he messes up with another violent offence, he will serve an even greater portion of his sentence, a longer one.

• (1305)

If that individual commits any crime again whatsoever, even stealing a pizza, as is often said, because he has had two violent offences against him, he will be put away for life.

In effect, for the offender who commits these violent acts, who has a greater propensity to commit a violent act such as taking someone's life, there is the death penalty in the state of California.

The research put forward by the Department of Justice and those who initiated this bill was quite substantive. It brought about this piece of legislation. It is targeting. It is effective. Did he examine any data or research to see how and why the department arrived at what it did? Maybe it is in the state of California, but also here sentences have been reduced.

This omnibus bill, Bill C-17, is alleged to modernize the law and streamline court proceedings. It quickly points out that the maximum sentences for very serious criminal activity, including unlawful confinement which is a crime against a person, that the maximum sentence be reduced.

I would like the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice to justify why those sentences were reduced and to produce the facts that justify this legislation in its total form. Lay it on the table here. Can the parliamentary secretary address that point?

Mr. Kirkby: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite has raised a number of points in his questions. He indicated that he investigated the three strikes rule in California. After someone has committed two violent offences—I do not know what the definition of violent is, perhaps two common assaults—and then afterward stole a pizza, he should be put in jail for life.

I am unclear what the hon. member means by violent offence. Certainly he is not suggesting that, in the case I mentioned in which someone brushes against someone else, committing common

Government Orders

assault twice and then stealing a pizza, he should go to jail. That would be absurd.

The hon. member said that he researched a number of interesting techniques of crime prevention. There is the three strikes rule, caning in Singapore as well as a number of other issues. The member makes the statement that because the crime rate is going down in California with its three strikes rule, somehow it alone is responsible for the reduction in crime rate.

We have taken a very multi-pronged approach, as I indicated in my speech, to prevent crime. There is no simple solution to the problem of crime but if the hon. member's logic applies, then we are doing the right thing. The crime rate is going down here also.

Mr. Hanger: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the member. I do not think the parliamentary secretary is getting the point of my question.

I asked him to lay on the table in this House the justification for reducing maximum sentences as opposed to increasing them.

• (1310)

The Liberal government has a tendency to constantly want to trivialize some of the more serious Criminal Code charges and there are more than three examples. Dual procedure offences can be handled as indictable or as summary convictions. However, the parliamentary secretary does not want to answer that question.

Where are the facts for bringing about any changes in the law and placing it before Parliament and passing it? I do not see any of that information flowing from the government side, apart from the fact that somebody in the legal community wants it this way or there is a charter argument that states we cannot do it that way any more. That is strictly an opinion that is offered too often by the justice department.

I want to see the facts for justifying a reduction in those maximum sentences.

Mr. Kirkby: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the changes introduced in the bill that deal with dual procedure offences, if the court decisions over the past number of years are looked at, we get an indication of what the judges are doing with respect to various types of offences.

All that we are trying to do, and something the provinces want to see because it aids the efficiency of the legal system, is to allow that where the cases are not so serious to give the provinces discretion to proceed at a more efficient level in court. Where the case is more serious, the result would be a more serious criminal sanction. Therefore, what it is doing is simply allowing more flexibility for the provinces. In more serious cases the accused will still be prosecuted in a serious, tough fashion with serious consequences if a conviction is rendered.

Government Orders

At the same time, in very minor cases, it would allow them to be handled in accordance with the type of issue that is a stake. That is simply reality.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. parliamentary secretary keeps talking he is going to convince me to vote against this bill. I will not because I see the need for some aspects of the bill.

However, the penalties imposed by the courts are no justification for reducing the penalties as prescribed by law. If that is the case then what do we do with this new conditional sentencing law that allows violent offenders to walk free? It is the courts that render those sentences, only because the law has been passed to allow them to do that.

Surely we cannot justify the reduction of penalties simply because some judges deem that a rapist should walk free and that we should reduce the penalty—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary has about 30 seconds.

Mr. Kirkby: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I dealt with that in the body of my speech. I indicated that we are simply allowing that where there is a serious offence it will continue to be dealt with seriously. Where it is not so serious it will be dealt with in a more summary fashion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Bill C-17 was tabled or rather brought back to the House this week. As you know, the official opposition had to approach the federal Minister of Justice on several occasions until he finally agreed to introduce Bill C-17 in the House, a bill which was and still is anxiously awaited by practically all the provinces, since they are responsible for the administration of justice.

Mr. Crête: Lucky we were there.

• (1315)

Mr. Bellehumeur: As my colleague just said, lucky the Bloc Québécois was here to keep reminding the Minister of Justice of Quebec's biding interest in Bill C-17.

You will recall that on Monday, April 7, the Bloc Québécois practically had to threaten the government opposite with amendments that would add provisions concerning anti-biker legislation before the government suddenly decided to bring back Bill C-17.

I think this was another important gain for the Bloc, the way the minister decided to act on Bill C-17 by bringing it back to the House.

Again, we have always been very consistent in our position on Bill C-17, in other words, we have always said yes, it is a good bill. What the Minister of Justice proposes in Bill C-17 is an improvement. The Bloc Québécois is prepared to support the government

100 per cent on this bill, but considering recent events in Quebec, he should take advantage of this opportunity to amend this bill by including, as requested by Quebec, a provision that would open the way to legislation or provisions dealing with bikers and organized crime.

The government has often told us to go to Quebec City, go to headquarters and see our former leader. Get him to agree, and then come back, and more of the same. As far as criminal law is concerned and Quebec's right to have its own anti-biker legislation and even regarding the most far-reaching provisions in Bill C-17, the Bloc and the Parti québécois are definitely on the same wave length. The minister was forced to admit that sovereignists are unanimous about the need for this kind of legislation. He had to do something to make up for the mistakes he has made in this area.

So he brought back Bill C-17. The government even proposed amendments at a stage when it does not usually do so. We gave our unanimous consent. Our co-operation with the government was exemplary. We have tried to make this bill as good as it could possibly be, with some very useful amendments so the police will be able to do their job. And I think Bill C-17 will provide the police with additional tools so they can deal with at least part of the problem of crime in this country.

The Bloc Québécois has repeatedly asked the minister how he intended to deal with crime. He kept saying: "Now listen, Bill C-17 is going to deal with all this. We will pass Bill C-17 in the House, which will introduce various changes, and the problem will be solved". So why has Bill C-17 yet to pass third reading, although it was tabled on March 8, 1996, when it passed first reading, and today is April 11, 1997, more than a year later?

However, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice recalled that some bills were tabled in 1994 and 1995. So they go back even further than March 1996. I wonder. Bill C-17 is supposed to be the answer to all our problems with crime. Because of C-17, we do not have to pursue legislation we have been demanding for months and even years—anti-biker legislation—to deal with the majority of criminal offenses. So why did the minister, who has been responsible for these matters since 1994, not table it so it could be passed?

• (1320)

Allow me to make a short digression. The biker war is currently an issue, but you will remember that, as early as 1982, the municipality of Tracy, in Quebec, asked for a special law to deal with the problem. The mayor of Sorel-Tracy asked for such a measure, because a bunker was being built by the Hell's Angels.

So, this problem has been with us for a long time. Now, the parliamentary secretary is reminding us that the bill, which the minister has had in his hands since 1994, has yet to be adopted.

If the minister had had any political will at all, and a good dose of humility to admit his mistake regarding the anti-biker legisla-

Government Orders

tion that is being asked of him, he could have introduced the necessary amendments and enlisted the same degree of co-operation that he received for his own amendments, on Monday. The minister could have enlisted the participation and co-operation of the Bloc Québécois and, I am convinced, of the third party, since the result would have been a more comprehensive bill.

But the Bloc Québécois will show magnanimity. We will once again give the minister a chance, because he promised us that legislation would be introduced next week. We are anxiously waiting for this legislation, but with an open mind. I hope the minister will follow up on our representations, on those of a large number of Quebec municipalities, and on those of Quebec's Minister of Justice, Mr. Bégin, and Minister of Public Security, Mr. Perreault.

In events surrounding the biker war and Bill C-17, I was somewhat surprised to see in the newspapers that the federal justice minister was accusing his provincial counterpart, Mr. Bégin, of being responsible for the fact that Bill C-17 had still not been passed. The federal minister said: "Bill C-17 could have been passed, but Mr. Bégin, the Quebec justice minister, is partly to blame for the fact that it was not".

I think it important that I mention to the House a letter, just to show that sometimes the Liberal government opposite puts out misinformation. On July 9, 1996, Quebec's deputy justice minister and deputy attorney general, Michel Bouchard, wrote to George Thomson, deputy minister and deputy attorney general of the federal justice department, to express his strong interest in seeing Bill C-17 passed as quickly as possible.

I know that earlier the parliamentary secretary cited a letter from New Brunswick's justice minister, Paul Duffy. In fact, New Brunswick has followed this issue with a great deal of interest, for essentially the same reasons as Quebec, but I find it strange, unless I missed something because I had to step out to make a phone call, that I did not hear the parliamentary secretary mention Michel Bouchard, although Mr. Bouchard wrote a very interesting letter to the deputy minister of the federal justice department on July 9, 1996.

I will read the first paragraph, because I know it sums up Quebec's position. It says: "Bill C-17, introduced in the House of Commons on March 8, 1996, contains many criminal amendments that we have been calling for for several years now and that have been approved by the conference to harmonize legislation".

A little further on, it reads: "The introduction of these new measures alone will, in the short term, save us millions of dollars, a not insignificant amount in the context of the budgetary constraint facing us all. It will therefore come as no surprise that we were extremely disappointed to learn that passage of this omnibus bill, which was already postponed until last spring, has again been postponed".

• (1325)

He went on: "You will therefore understand our great desire to see Bill C-17 among the bills the federal justice minister is determined to move on as quickly as possible".

This letter is dated July 9, 1996. Nobody should be blaming the provincial justice minister, Mr. Bégin, for the delay in passing this bill. I think that all provincial attorneys general were in agreement that Bill C-17 should be passed as speedily as possible, given certain factors that I will mention in a few minutes. Why are these attorneys general in Canada and in Quebec in favour of Bill C-17? Why is the Bloc Québécois in favour of this bill? Because it contains some very important elements that are necessary to update the Criminal Code.

I will presently discuss the main components of this bill. The third party in the House probably would have liked to see a much harder line in this bill on parole, for instance, and the repeal of section 745, but I can assure you we do not share the position of the Reform Party on this part of the Criminal Code. I think the minister has taken a major step forward, but, as I will explain later on, he should have done more.

Here are some of the main areas affected by Bill C-17. The bill proposes a series of changes to deal more effectively with the proceeds of crime. Some of these changes will help the police to carry out seizures, including the money that makes the world of organized crime go round. In politics, money makes the world go round; the same is true of organized crime. I think we must have all the tools we need to seek out the proceeds of crime.

If I may digress for a moment, this is what Mr. Bégin made very clear in a proposal that was rejected out of hand by the Minister of Justice on Monday, a proposal that favoured anti-biker legislation, with provisions that would help the police seize their money, their property, their bunkers, their armoured cars and their big limousines. The bill will make all this possible. I think that by cutting off their livelihood, it will be possible to get rid of the organized crime element. I just wanted to say that in passing.

As for other aspects of this bill, there were several changes with respect to computer-assisted crime, counterfeiting and the fraudulent use of credit cards. I think we have to move with the times. The Criminal Code goes back many years and has to be updated regularly. That is the purpose of Bill C-17. We certainly had no objection to updating the Criminal Code.

There are also provisions to deal more severely with driving under the influence. Here again, I think that considering certain court decisions, it was necessary to amend the Criminal Code in this respect.

There are also provisions—and this is very important as far as the provinces are concerned—that will save money while helping counsel with court appearances. For instance, there are provisions for videoconferencing and the issuing of warrants by means of modern communications. Here again no one would have thought of this ten years ago, but, today, with informatics and the whole field

Private Members' Business

of telecommunications, things like remote appearances are possible so as to save money for the provinces, which administer justice. All that is in Bill C-17.

Clearly we support these provisions, but, once again, I think things could have gone further, as for example with the provisions on money laundering, because this is glossed over somewhat. Canada, let us face it, is the best country for money laundering. The Liberals opposite often boast that Canada is the finest country in the world, but in this finest country in the world, we annually launder, according to estimates, between \$20 billion and \$90 billion.

The police estimate it as follows: only some 10 per cent of drugs are seized annually. The seizures are worth between \$1.5 billion and \$4.5 billion a year. A quick calculation reveals that 100 per cent would be over \$20 billion.

The President of the Treasury Board is looking at me with great interest. I am sure he sees a lot of numbers, but he has only to consult the Canadian crime service and the RCMP for confirmation of my figures.

Bill C-17 should contain provisions to reinforce the whole matter of money laundering to further prevent it and to better equip the police so Canada loses its title.

I will conclude on this point. The title is awarded by the great jurists of the world and by the Americans annually in September, because American inquiries and commissions look into the matter. Every year, the Canadian government is encouraged to strengthen its legislation to prohibit this activity because of the border between Canada and the United States.

I could go on with my speech, but I see my time has run out.

The Deputy Speaker: My colleagues, pursuant to the order made April 10, the question is deemed to have been put to a vote, and the recorded division is deemed to have been requested and deferred.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The division on the motion stands deferred.

Mr. Pomerleau: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you would find unanimous consent that all questions relating to Private Members' Business of April 11, 1997 be deemed to have been put to a vote and that any required division be deferred until April 15, 1997, at the end of Government Orders.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member's proposal?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: It being more or less 1:30 p.m., the House will now proceed to consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*Translation*]

CROWN CORPORATIONS

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, BQ) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should make all Crown corporations subject to the Privacy Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise today to speak to this motion of mine, which was selected as a votable item by the parliamentary committee responsible. I would like to thank the committee and particularly the member for Bellechasse, who made it possible for us to vote on this motion.

When first elected in 1993, I became the Bloc Québécois' critic on Canada Post. During the first few weeks, I asked this Crown corporation for some information that would have helped us evaluate its efficiency.

We all know that, since then, several allegations have been made as to whether or not that corporation was properly managed. I cannot come to a conclusion even today because we never had access to the information. We might have had the opportunity to examine all relevant documents if only that corporation had come under the Privacy Act and possibly the Access to Information Act.

Therefore, I move this motion today in order to remedy an absurd situation. Some ministers are responsible for Crown corporations and they should reply to questions in the House about those corporations. At the same time, these corporations do not have to

Private Members' Business

provide the information that would be relevant to the decisions made by parliamentarians. This situation is rather absurd, and I think it would be nice if it could be solved. We cannot assume that illegal and inappropriate actions are taking place, but justice must be seen to be done.

When a minister is put in charge of a Crown corporation, it means that people who have questions to ask, parliamentarians and citizens who need information and those on whom this corporation holds personal information can ensure that it is properly managed and that data banks will not be shared between corporations without their having a say in the matter.

• (1335)

We are talking about personal information. Is the personal information held in these Crown corporations' data banks well protected? Is it not sometimes shared with other organizations for money? Is the Crown corporation not sometimes used as a straw man in order to get information that would otherwise not be available to the department? We may ask these questions and others as well.

I would like to list a number of organizations that are not covered by the Access to Information Act: the Canadian Wheat Board, Atomic Energy of Canada, Petro-Canada, Canada Post, the Export Development Corporation, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and VIA Rail.

We see that all these organizations have an impact on the lives of Canadians and Quebecers, particularly when it comes to the Canadian Wheat Board and the issues that were raised recently about its management. When we think about Petro-Canada, which is a Crown corporation competing with the private sector, is there not a double standard if the corporation will now be able to act like a private corporation, but with the advantages provided to a Crown corporation? Some things have yet to be clarified in this regard. I think my motion would improve the situation.

Also, for your information, let us review the mandate of the privacy commissioner and see how all public corporations could be subject to the Privacy Act. The privacy commissioner has the mandate to review each and every complaint about a federal institution that has not adequately processed the request made by an individual who wanted to review his or her personal files or that has collected, used, released or eliminated personal information in an illegal fashion.

Right now, some crown corporations do not have to meet these criteria. Complaints can be made against them, because an individual has been unable to review his or her personal files or because personal information has been collected, used, released or eliminated and the individual is left without any recourse. The purpose of my motion is to provide that individual with some recourse, because if an institution is considered to be a public corporation, if

it is accountable to Parliament, if it has to submit reports to Parliament, then it is quite normal that these corporations be treated the same way as our departments.

We cannot think, on the one hand, that public institutions are sometimes less efficient than crown corporations could be if, on the other hand, we do not subject them to the same requirements. On this issue, our society needs to make some progress, especially since we live at a time where information exchange is now made possible thanks to all the new technology.

We need to ensure our citizens that they will be treated as fairly as possible and that they will be able to get the information that a particular corporation has collected about them. Did the corporation have the right to have this information? Is it handling that information appropriately and does it not transmit it to other organizations that do not have a right to have them?

Taking into account how important information has become in our society—information is power, as we say—and how important privacy is for us, there is a void that my motion seeks to fill.

It is also possible that the motion can be improved, in that it would be interesting if this matter was also covered by the Access To Information Act. Passed in 1983, this legislation gives Canadians the general right to access information detained by federal institutions, as we said earlier for the protection of personal information. There is also an Information Commissioner who investigates complaints.

The Commissioner sees to it that rights are protected and convinces public institutions to adopt information management practices that are in line with the Access to Information Act. Thus we must ensure that there is a watchdog and that he has real powers to act appropriately and have the necessary influence. He can even refer to the federal court any problem in the interpretation of the law that require its attention.

All those who think that this will create insuperable difficulties should remember that access rights are not absolute rights. They are subject to specific exceptions, limited exceptions, exceptions that did not prevent departments from working properly.

• (1340)

There has been a shift toward an increase in efficiency within departments and crown corporations, and I agree with that, but we must be careful that this shift does not result in a corporation acting as if it were a private corporation that is not accountable to the people.

I think it is necessary to ensure that all crown corporations are subject to the Privacy Act and the Access to Information Act. Let us take, for example, the Export Development Corporation, which is not covered. I was reading all kinds of things this week about exports. For example, I heard that, when a product such as a Japanese car arrives in British Columbia, it is considered as a

Private Members' Business

product imported by that province even though it can be used anywhere in Canada.

When we hear that kind of information that seems absurd, we should be able to obtain the available data and analyze it to see if what we heard is true. Let us not forget that all that money comes from the public purse, that it is the taxpayers' money.

For all these reasons, I hope to have the support of the members of all parties in the House so that we can fill what I would call a gap in our privacy and access to information legislation. I hope all members of the House will agree on this and we will be able to agree to this motion before the next federal election.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Comox—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to address the motion by the member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup.

Motion No. 260 proposes to include all crown corporations under the jurisdiction of the Privacy Act. I put forward a very similar motion to this in the last session with respect to crown corporations under the Access to Information Act. This one is on the Privacy Act. It is very similar.

The right to privacy is a significant issue and important to many Canadians. Privacy is the right to enjoy private space, to conduct private communications, to be free from surveillance and to respect the sanctity of one's body. Privacy is a basic human value that Canadians hold as a right central to their freedoms and sense of human dignity and autonomy. Most Canadians believe they should have the right to control their personal information and to choose to remain anonymous if they should so wish.

Our privacy rights come from many sources. They are entrenched in international law, constitutional law, federal and provincial legislation, professional codes and guidelines. All the largest provinces, including Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta, have provincial privacy acts and freedom of information acts

The Privacy Act took effect July 1, 1983 and replaced some limited personal information rights set out in part IV of the Canadian Human Rights Act. These rights were expanded in the Privacy Act to deal with the growing impact of computers on government record keeping. The act increases the transparency and accountability of the process and gives Canadians greater individual control over their personal data in the government data banks.

In its day to day operations, federal government departments and agencies collect personal information from almost all Canadians. The Privacy Act gives Canadian citizens and people present in Canada the right to have access to information that is held about

them by the federal government. It also protects against unauthorized disclosure of personal information.

In addition, it strictly controls how the government will collect, use, store, disclose and dispose of any personal information. The act gives Canadians the right to examine information about them that is held by 110 federal departments and agencies subject to some specific exceptions. Individuals may request to have any errors corrected and if the request is refused individuals may require that a notation be attached to the information describing any corrections requested but not made.

● (1345)

According to the act the government can only disclose personal information to someone else with consent or when one or more of the criteria in the Privacy Act are met such as to comply with a subpoena. The act also establishes an information code to regulate government handling of personal records.

Clearly standards for the use of personal information must be imposed on all federal departments, agencies and crown corporations. This is basic to the principle of responsible government that Reform upholds.

However there are many problems with the Privacy Act both with its enforcement and its abuse that must be addressed. Our rights under the Privacy Act are meaningless unless there are enforcement measures to ensure that the violation of these rights are deterred.

However, as it stands, there are no enforcement measures built into the act which means clearly the act is not as effective as it should be. Our privacy rights can be abused and there is nothing to prevent it.

A clear example of this point was recently reported in the newspapers when the Prime Minister's friend and political appointee, Bob Fowler, broke the Privacy Act. Bob Fowler improperly issued documents in an attempt to destroy the reputation of Colonel Michael Drapeau. Fowler sent poison pen letters about Colonel Drapeau to CSIS, the Department of Justice and the Department of National Revenue. These letters clearly broke the Privacy Act.

The privacy commissioner looked at the case. When he confirmed that in fact Bob Fowler had broken the Privacy Act what happened? Nothing happened because Bob Fowler is a friend of the Prime Minister and there is nothing in the Privacy Act to enforce its provisions. This incident clearly illustrates the ineptness of the Privacy Act. It is not working.

The Privacy Commissioner of Canada may investigate complaints about violations of the Privacy Act by government institutions. Yet when the commissioner finds a breach of the act, as he did with Bob Fowler, he can only recommend changes to the

Private Members' Business

government and bring to public scrutiny institutions that do not accept the instructions.

The provincial privacy acts in Quebec and Ontario, on the other hand, contain enforcement provisions which allow their privacy commissioners to make orders. These provincial acts and their effectiveness should be examined by the government to make our federal act more effective.

Despite the ineffectiveness of our federal Privacy Act, the main concern which I share with many Canadians is the abuse of the Privacy Act by government and its departments. The privacy and access to information acts work hand in hand. One is to protect information and the other is to ensure that information is open and available. There must be a balance between privacy protection and freedom of information.

Canadians have a right to see government files. At the same time they have a right to protection of personal information. Yet time and again the Privacy Act has been used to prevent individuals from accessing information that should be public.

The information commissioner has noted many problems and abuses of both the privacy and the access to information acts in his 1994-95 annual report. According to the information commissioner, the Privacy Act is used by the government as "justification for keeping secret embarrassing details about misuse of public funds or position".

The information commissioner also notes that "officials in the system have sometimes sought to protect the privacy of their colleagues by withholding the portions of records and reports which questioned their actions or competence".

The commissioner also says that "such a selective and seemingly self-serving application of privacy rights in the corrections and parole systems increases the cynicism of the news media and Canadians about the value of the right to privacy".

One example he gives, which I support wholeheartedly, is the government's refusal to disclose the names of former MPs in receipt of pensions. The government defended this decision by citing protection of privacy.

At present the Red Cross is fighting the Krever report and wants to go to the Supreme Court of Canada rather than have any of its members publicly named for their role in this scandal. In our criminal justice system we are also faced with the need to balance the public right to know how the corrections and parole system are working on the one side with offenders privacy rights on the other.

The right to information should be a fundamental block of democracy. There should be a spirit of openness and honesty practised by the government, not deceit and cover-up as we

witnessed in the Krever and Somalia scandals the government continues to cover up. The destruction, withholding and disguising of information have become an everyday part of the government.

The government has an elaborate and sophisticated early warning alerting system that warns departments and ministers of requests under the Access to Information Act and that damages the public right to know about government.

• (1350)

Several pre-release administrative practices assist the government in monitoring, manipulating, delaying and holding back the release of information to the public. Clearly the system has been abused and exploited to the extent that Canadians no longer trust the integrity of their government. There is no question this has to change.

Many issues need to be addressed regarding the Privacy Act. It is important all government agencies be covered under the act. At the same time it is vital that the abuses of the act be brought under control. The Privacy Act must be a tool of individual protection, not an agency of political cover-up.

Mr. Gordon Kirkby (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have before us today a motion asking the government to make all crown corporations subject to the Privacy Act.

While the motion is very specific it also addresses a much larger issue which has gained a new sense of urgency: the fact that Canadians feel they are losing control over their information or that they have been subjected to new invasions of privacy.

A recent survey suggests a great majority of Canadians are concerned about their privacy. This is hardly surprising. Personal information has become a valuable commodity in the marketplace. New technologies are making it possible to do widespread data matching and to electronically capture a person's profile for purposes of target marketing or other uses.

Without the consent of the individual, downstream use of personal information by third parties means the individual has lost control of his privacy and his personality. Not only that, but because of the unregulated exchange of personal information without the consent or even the knowledge of the concerned individual, financial and other decisions that have great implications on the individual's life may be based on inaccurate information.

Canadians are thus increasingly concerned that technology is threatening their privacy at home, on the street and in the workplace. Video surveillance in the street, workplace monitoring including interception of E-mail and voice messages, personality profiling aids, drug testing for employment screening, photo radar

Private Members' Business

and genetic testing are some of the examples of the threats to privacy created by new technologies.

New technological advances that promote efficiency and less costly flow of information also carry with them great dangers to the protection of individual privacy. As technology is making it easier to gather, manipulate and transmit personal information all over the world without individuals even knowing it is happening, concerns are growing that individuals could lose control over their information or be subjected to new invasions of privacy.

These considerations have led the Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons to conduct a study of these issues. We are looking forward to its comments and recommendations.

Canadians view privacy as a fundamental right, and rightly so. We should not lose sight of the fact that the right to privacy is based not only on respect for an individual's anonymity and privacy but on his or her autonomy. The right of privacy is therefore not simply an individual right to be exercised in opposition to some larger public interest to make the operations of governments and businesses more efficient, less expensive and less subject to fraud. It should also be considered as an important social tool essential to the maintenance of a free society.

If citizens lose the basic individual autonomy provided them by the right of privacy they will not be able to make their own contribution to a free society. A free society cannot exist solely on values such as efficiency and attention to the bottom line. Mutual respect and personal autonomy, two values promoted by the right to privacy, are essential ingredients to a free society that must always be nurtured and protected.

The protection of personal information can no longer depend on whether that data is held by a public or private institution. This does not mean that rules governing the collection, use, communication and disposal of personal information need to be exactly the same for every individual and organization, but it means that it should be based on a common set of principles. It does mean that personal information held in the private sector should be protected by law.

• (1355)

What are the implications of the motion which is before us today? The Privacy Act governs the collection, retention and disposal of personal information by government institutions. It also limits the use government institutions may make of personal information and under what circumstances it can be disclosed to another government institution or to a third party. In brief, government institutions may only collect personal information defined as information about an identifiable individual that is recorded in any

form that they need for one of their programs or activities. In most circumstances they must collect it directly from the individual to whom it relates. The personal information that has been used must then be kept for a certain amount of time, usually at least two years.

In addition, strict conditions must be met before personal information may be disclosed to a third party by a government institution.

Finally, the act grants individuals a right of access and correction which, if refused, may be investigated by the privacy commissioner and reviewed by the federal court.

When Parliament adopted the Privacy Act in 1982 the government was by far the main collector and user of information on individuals. The act was therefore made applicable to the various departments and agencies of the Government of Canada, including some crown corporations, such as Canada Post Corporation.

At the time, however, it was felt that crown corporations which conducted business in competition with the private sector, such as the CBC, should now be subject to the act so as not to place them at a disadvantage against their private sector competitors. Since then most provinces have adopted similar legislation applicable to their public sector. The province of Quebec has gone even further by subjecting its entire private sector to the protection of personal information legislation.

As it stands now, the Minister of Justice has committed the government to introducing legislation which will protect personal information held by federally regulated private sector businesses. As the Minister of Justice said last September at the international conference of privacy and data protection commissioners, by the year 2000 we aim to have federal legislation on the books which will provide effective, enforceable protection of privacy rights in the private sector.

The Standing Committee on Human Rights and the Status of Disabled Persons will report to the House shortly on its study of privacy issues raised by the availability of new technologies, and I believe the government should wait for the recommendations of the committee before following up on the motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ):
Mr. Speaker, my colleagues having made me realize how important this motion is, how important it is to make the information as widely available as possible while protecting people's privacy, I would like to put forward an amendment to the motion proposed by my colleague from Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup.

I move:

That the motion be amended by adding, after the words "Privacy Act", the words "and the Access to Information Act".

Private Members' Business

[English]

Mr. Gilmour: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was also going to move a very similar motion. I would like to amend Motion No. 260 by adding after the words "Privacy Act" the words "and the Access to Information Act".

The table officers ruled that this was not an acceptable amendment because it would introduce a new concept. I question why my motion was rejected when my colleague's was accepted.

The Deputy Speaker: The member raises a good point. In fact, it is sauce for the goose and sauce for the gander. Actually the Table does not rule. The Chair rules with the advice of the Table. The Chair rules that both of the proposed amendments are out of order for the reasons given by the member.

[Translation]

A new legislation, a new concept is being introduced, and for this reason both amendments are out of order. But, as the hon. members know, with the unanimous consent of the House, such an amendment may be accepted.

Does the hon. member for Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies want to ask for unanimous consent?

Mr. Pomerleau: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Do we have unanimous consent to accept this motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: We do not have unanimous consent.

Pursuant to order made earlier this day, the House is deemed to have divided on the motion and the recorded division on the question is deemed to have been requested and deferred until Tuesday, April 15, after government orders.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: The recorded division on the question is deemed to have been requested and deferred until April 15, after government orders.

[English]

It being two o'clock, the House stands adjourned until Monday next at 11 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 2.00 p.m.)

APPENDIX

**ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS WITH THEIR
CONSTITUENCIES, PROVINCE OF CONSTITUENCY
AND POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS;
COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE,
THE MINISTRY AND PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES**

CHAIR OCCUPANTS

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY

HON. GILBERT PARENT (CHAIRMAN)

HON. ALFONSO GAGLIANO, P.C.

HON. HERB GRAY, P.C.

MR. LEN HOPKINS

MR. BOB KILGER

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

MR. RENÉ LAURIN

MR. CHUCK STRAHL

MRS. SUZANNE TREMBLAY

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session – Thirty-fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	British Columbia	Ref.
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Alberta	Ref.
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Ontario	Lib.
Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Manitoba	Lib.
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	Saskatchewan	NDP
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiaq	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	British Columbia	Lib.
Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	New Brunswick	Lib.
Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Quebec	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Ontario	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	Quebec	BQ
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Ontario	Lib.
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	Saskatchewan	NDP
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Newfoundland	Lib.
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Quebec	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Ontario	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Ontario	Lib.
Bélair, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Ontario	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Ontario	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	Quebec	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	Quebec	BQ
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Ontario	Lib.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Alberta	Ref.
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Quebec	Ind.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	Quebec	BQ
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	Quebec	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Quebec	Lib.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Alberta	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Ontario	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville		Lib. Dem.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	Manitoba	NDP
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Northwest Territories	Lib.
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Ontario	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Ontario	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	British Columbia	Ref.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	Quebec	BQ
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Ontario	Lib.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Alberta	Ind.
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Ontario	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Newfoundland	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Ontario	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Ontario	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	Quebec	BQ
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Ontario	Lib.
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Quebec	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Ontario	Lib.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia-Pacific)	Richmond	British Columbia	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	Quebec	PC
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Alberta	Ref.
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Quebec	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	Quebec	BQ
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Ontario	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M.	Don Valley East	Ontario	Lib.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Ontario	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Ontario	Lib.
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Manitoba	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du- Loup	Quebec	BQ
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	New Brunswick	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Ontario	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	British Columbia	Ref.
Dalphond-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	Quebec	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	Quebec	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	Quebec	BQ
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	Saskatchewan	NDP
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	Quebec	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	Quebec	BQ
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Ontario	Lib.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	British Columbia	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Quebec	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Quebec	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Ontario	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	Quebec	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	Quebec	BQ
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Manitoba	Lib.
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	Quebec	BQ
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	British Columbia	Ref.
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Quebec	Lib.
Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Ontario	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Ontario	Lib.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Alberta	Ref.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Manitoba	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	Quebec	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Quebec	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Ontario	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Ontario	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Ontario	Lib.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	British Columbia	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	British Columbia	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	British Columbia	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Ontario	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Quebec	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	Quebec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la- Madeleine	Quebec	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Ontario	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	Quebec	BQ
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Manitoba	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	British Columbia	Ref.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Ontario	Lib.
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	Quebec	BQ
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	British Columbia	Ref.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Ontario	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Ontario	Lib.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Alberta	Ref.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Ontario	Lib.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	British Columbia	Ref.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Ontario	Lib.
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	Quebec	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	Quebec	BQ
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Alberta	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Alberta	Ref.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Ontario	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ontario	Ref.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Manitoba	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	British Columbia	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	British Columbia	Ref.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Manitoba	Lib.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Newfoundland	Lib.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Alberta	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	British Columbia	Ref.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Manitoba	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Ontario	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	New Brunswick	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Ontario	Lib.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Manitoba	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Ontario	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Ontario	Lib.
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	Quebec	BQ
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	British Columbia	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Alberta	Ref.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Ontario	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Ontario	Lib.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Ontario	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas	Ontario	Lib.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Alberta	Lib.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Ontario	Lib.
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	Quebec	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	Quebec	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	Quebec	BQ
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Ontario	Lib.
Laurin, René	Joliette	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	Quebec	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Quebec	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	Quebec	BQ
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	Quebec	Ind. Sov.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Ontario	Lib.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	Quebec	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	Quebec	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Quebec	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Alberta	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	Quebec	BQ
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Nova Scotia	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Ontario	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Ontario	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Ontario	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	Quebec	BQ
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Ontario	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Ontario	Lib.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	British Columbia	Ref.
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Quebec	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Quebec	Lib.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	British Columbia	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Alberta	Ref.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Ontario	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Manitoba	Lib.
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	Yukon	NDP
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Alberta	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Ontario	Lib.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	British Columbia	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	Quebec	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	Quebec	BQ
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	British Columbia	Ref.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Newfoundland	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Ontario	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Alberta	Ref.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Ontario	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Ontario	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Ontario	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Saskatchewan	Ref.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Ontario	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Ontario	Lib.
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	Quebec	BQ
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Ontario	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Newfoundland	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Ontario	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Manitoba	Lib.
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Quebec	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	Quebec	BQ
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Ontario	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Ontario	Lib.
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Quebec	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Newfoundland	Lib.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Alberta	Ref.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Ontario	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Ontario	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Ontario	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Quebec	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Ontario	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	Quebec	BQ
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Ontario	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Ontario	Lib.
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	Quebec	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des- Prairies	Quebec	BQ
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Prince Edward Island	Lib.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Alberta	Ref.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Ontario	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	New Brunswick	Lib.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	British Columbia	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	British Columbia	Ref.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	New Brunswick	Lib.
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Quebec	Lib.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	British Columbia	NDP
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	Quebec	BQ
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Ontario	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Ontario	Lib.
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	Quebec	Ind.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	Quebec	BQ
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	British Columbia	Ref.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York- Sunbury	New Brunswick	Lib.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	British Columbia	Ref.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Ontario	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Ontario	Lib.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Saskatchewan	Lib.
Silve, Jim	Calgary Centre	Alberta	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Province of Constituency	Political Affiliation
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Newfoundland	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Alberta	Ref.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	Saskatchewan	NDP
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Alberta	Ref.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Ontario	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Ontario	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Ontario	Lib.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	British Columbia	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	British Columbia	Ref.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Ontario	Lib.
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	Saskatchewan	NDP
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Ontario	Lib.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	British Columbia	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Ontario	Lib.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Alberta	Ref.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Ontario	Lib.
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	Quebec	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	Quebec	BQ
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Ontario	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Ontario	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Ontario	Lib.
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	Quebec	BQ
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Ontario	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Manitoba	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Ontario	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	New Brunswick	PC
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Nova Scotia	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Nova Scotia	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	British Columbia	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	British Columbia	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Alberta	Ref.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Ontario	Lib.
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Acadie — Bathurst	New Brunswick	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	New Brunswick	Lib.
VACANCY	Calgary West	Alberta	
VACANCY	Jonquière	Quebec	
VACANCY	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	Quebec	

N.B.: Under Political Affiliation: BQ—Bloc Québécois; Ind.—Independent; Ind. Sov.—Independent Sovereigntist; Lib.—Liberal; Lib. Dem.—Liberal Democrat; NDP—New Democratic Party; PC—Progressive Conservative; Ref.—Reform Party of Canada.

Anyone wishing to communicate with House of Commons members is invited to communicate with either the Member's constituency or Parliament Hill offices.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVINCE

Second Session — Thirty—fifth Parliament

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
ALBERTA (26)		
Ablonczy, Diane	Calgary North	Ref.
Benoit, Leon E.	Vegreville	Ref.
Bethel, Judy	Edmonton East	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Cliff	Yellowhead	Ref.
Brown, Jan	Calgary Southeast	Ind.
Chatters, David	Athabasca	Ref.
Epp, Ken	Elk Island	Ref.
Grey, Deborah	Beaver River	Ref.
Hanger, Art	Calgary Northeast	Ref.
Hanrahan, Hugh	Edmonton — Strathcona	Ref.
Hill, Grant	Macleod	Ref.
Johnston, Dale	Wetaskiwin	Ref.
Kilgour, David, Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Edmonton Southeast	Lib.
Loney, John	Edmonton North	Lib.
Manning, Preston	Calgary Southwest	Ref.
McClelland, Ian	Edmonton Southwest	Ref.
McLellan, Hon. Anne, Minister of Natural Resources	Edmonton Northwest	Lib.
Mills, Bob	Red Deer	Ref.
Penson, Charlie	Peace River	Ref.
Ramsay, Jack	Crowfoot	Ref.
Silye, Jim	Calgary Centre	Ref.
Solberg, Monte	Medicine Hat	Ref.
Speaker, Ray	Lethbridge	Ref.
Thompson, Myron	Wild Rose	Ref.
Williams, John	St. Albert	Ref.
VACANCY	Calgary West	
BRITISH COLUMBIA (32)		
Abbott, Jim	Kootenay East	Ref.
Anderson, Hon. David, Minister of Transport	Victoria	Lib.
Bridgman, Margaret	Surrey North	Ref.
Chan, Hon. Raymond, Secretary of State (Asia—Pacific)	Richmond	Lib.
Cummins, John	Delta	Ref.
Dhaliwal, Harbance Singh	Vancouver South	Lib.
Duncan, John	North Island — Powell River	Ref.
Forseth, Paul	New Westminster — Burnaby	Ref.
Frazer, Jack	Saanich — Gulf Islands	Ref.
Fry, Hon. Hedy, Secretary of State (Multiculturalism)(Status of Women)	Vancouver Centre	Lib.
Gilmour, Bill	Comox — Alberni	Ref.
Gouk, Jim	Kootenay West — Revelstoke	Ref.
Grubel, Herb	Capilano — Howe Sound	Ref.
Harris, Dick	Prince George — Bulkley Valley	Ref.
Hart, Jim	Okanagan — Similkameen — Merritt	Ref.
Hayes, Sharon	Port Moody — Coquitlam	Ref.
Hill, Jay	Prince George — Peace River	Ref.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Jennings, Daphne	Mission — Coquitlam	Ref.
Martin, Keith	Esquimalt — Juan de Fuca	Ref.
Mayfield, Philip	Cariboo — Chilcotin	Ref.
McWhinney, Ted, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Vancouver Quadra	Lib.
Meredith, Val	Surrey — White Rock — South Langley	Ref.
Riis, Nelson	Kamloops	NDP
Ringma, Bob	Nanaimo — Cowichan	Ref.
Robinson, Svend J.	Burnaby — Kingsway	NDP
Schmidt, Werner	Okanagan Centre	Ref.
Scott, Mike	Skeena	Ref.
Stinson, Darrel	Okanagan — Shuswap	Ref.
Strahl, Chuck	Fraser Valley East	Ref.
Terrana, Anna	Vancouver East	Lib.
White, Randy	Fraser Valley West	Ref.
White, Ted	North Vancouver	Ref.

MANITOBA (14)

Alcock, Reg	Winnipeg South	Lib.
Axworthy, Hon. Lloyd, Minister of Foreign Affairs	Winnipeg South Centre	Lib.
Blaikie, Bill	Winnipeg Transcona	NDP
Cowling, Marlene, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Natural Resources	Dauphin — Swan River	Lib.
Duhamel, Ronald J.	St. Boniface	Lib.
Fewchuk, Ron	Selkirk — Red River	Lib.
Gerrard, Hon. Jon, Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development)(Western Economic Diversification)	Portage — Interlake	Lib.
Harper, Elijah	Churchill	Lib.
Harvard, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Winnipeg St. James	Lib.
Hoepfner, Jake E.	Lisgar — Marquette	Ref.
Iftody, David	Provencher	Lib.
McKinnon, Glen	Brandon — Souris	Lib.
Pagtakhan, Rey D., Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister	Winnipeg North	Lib.
Walker, David	Winnipeg North Centre	Lib.

NEW BRUNSWICK (10)

Arseneault, Guy H., Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Restigouche — Chaleur	Lib.
Culbert, Harold	Carleton — Charlotte	Lib.
Hubbard, Charles	Miramichi	Lib.
Rideout, George S.	Moncton	Lib.
Ringuette-Maltais, Pierrette, Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Madawaska — Victoria	Lib.
Robichaud, Hon. Fernand, Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri-Food, Fisheries and Oceans)	Beauséjour	Lib.
Scott, Andy	Fredericton — York-Sunbury	Lib.
Wayne, Elsie	Saint John	PC
Young, Hon. Douglas, Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Acadie — Bathurst	Lib.
Zed, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Fundy — Royal	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
NEWFOUNDLAND (7)		
Baker, George S.	Gander — Grand Falls	Lib.
Byrne, Gerry	Humber — St. Barbe — Baie Verte	Lib.
Hickey, Bonnie	St. John's East	Lib.
Mifflin, Hon. Fred, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans	Bonavista — Trinity — Conception	Lib.
O'Brien, Lawrence D.	Labrador	Lib.
Payne, Jean	St. John's West	Lib.
Simmons, Hon. Roger	Burin — St. George's	Lib.
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES (2)		
Anawak, Jack Iyerak	Nunatsiaq	Lib.
Blondin—Andrew, Hon. Ethel, Secretary of State (Training and Youth)	Western Arctic	Lib.
NOVA SCOTIA (11)		
Brushett, Dianne	Cumberland — Colchester	Lib.
Clancy, Mary	Halifax	Lib.
Dingwall, Hon. David, Minister of Health	Cape Breton — East Richmond	Lib.
LeBlanc, Francis G., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Foreign Affairs	Cape Breton Highlands — Canso	Lib.
MacDonald, Ron, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade	Dartmouth	Lib.
MacLellan, Russell	Cape Breton — The Sydneys	Lib.
Murphy, John	Annapolis Valley — Hants	Lib.
Regan, Geoff	Halifax West	Lib.
Skoke, Roseanne	Central Nova	Lib.
Verran, Harry	South West Nova	Lib.
Wells, Derek	South Shore	Lib.
ONTARIO (99)		
Adams, Peter	Peterborough	Lib.
Assadourian, Sarkis	Don Valley North	Lib.
Augustine, Jean	Etobicoke — Lakeshore	Lib.
Barnes, Sue, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue	London West	Lib.
Beaumier, Colleen	Brampton	Lib.
Bélaïr, Réginald	Cochrane — Superior	Lib.
Bélangier, Mauril	Ottawa — Vanier	Lib.
Bellemare, Eugène	Carleton — Gloucester	Lib.
Bevilacqua, Maurizio	York North	Lib.
Bhaduria, Jag	Markham — Whitchurch — Stouffville	Dem.
Bonin, Raymond	Nickel Belt	Lib.
Boudria, Hon. Don, Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie	Glengarry — Prescott — Russell	Lib.
Brown, Bonnie	Oakville — Milton	Lib.
Bryden, John	Hamilton — Wentworth	Lib.
Caccia, Hon. Charles	Davenport	Lib.
Calder, Murray	Wellington — Grey — Dufferin — Simcoe	Lib.
Campbell, Barry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance	St. Paul's	Lib.
Cannis, John	Scarborough Centre	Lib.
Catterall, Marlene	Ottawa West	Lib.
Chamberlain, Brenda	Guelph — Wellington	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Cohen, Shaughnessy	Windsor — St. Clair	Lib.
Collenette, Hon. David M.	Don Valley East	Lib.
Comuzzi, Joe	Thunder Bay — Nipigon	Lib.
Copps, Hon. Sheila, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage	Hamilton East	Lib.
Crawford, Rex	Kent	Lib.
Cullen, Roy	Etobicoke North	Lib.
DeVillers, Paul, Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Simcoe North	Lib.
Dromisky, Stan	Thunder Bay — Atikokan	Lib.
Eggleton, Hon. Arthur C., Minister for International Trade	York Centre	Lib.
English, John	Kitchener	Lib.
Finlay, John	Oxford	Lib.
Flis, Jesse	Parkdale — High Park	Lib.
Fontana, Joe	London East	Lib.
Gaffney, Beryl	Nepean	Lib.
Galloway, Roger	Sarnia — Lambton	Lib.
Godfrey, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Cooperation	Don Valley West	Lib.
Graham, Bill	Rosedale	Lib.
Gray, Hon. Herb, Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada	Windsor West	Lib.
Grose, Ivan	Oshawa	Lib.
Guarnieri, Albina	Mississauga East	Lib.
Harb, Mac	Ottawa Centre	Lib.
Harper, Ed	Simcoe Centre	Ref.
Hopkins, Leonard	Renfrew — Nipissing — Pembroke	Lib.
Ianno, Tony	Trinity — Spadina	Lib.
Irwin, Hon. Ron, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Sault Ste. Marie	Lib.
Jackson, Ovid L., Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board	Bruce — Grey	Lib.
Jordan, Jim	Leeds — Grenville	Lib.
Karygiannis, Jim	Scarborough — Agincourt	Lib.
Keyes, Stan, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport	Hamilton West	Lib.
Kilger, Bob	Stormont — Dundas	Lib.
Knutson, Gar	Elgin — Norfolk	Lib.
Kraft Sloan, Karen, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment	York — Simcoe	Lib.
Lastewka, Walt	St. Catharines	Lib.
Lee, Derek	Scarborough — Rouge River	Lib.
Malhi, Gurbax Singh	Bramalea — Gore — Malton	Lib.
Maloney, John	Erie	Lib.
Manley, Hon. John, Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec	Ottawa South	Lib.
Marchi, Hon. Sergio, Minister of the Environment	York West	Lib.
Marleau, Hon. Diane, Minister of Public Works and Government Services	Sudbury	Lib.
McCormick, Larry	Hastings — Frontenac — Lennox and Addington	Lib.
McTeague, Dan	Ontario	Lib.
Milliken, Peter, Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole	Kingston and the Islands	Lib.
Mills, Dennis J.	Broadview — Greenwood	Lib.
Minna, Maria, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Beaches — Woodbine	Lib.
Mitchell, Andy	Parry Sound — Muskoka	Lib.
Murray, Ian	Lanark — Carleton	Lib.
Nault, Robert D., Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development	Kenora — Rainy River	Lib.

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Nunziata, John	York South — Weston	Lib.
O'Brien, Pat	London — Middlesex	Lib.
O'Reilly, John	Victoria — Haliburton	Lib.
Parent, Hon. Gilbert, Speaker	Welland — St. Catharines — Thorold	Lib.
Parrish, Carolyn	Mississauga West	Lib.
Perić, Janko	Cambridge	Lib.
Peters, Hon. Douglas, Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)	Scarborough East	Lib.
Peterson, Jim	Willowdale	Lib.
Phinney, Beth	Hamilton Mountain	Lib.
Pickard, Jerry, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Essex — Kent	Lib.
Pillitteri, Gary	Niagara Falls	Lib.
Reed, Julian	Halton — Peel	Lib.
Richardson, John, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs	Perth — Wellington — Waterloo	Lib.
Rock, Hon. Allan, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Etobicoke Centre	Lib.
St. Denis, Brent	Algoma	Lib.
Serré, Benoît	Timiskaming — French River	Lib.
Shepherd, Alex	Durham	Lib.
Speller, Bob	Haldimand — Norfolk	Lib.
Steckle, Paul	Huron — Bruce	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Christine, Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)	Northumberland	Lib.
Stewart, Hon. Jane, Minister of National Revenue	Brant	Lib.
Szabo, Paul	Mississauga South	Lib.
Telegdi, Andrew	Waterloo	Lib.
Thalheimer, Peter	Timmins — Chapleau	Lib.
Torsney, Paddy	Burlington	Lib.
Ur, Rose-Marie	Lambton — Middlesex	Lib.
Valeri, Tony	Lincoln	Lib.
Vanclief, Lyle	Prince Edward — Hastings	Lib.
Volpe, Joseph, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health	Eglinton — Lawrence	Lib.
Wappel, Tom	Scarborough West	Lib.
Whelan, Susan	Essex — Windsor	Lib.
Wood, Bob	Nipissing	Lib.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (4)

Easter, Wayne	Malpeque	Lib.
MacAulay, Hon. Lawrence, Secretary of State (Veterans)(Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)	Cardigan	Lib.
McGuire, Joe	Egmont	Lib.
Proud, George, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour	Hillsborough	Lib.

QUEBEC (75)

Assad, Mark	Gatineau — La Lièvre	Lib.
Asselin, Gérard	Charlevoix	BQ
Bachand, Claude	Saint-Jean	BQ
Bakopanos, Eleni	Saint-Denis	Lib.
Bélisle, Richard	La Prairie	BQ
Bellehumeur, Michel	Berthier — Montcalm	BQ
Bergeron, Stéphane	Verchères	BQ
Bernier, Gilles	Beauce	Ind.
Bernier, Maurice	Mégantic — Compton — Stanstead	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Bernier, Yvan	Gaspé	BQ
Bertrand, Robert	Pontiac — Gatineau — Labelle	Lib.
Brien, Pierre	Témiscamingue	BQ
Canuel, René	Matapédia — Matane	BQ
Cauchon, Hon. Martin, Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development — Quebec)	Outremont	Lib.
Charest, Hon. Jean J.	Sherbrooke	PC
Chrétien, Right Hon. Jean, Prime Minister	Saint-Maurice	Lib.
Chrétien, Jean-Guy	Frontenac	BQ
Crête, Paul	Kamouraska — Rivière-du-Loup	BQ
Dalphonde-Guiral, Madeleine	Laval Centre	BQ
Daviault, Michel	Ahuntsic	BQ
Debien, Maud	Laval East	BQ
de Savoye, Pierre	Portneuf	BQ
Deshaies, Bernard	Abitibi	BQ
Dion, Hon. Stéphane, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs	Saint-Laurent — Cartierville	Lib.
Discepola, Nick, Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada	Vaudreuil	Lib.
Dubé, Antoine	Lévis	BQ
Duceppe, Gilles	Laurier — Sainte-Marie	BQ
Dumas, Maurice	Argenteuil — Papineau	BQ
Dupuy, Hon. Michel	Laval West	Lib.
Fillion, Gilbert	Chicoutimi	BQ
Finestone, Hon. Sheila	Mount Royal	Lib.
Gagliano, Hon. Alfonso, Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons	Saint-Léonard	Lib.
Gagnon, Christiane	Québec	BQ
Gagnon, Patrick	Bonaventure — Îles-de-la-Madeleine	Lib.
Gauthier, Michel, Leader of the Opposition	Roberval	BQ
Godin, Maurice	Châteauguay	BQ
Guay, Monique	Laurentides	BQ
Guimond, Michel	Beauport — Montmorency — Orléans	BQ
Jacob, Jean-Marc	Charlesbourg	BQ
Lalonde, Francine	Mercier	BQ
Landry, Jean	Lotbinière	BQ
Langlois, François	Bellechasse	BQ
Laurin, René	Joliette	BQ
Lavigne, Laurent	Beauharnois — Salaberry	BQ
Lavigne, Raymond	Verdun — Saint-Paul	Lib.
Lebel, Ghislain	Chambly	BQ
Leblanc, Nic	Longueuil	Ind. Sov.
Lefebvre, Réjean	Champlain	BQ
Leroux, Gaston	Richmond — Wolfe	BQ
Leroux, Jean H.	Shefford	BQ
Lincoln, Clifford	Lachine — Lac-Saint-Louis	Lib.
Loubier, Yvan	Saint-Hyacinthe — Bagot	BQ
Marchand, Jean-Paul	Québec-Est	BQ
Martin, Hon. Paul, Minister of Finance	LaSalle — Émard	Lib.
Massé, Hon. Marcel, President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure	Hull — Aylmer	Lib.
Ménard, Réal	Hochelaga — Maisonneuve	BQ
Mercier, Paul	Blainville — Deux-Montagnes	BQ

Name of Member	Constituency	Political Affiliation
Nunez, Osvaldo	Bourassa	BQ
Paradis, Denis	Brome — Missisquoi	Lib.
Paré, Philippe	Louis-Hébert	BQ
Patry, Bernard, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Pierrefonds — Dollard	Lib.
Pettigrew, Hon. Pierre S., Minister of Human Resources Development	Papineau — Saint-Michel	Lib.
Picard, Pauline	Drummond	BQ
Plamondon, Louis	Richelieu	BQ
Pomerleau, Roger	Anjou — Rivière-des-Prairies	BQ
Robillard, Hon. Lucienne, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	Saint-Henri — Westmount	Lib.
Rocheleau, Yves	Trois-Rivières	BQ
St-Laurent, Bernard	Manicouagan	Ind.
Sauvageau, Benoît	Terrebonne	BQ
Tremblay, Benoît	Rosemont	BQ
Tremblay, Stéphan	Lac-Saint-Jean	BQ
Tremblay, Suzanne	Rimouski — Témiscouata	BQ
Venne, Pierrette	Saint-Hubert	BQ
VACANCY	Jonquière	
VACANCY	Notre-Dame-de-Grâce	
SASKATCHEWAN (14)		
Althouse, Vic	Mackenzie	NDP
Axworthy, Chris	Saskatoon — Clark's Crossing	NDP
Bodnar, Morris, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification	Saskatoon — Dundurn	Lib.
Breitkreuz, Garry	Yorkton — Melville	Ref.
Collins, Bernie	Souris — Moose Mountain	Lib.
de Jong, Simon	Regina — Qu'Appelle	NDP
Goodale, Hon. Ralph E., Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food	Regina — Wascana	Lib.
Hermanson, Elwin	Kindersley — Lloydminster	Ref.
Kerpan, Allan	Moose Jaw — Lake Centre	Ref.
Kirkby, Gordon, Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada	Prince Albert — Churchill River	Lib.
Morrison, Lee	Swift Current — Maple Creek — Assiniboia	Ref.
Sheridan, Georgette	Saskatoon — Humboldt	Lib.
Solomon, John	Regina — Lumsden	NDP
Taylor, Len	The Battlefords — Meadow Lake	NDP
YUKON (1)		
McLaughlin, Hon. Audrey	Yukon	NDP

LIST OF STANDING AND SUB-COMMITTEES

(As of April 11th, 1997 — 2nd Session, 35th Parliament)

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: **Raymond Bonin**

Vice-Chairmen: **Claude Bachand
John Finlay**

Jack Iyerak Anawak Margaret Bridgman	Maurice Dumas John Duncan	Elijah Harper Charles Hubbard	John Murphy Bernard Patry	(11)
---	------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------	------

Associate Members

Garry Breitkreuz John Bryden	Marlene Cowling Maurice Godin	Dick Harris Audrey McLaughlin	Len Taylor
---------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------

AGRICULTURE AND AGRI-FOOD

Chairman: **Lyle Vanclief**

Vice-Chairmen: **Jean-Guy Chrétien
Glen McKinnon**

Cliff Breitkreuz Murray Calder Bernie Collins	Harold Culbert Wayne Easter Elwin Hermanson	Jake E. Hoepfner Jean Landry Réjean Lefebvre	Jerry Pickard Julian Reed Rose-Marie Ur	(15)
---	---	--	---	------

Associate Members

Peter Adams Vic Althouse Leon E. Benoit Morris Bodnar	Marlene Cowling John Cummins Allan Kerpan	Laurent Lavigne John Maloney Denis Paradis	John Solomon Paul Steckle Len Taylor
--	---	--	--

CANADIAN HERITAGE

Chairman: **Clifford Lincoln**

Vice-Chairs: **Gaston Leroux
Beth Phinney**

Jim Abbott Guy H. Arseneault	Mauril Bélanger Pierre de Savoye	Hugh Hanrahan Raymond Lavigne	Pat O'Brien Janko Perić	(11)
---------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	------

Associate Members

John Bryden Simon de Jong Stan Dromisky	Antoine Dubé John English	Christiane Gagnon Rey D. Pagtakhan	Louis Plamondon Monte Solberg
---	------------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------

CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Chairman: **Stan Dromisky**

Vice-Chairs: **Judy Bethel
Osvaldo Nunez**

Colleen Beaumier Mauril Bélanger	Maud Debien Hugh Hanrahan	Dan McTeague Val Meredith	Maria Minna Tom Wappel	(11)
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------	------

Associate Members

Jag Bhaduria Simon de Jong Harbance Singh Dhaliwal	Paul Forseth Beryl Gaffney Christiane Gagnon	Sharon Hayes Gar Knutson John Loney	Rey D. Pagtakhan Anna Terrana
--	--	---	----------------------------------

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: Charles Caccia

Vice-Chairs:

Monique Guay
Jean Payne

Peter Adams
Jack Iyerak Anawak

G rard Asselin
Paul Forseth

Daphne Jennings
Gar Knutson

Karen Kraft Sloan
Paul Steckle

(11)

Associate Members

Margaret Bridgman
Rex Crawford
John Cummins
John Finlay

Maurice Godin
Clifford Lincoln
Bob Mills

Pat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Julian Reed

Geoff Regan
Darrel Stinson
Len Taylor

SUB-COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS FOR SUSTAINABILITY

Chair: Karen Kraft Sloan

John Finlay
Paul Forseth

Monique Guay

Jean Payne

Len Taylor

(6)

FINANCE

Chairman: Jim Peterson

Vice-Chairs:

Yvan Loubier
Susan Whelan

Richard B lisle
Leon E. Benoit
Dianne Brushett

Barry Campbell
Brenda Chamberlain
Ronald J. Duhamel

Ron Fewchuk
Herb Grubel
Gary Pillitteri

Roger Pomerleau
Monte Solberg
Brent St. Denis

(15)

Associate Members

Reg Alcock
Judy Bethel
Jag Bhaduria
Paul Cr te
Roy Cullen
Nick Discepola
Joe Fontana

Jim Gouk
Bill Graham
Stephen Harper
Dick Harris
Jay Hill
Jake E. Hoeppepner
Dale Johnston

Karen Kraft Sloan
Ren  Laurin
Peter Milliken
Bob Mills
Andy Mitchell
Rey D. Pagtakhan
Nelson Riis

Yves Rocheleau
Ben t Sauvageau
Werner Schmidt
Jim Silye
John Solomon
Paddy Torsney
John Williams

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Chairman: Brent St. Denis

Richard B lisle

Dianne Brushett

Herb Grubel

Paddy Torsney

(5)

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

Chairman: Joe McGuire

Vice-Chairmen:

Yvan Bernier
Derek Wells

Ren  Canuel
Harold Culbert

John Cummins
Ted McWhinney

Lawrence D. O'Brien
Mike Scott

Paul Steckle
Harry Verran

(11)

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy
Vic Althouse

Ron Fewchuk
Yves Rocheleau

Roger Simmons

Elsie Wayne

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Chairman: Bill Graham

Vice-Chairmen: Stéphane Bergeron
John English

Sarkis Assadourian Eleni Bakopanos Michel Dupuy	Jesse Flis Beryl Gaffney Francis G. LeBlanc	Bob Mills Lee Morrison Philippe Paré	Charlie Penson Benoît Sauvageau Bob Speller	(15)
---	---	--	---	------

Associate Members

Diane Ablonczy Colleen Beaumier Réginald Bélair Leon E. Benoit Jag Bhaduria Bill Blaikie Pierre Brien	Roy Cullen Maud Debien Jack Frazer Christiane Gagnon John Godfrey Herb Grubel	Jean H. Leroux Ron MacDonald Gurbax Singh Malhi Keith Martin Ted McWhinney Val Meredith	Rey D. Pagtakhan Janko Perić George Proud Svend J. Robinson Andrew Telegdi Paddy Torsney
---	--	--	---

SUB-COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Chairman: Bill Graham

David Iftody	Bob Mills	Philippe Paré	Paddy Torsney	(5)
--------------	-----------	---------------	---------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SUSTAINABLE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: John English

Maud Debien	Beryl Gaffney	John Godfrey	Keith Martin	(5)
-------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON TRADE DISPUTES

Chairman: Michel Dupuy

Roy Cullen	Ron MacDonald	Charlie Penson	Benoît Sauvageau	(5)
------------	---------------	----------------	------------------	-----

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Chairman: Tony Valeri

Vice-Chairmen: Eugène Bellemare
Gilbert Fillion

Colleen Beaumier John Bryden	Paul Crête Bill Gilmour	Stephen Harper John Harvard	Ovid L. Jackson Ian Murray	(11)
---------------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------	------

Associate Members

Ghislain Lebel Ian McClelland	Carolyn Parrish Janko Perić	George Proud John Solomon	Ted White John Williams
----------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------	----------------------------

HEALTH**Chairman:** Roger Simmons**Vice-Chairs:**Harbance Singh Dhaliwal
Pauline PicardAntoine Dubé
Bonnie HickeyGrant Hill
Keith MartinJohn Murphy
Andy ScottPaul Szabo
Joseph Volpe

(11)

Associate MembersColleen Beaumier
Margaret Bridgman
Jan Brown
Pierre de SavoyeMaurice Dumas
Réjean Lefebvre
Audrey McLaughlin
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
John O'Reilly
Carolyn Parrish
Bob RingmaSvend J. Robinson
Roseanne Skoke
Rose-Marie Ur**SUB-COMMITTEE ON BILL C-47, AN ACT RESPECTING HUMAN
REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES AND COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS
RELATING TO HUMAN REPRODUCTION****Chair:** Bonnie HickeyColleen Beaumier
Grant Hill

Carolyn Parrish

Pauline Picard

Joseph Volpe

(6)

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HIV/AIDS**Chairman:** John O'ReillyGrant Hill
Réal MénardPat O'Brien
Paul Szabo

Rose-Marie Ur

Joseph Volpe

(7)

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT**Chairman:** Maurizio Bevilacqua**Vice-Chairs:**Jean Augustine
Francine LalondeGerry Byrne
Christiane Gagnon
Patrick GagnonDale Johnston
Gurbax Singh Malhi
Ian McClellandLarry McCormick
Robert D. Nault
George ProudJim Silye
Anna Terrana
Stéphan Tremblay

(15)

Associate MembersDiane Ablonczy
Warren Allmand
Chris Axworthy
Leon E. BenoitJan Brown
John Cannis
Marlene Cowling
Paul CrêtePaul DeVillers
Antoine Dubé
Jim Gouk
Herb GrubelKeith Martin
Réal Ménard
Svend J. Robinson
Andy Scott**HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE STATUS OF
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES****Chair:** Sheila Finestone**Vice-Chairmen:**Maurice Bernier
Andy ScottSarkis Assadourian
Jean AugustineJohn Godfrey
Deborah GreySharon Hayes
Russell MacLellanRéal Ménard
Georgette Sheridan

(11)

Associate MembersChris Axworthy
Mauril Bélanger
Robert BertrandMaud Debien
Audrey McLaughlinPhilippe Paré
Svend J. RobinsonRoseanne Skoke
Myron Thompson

INDUSTRY

Chairman: David Walker

Vice-Chairmen: Pierre Brien
Walt Lastewka

Morris Bodnar Bonnie Brown Nick Discepola	Jay Hill Ron MacDonald Philip Mayfield	Réal Ménard Ian Murray Bernard Patry	Yves Rocheleau Werner Schmidt Joseph Volpe	(15)
---	--	--	--	------

Associate Members

Peter Adams Leon E. Benoit Pierre de Savoye Bernard Deshaies	Joe Fontana Maurice Godin Karen Kraft Sloan Ghislain Lebel	Andy Mitchell Rey D. Pagtakhan Roseanne Skoke John Solomon	Darrel Stinson Paul Szabo Len Taylor
---	---	---	--

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CONVERSION OF MILITARY INDUSTRIES TO CIVILIAN PURPOSES

Chairman: Walt Lastewka

Bonnie Brown	Réal Ménard	Ian Murray	Chuck Strahl	(5)
--------------	-------------	------------	--------------	-----

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Chair: Shaughnessy Cohen

Vice-Chairs: Michel Bellehumeur
Paddy Torsney

Pierre de Savoye Paul DeVillers Nick Discepola	Art Hanger Gordon Kirkby François Langlois	John Maloney Jack Ramsay Geoff Regan	George S. Rideout Andrew Telegdi Randy White	(15)
--	--	--	--	------

Associate Members

Chris Axworthy Jag Bhaduria Garry Breitreuz Jan Brown John Finlay Paul Forseth Jack Frazer	Christiane Gagnon Patrick Gagnon Roger Gallaway Jim Gouk Stephen Harper Jay Hill	Ghislain Lebel Derek Lee John Loney Russell MacLellan Val Meredith Bob Mills	Svend J. Robinson Roseanne Skoke Bernard St-Laurent Myron Thompson Susan Whelan Ted White
--	---	---	--

SUB-COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Chairman: Derek Lee

Nick Discepola Roger Gallaway	Art Hanger	François Langlois	George S. Rideout	(6)
----------------------------------	------------	-------------------	-------------------	-----

SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE DRAFT REGULATIONS ON FIREARMS

Chairman: Russell MacLellan

Pierre de Savoye Gordon Kirkby	John Maloney	Jack Ramsay	Susan Whelan	(6)
-----------------------------------	--------------	-------------	--------------	-----

LIAISON**Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chair:****Mary Clancy**Reg Alcock
Maurizio Bevilacqua
Raymond Bonin
Charles Caccia
Shaughnessy CohenStan Dromisky
Sheila Finestone
Albina Guarnieri
Michel Guimond
Ghislain LebelClifford Lincoln
Joe McGuire
Andy Mitchell
Jim Peterson
Roger SimmonsTony Valeri
Lyle Vanclief
David Walker
Paul Zed

(21)

Associate Member

Jack Frazer

SUB-COMMITTEE ON BUDGET**Chairman: Bill Graham****Vice-Chairman:****Paul Zed**Reg Alcock
Jack Frazer

Michel Guimond

Andy Mitchell

Lyle Vanclief

(7)

NATIONAL DEFENCE AND VETERANS AFFAIRS**Chair: Mary Clancy****Vice-Chairmen:****Robert Bertrand
Jean H. Leroux**John Cannis
Bernie CollinsJack Frazer
Jim HartJean-Marc Jacob
John O'ReillyJohn Richardson
Bob Wood

(11)

Associate MembersStéphane Bergeron
Bill Blaikie
Pierre de SavoyeJesse Flis
Gar Knutson
John MaloneyRéal Ménard
Val Meredith
Bob RingmaSvend J. Robinson
Elsie Wayne**NATURAL RESOURCES****Chairman: Andy Mitchell****Vice-Chairmen:****René Canuel
Peter Thalheimer**Réginald Bélair
David Chatters
Marlene CowlingBernard Deshaies
Monique Guay
David IftodyJulian Reed
Bob Ringma
Benôit SerréRoseanne Skoke
Darrel Stinson
Bob Wood

(15)

Associate MembersJim Abbott
Gérard AsselinLeon E. Benoit
John FinlayRoger Gallaway
John SolomonBrent St. Denis
Derek Wells**PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS****Chairman: Paul Zed****Vice-Chairs:****Marlene Catterall
François Langlois**Jack Frazer
Mac Harb
Bonnie HickeyBob Kilger
René Laurin
John LoneyRey D. Pagtakan
Carolyn Parrish
Roger PomerleauRay Speaker
Chuck Strahl

(14)

Associate MembersMauril Bélanger
Robert Bertrand
Dianne Brushett
John Cummins
Ken EppRon Fewchuk
Deborah Grey
Michel Guimond
Hugh Hanrahan
Stephen HarperDick Harris
Jim Hart
Jim Jordan
John Solomon
Darrel StinsonSuzanne Tremblay
Elsie Wayne
Ted White
John Williams

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES**Joint Chairs:** **Sen. Maurice Riel**
Albina Guarnieri**Vice-Chairmen:** **Jean-Paul Marchand**
Benoît SerréRepresenting the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons

Gerald A. Beaudoin
Shirley MaheuJean-Claude Rivest
Louis J. RobichaudMark Assad
Cliff BreitzkreuzMichel Dupuy
Georgette Sheridan

(12)

Associate Members

Gaston Leroux

Jim Silye

SCRUTINY OF REGULATIONS**Joint Chairmen:** **Sen. P. Derek Lewis**
Ghislain Lebel**Vice-Chairman:** **Derek Lee**Representing the Senate:
The Honourable Senators

Representing the House of Commons:

Doris M. Anderson
Michel Cogger
Normand Grimard
William M. KellyShirley Maheu
Pietro Rizzuto
Nicholas W. TaylorMark Assad
Gilbert Fillion
Janko PerićGeoff Regan
Tom Wappel
Ted White

(16)

The Speaker

HON. GILBERT PARENT

Panels of Chairmen of Legislative Committees

The Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. DAVID KILGOUR

The Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MR. PETER MILLIKEN

The Assistant Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole

MRS. PIERRETTE RINGUETTE-MALTAIS

THE MINISTRY

According to precedence

The Right Hon. Jean Chrétien	Prime Minister
The Hon. Herb Gray	Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada
The Hon. Lloyd Axworthy	Minister of Foreign Affairs
The Hon. David Anderson	Minister of Transport
The Hon. Ralph E. Goodale	Minister of Agriculture and Agri–Food
The Hon. David Dingwall	Minister of Health
The Hon. Ron Irwin	Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
The Hon. Joyce Fairbairn	Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister with special responsibility for Literacy
The Hon. Sheila Copps	Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
The Hon. Sergio Marchi	Minister of the Environment
The Hon. John Manley	Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec
The Hon. Diane Marleau	Minister of Public Works and Government Services
The Hon. Paul Martin	Minister of Finance
The Hon. Douglas Young	Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
The Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton	Minister for International Trade
The Hon. Marcel Massé	President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure
The Hon. Anne McLellan	Minister of Natural Resources
The Hon. Allan Rock	Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
The Hon. Alfonso Gagliano	Minister of Labour and Deputy Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
The Hon. Lucienne Robillard	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
The Hon. Fred Mifflin	Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
The Hon. Jane Stewart	Minister of National Revenue
The Hon. Stéphane Dion	President of the Queen’s Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs
The Hon. Pierre Pettigrew	Minister of Human Resources Development
The Hon. Don Boudria	Minister for International Cooperation and Minister responsible for Francophonie
The Hon. Fernand Robichaud	Secretary of State (Agriculture and Agri–Food, Fisheries and Oceans)
The Hon. Ethel Blondin–Andrew	Secretary of State (Training and Youth)
The Hon. Lawrence MacAulay	Secretary of State (Veterans) (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency)
The Hon. Christine Stewart	Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)
The Hon. Raymond Chan	Secretary of State (Asia–Pacific)
The Hon. Jon Gerrard	Secretary of State (Science, Research and Development) (Western Economic Diversification)
The Hon. Douglas Peters	Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions)
The Hon. Martin Cauchon	Secretary of State (Federal Office of Regional Development – Quebec)
The Hon. Hedy Fry	Secretary of State (Multiculturalism) (Status of Women)

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARIES

Rey D. Pagtakhan	to Prime Minister
Paul Zed	to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons
Nick Discepola	to Solicitor General of Canada
Francis G. LeBlanc	to Minister of Foreign Affairs
John Richardson	to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs
Stan Keyes	to Minister of Transport
Jerry Pickard	to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food
Joseph Volpe	to Minister of Health
Bernard Patry	to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development
Guy H. Arseneault	to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage
Karen Kraft Sloan	Minister of the Environment
Morris Bodnar	to Minister of Industry, Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency and Minister of Western Economic Diversification
John Harvard	to Minister of Public Works and Government Services
Barry Campbell	to Minister of Finance
Robert D. Nault	to Minister of Human Resources Development
Ron MacDonald	to Minister for International Trade
Ovid L. Jackson	to President of the Treasury Board
Marlene Cowling	to Minister of Natural Resources
Gordon Kirkby	to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada
George Proud	to Minister of Labour
Maria Minna	to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration
Ted McWhinney	to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans
Sue Barnes	to Minister of National Revenue
Paul DeVillers	to President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Inter-governmental Affairs
John Godfrey	to Minister for International Cooperation

CONTENTS

Friday, April 11, 1997

Privilege

The Department of Citizenship and Immigration— Speaker's Ruling	
The Deputy Speaker	9589

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act

Bill C-5. Consideration resumed of motion for concurrence	9590
Division on motion deferred	9590

Criminal Code

Bill C-17. Consideration resumed of report stage and on Motion No. 2	9590
Mr. Strahl	9590
(Motion No. 2 agreed to.)	9592
Motion for concurrence	9592
Mr. Rock	9592
(Motion agreed to.)	9592
Motion for third reading	9592
Mr. Strahl	9592
Mr. Ramsay	9594
Mr. Hanger	9597

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Maple Syrup Season

Mr. McCormick	9597
---------------------	------

Polyvalente Charles-Gravel

Mr. Godin	9598
-----------------	------

Health Supplements

Mr. Strahl	9598
------------------	------

Meredith Doyle Rink

Mrs. Brushett	9598
---------------------	------

Magdalena Filipowich

Mr. Lastewka	9598
--------------------	------

TOYS PROMOTING VIOLENCE

Mr. Brien	9598
-----------------	------

New Liskeard Cubs

Mr. Serré	9599
-----------------	------

Aquaculture

Mr. Duncan	9599
------------------	------

Employment Insurance

Mr. Proud	9599
-----------------	------

Co-operative Housing

Ms. Bethel	9599
------------------	------

Gun Control

Mr. Grose	9600
-----------------	------

MIRABEL AIRPORT

Mr. Dumas	9600
-----------------	------

Fisheries

Mr. Scott (Skeena)	9600
--------------------------	------

Parkinson Awareness Month

Mr. Mitchell	9600
--------------------	------

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Bellehumeur	9600
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9601
Mr. Bellehumeur	9601
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9601
Mr. Bellehumeur	9601
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9601

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Mrs. Debien	9601
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9602
Mrs. Debien	9602
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9602

Justice

Mr. Ramsay	9602
Mr. Rock	9602
Mr. Ramsay	9602
Mr. Rock	9602
Mr. Ramsay	9603
Mr. Rock	9603

MIDDLE EAST

Mrs. Guay	9603
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9603
Mrs. Guay	9603
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9603

Justice

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	9604
Mr. Rock	9604
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	9604
Mr. Rock	9604

U.S.—Canada Tax Treaty

Mr. Crête	9604
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	9604
Mr. Crête	9604
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Énard)	9604

Military Bases

Mr. Scott (Skeena)	9605
Mr. Young	9605
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	9605
Mr. Young	9605

Employment Insurance

Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	9605
Mr. Young	9605
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	9605
Mr. Young	9606

Infrastructure Program

Mr. Dupuy	9606
Mr. Massé	9606

Government Contracts

Mr. Gilmour	9606
Mr. Massé	9606

Mr. Gilmour	9606
Mr. Massé	9606
National Defence	
Mr. Pomerleau	9607
Mr. Young	9607
Mr. Pomerleau	9607
Mr. Young	9607
Health Care	
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	9607
Mr. Volpe	9607
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	9608
Mr. Volpe	9608
Montfort Hospital	
Mr. Bellemare	9608
Mr. Volpe	9608
Parc technologique du Québec métropolitain	
Mr. Dubé	9608
Mr. Cauchon	9608
Aquaculture	
Mr. Duncan	9609
Mr. Mifflin	9609
Employment	
Mr. Iftody	9609
Mr. Goodale	9609
Presence in the Gallery	
The Deputy Speaker	9609

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House	
Justice and Legal Affairs	
Mr. Kirkby	9609
Finance	
Mrs. Brushett	9609
Broadcasting Act	
Bill C-401. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	9609
Mr. Murray	9609

Petitions	
Disability Benefits	
Ms. Meredith	9610
Taxation	
Ms. Meredith	9610
Highways	
Mr. Hanger	9610
Taxation	
Mr. Hanger	9610
Pedophiles	
Mr. Hanger	9610
Age of Consent	
Mr. Hanger	9610
Justice	
Mr. Hanger	9610
Taxation	
Mrs. Jennings	9610
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Proud	9610

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Criminal Code	
Bill C-17. Consideration resumed of motion for third reading	9611
Mr. Hanger	9611
Mr. Kirkby	9614
Mr. Hanger	9616
Mr. Ramsay	9618
Mr. Bellehumeur	9618
Division on motion deferred	9620

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Crown corporations	
Motion M-260	9620
Mr. Crête	9620
Mr. Gilmour	9622
Mr. Kirkby	9623
Mr. Pomerleau	9624
Division on motion deferred	9625

Appendix

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**8801320
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:

Public Works and Government Services Canada — Publishing
45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,
Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

En cas de non-livraison,

retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:

Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada — Édition
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 Public Works and Government Services Canada — Publishing,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, at \$1.75 per copy or \$286 per year.**

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 la version française de cette publication en écrivant à Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada — Édition,
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9, à 1.75 \$ l'exemplaire ou 286 \$ par année.**