



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 134 • NUMBER 147 • 2nd SESSION • 35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, March 19, 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

Wednesday, March 19, 1997

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

The Speaker: Every Wednesday we sing our national anthem and today we will be led by the hon. member for Beaver River.

[Editor's Note: Whereupon members sang the national anthem.]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

JOHN PAHAPILL

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to pay tribute to my constituent John Pahapill. Mr. Pahapill recently returned from a mission overseas with the Canadian executives service organization. Mr. Pahapill was in Estonia advising the government's ministry of justice on developing an efficient work program to rehabilitate prisoners.

CESO volunteers are professional men and women, usually retired, who share their wealth of knowledge and experience to aid businesses and organizations in developing countries, emerging market economies and Canadian aboriginal communities.

CESO is supported by CIDA, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and hundreds of Canadian corporations and individuals.

We applaud the volunteer work that Mr. Pahapill and the CESO organization are doing in eastern Europe to help those economies make the transition from the old Soviet state run system to a freer market system. Bravo, John.

* * *

[Translation]

MUNICIPALITY OF GROSSE-ÎLE

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse, BQ): Mr. Speaker, 1997 marks the 150th anniversary of the Great Famine in Ireland.

Thousands of Irish men and women fled their country only to be decimated by cholera and typhus epidemics at the Grosse-Île quarantine station, which is located in the riding of Bellechasse-Etchemins-Montmagny-L'Islet.

Grosse-Île will be the site of a number of major events this year to commemorate the sad fate of those men and women. The Corporation de la Grosse-Île, inspired by its chairman, Dr. Jean-Marie Dionne, has been working for more than 15 years to remind the general public that the people of the South Shore responded with hospitality, and a spirit of brotherhood, to the struggling new arrivals who had fled the famine in their homeland.

I invite the people of Canada, and elsewhere, to put Grosse-Île at the top of their list of places to visit during 1997, and in the years to come.

This summer, special commemorations will also be held in the city of Montmagny, and the parishes of Saint-Jean-Port-Joli, L'Islet, Berthier-sur-Mer and Saint-Édouard-de-Frampton.

Come one, come all, the welcome mat is out for you.

* * *

[English]

FAMEX

Mr. Paul Forseth (New Westminster—Burnaby, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mary Mercier and 16,000 other Canadians, I am protesting the use of the FAMEX survey by Statistics Canada. The intrusive content and threatening manner of the survey is objectionable to Canadians and violates our fundamental sense of fairness of what governments should do.

This survey certainly is unaccountable bureaucracy gone wrong. Such detailed information about one's personal income tax form, how much they spend on toilet paper in a whole year or how much interest they accumulate on their credit cards per year is of no business to a government collector.

Governments should not be threatening people with legal penalties for non co-operation to fill out a three hour long survey when the private sector can collect for itself what it needs from volunteers and then pay them for it.

Criminal legal sanctions of government should not be used to enable private market economy work.

S. O. 31

I call on the minister responsible, if indeed there is one at this point, to ensure that Statistics Canada stop this objectionable survey which violates mainstream Canadian values.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, the minister of immigration recently announced changes to Canada's immigration policies, but unfortunately the Liberals have left untouched those policies most in need of change.

They have left a head tax on immigrants in place, a regressive tax that penalizes immigrants with no regard to their financial resources, inflicting needless hardship on new Canadians and their families.

The Liberals have also left in place refugee policies that require some legitimate refugees to return to countries from which they are fleeing in order to obtain documents. These policies have threatened the lives of refugees from such countries as Iran, which has an atrocious record on human rights.

Many new Canadians and those concerned about the plight of refugees and immigrants are feeling betrayed by the immigration policies of this Liberal government.

* * *

JUSTICE

Mr. Morris Bodnar (Saskatoon—Dundurn, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the issue of section 745, the faint hope clause, should be dealt with without trying to capitalize politically on the misfortune of the families of victims. Section 745 needs constructive discussion.

In my opinion section 745 should be eliminated and discretion returned to the sentencing judges. This would eliminate injustices and would allow judges leeway in sentencing. A judge could rule that an Olson or a Bernardo would never be paroled and they would never darken the door of the parole board, not even after 25 years. Someone who has committed murder under extenuating circumstances could be ordered eligible for parole in a much shorter time.

Let us eliminate section 745, return discretion to our judges and return to making good laws, rather than politically capitalizing on the misfortunes of victims' families.

* * *

LITERACY

Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of national literacy action day. In doing so I wish to honour two outstanding teachers who live in Winnipeg South and who are recipients of the Prime Minister's award for teaching excellence in science, technology and mathematics.

Emanuel Sylvester, a teacher at Jameswood school, is dedicated to preparing his students for the future. He provides extra help for his students through a homework club and is constantly looking for new techniques for teaching science.

Judith Lawrence teaches math at Phoenix school in Headingly, Manitoba. She took on the challenge of not only introducing the province's new math curriculum but conducted special math nights for family members.

A lack of basic literacy and numeracy is a problem which holds back thousands and thousands of Canadians. Our colleague, Senator Joyce Fairbairn, Minister with special responsibility for Literacy, is working closely with provincial, corporate and community partners to address this serious problem.

With teachers like Emanuel Sylvester and Judith Lawrence it is a battle we can win. Today I salute the outstanding contributions of these individuals and their commitment to teaching excellence.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADA COUNCIL

Ms. Paddy Torsney (Burlington, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Canada Council for its excellent work over the years.

Today, we are celebrating its 40th anniversary and the contribution Canadian artists, publishers and artistic organizations have made to the culture of Canada.

● (1405)

Artists express the essence of our society, its very soul. Their artistic expressions are rooted in their imagination, their emotions, their ideas. They tell us who we are, and show us what we can become. It is important to recognize the true value of their contribution to our society.

Over its forty-year history, the Canada Council has been a remarkable source of support to the production and dissemination of culture in Canada. The founders of the Council, including Father Lévesque who is with us here today, probably had no idea how much their new organization would accomplish.

We hope that the Council—

The Speaker: I am sorry but I must interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member for Québec has the floor.

* * *

FAMILY VIOLENCE

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Fondation Jamais Plus invites the men and women of Quebec to take a stand against domestic violence by going out on Friday and purchasing a pin in the form of a purple cross, which is the symbol of the struggle against family violence.

Through the sales of this pin, the Fondation hopes to collect \$100,000, which it will invest in research projects, particularly with respect to children who have witnessed family violence. The federation includes 32 shelters in Quebec. We all wonder what we can do in response to the tragedies of this world that we see depicted on the television news night after night. The Fondation Jamais Plus is offering one positive and practical way.

The Bloc Quebecois encourages Quebecers to act on Friday and buy a purple cross and help build a society free of domestic violence.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the constituents of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt to warn the Liberals against allowing the United Nations Codex commission to outlaw, restrict and control the sale of herbs and vitamins to Canadian consumers.

Consumers of these products do not want the Liberals to increase the price, cut the selection and force them to get prescriptions for these products.

The Liberals are once again killing jobs, jobs, jobs. They are turning the control of this industry over to an international body.

The reclassification and the imposition of a restricted list for these products will put small manufacturers out of business. Large pharmaceutical firms will take over as health food stores across Canada shut down.

A Reform government would encourage Canadians to use vitamins, herbs and other health supplements in order to improve their overall health. The Reform Party is offering Canadians a fresh start so that consumers come first and have the right to safe, low cost health products.

* * *

OFFICIAL OPPOSITION

Mr. Jag Bhaduria (Markham—Whitchurch—Stouffville, Lib. Dem.): Mr. Speaker, for more than three years it has been evident to Canadians across the country that they have not had a strong and effective voice representing them in the official opposition benches of this House.

Canadians realize that the official opposition is nothing more than a single province party, committed to breaking up and destroying our great country.

It is time for the opposition members in this House to consider a parliamentary coalition of political forces to replace the separatist party from the official opposition benches. To this end, I offer my

S. O. 31

consent and support to the formation of a political coalition for the purpose of recognition of a group of 51 or more members as the official opposition. I invite my colleagues from the opposition side to join this coalition for the sake of keeping our country together.

Canadians need a strong and effective voice in the official opposition to challenge the Prime Minister and his government on their dismal record.

* * *

THE LATE MURRAY FRASER

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Murray Fraser was a lawyer, a law teacher, law reformer, law school founder, law dean, university administrator and university president.

He was a husband, a father, a grandfather, a son, a brother, a friend, a colleague and a mentor. He was a diplomat, a wit, an intellectual and a scholar. He was a comforter, a consolidator, a builder and an inspiration.

He could calm a class of hysterical law students, play a wicked game of charades and charm an auditorium full of people, all effortlessly and with true warmth. He was a stellar member of his profession in every aspect of that profession.

With his wife Anne he formed a team that made the places where they lived and worked in Canada, Halifax, Ottawa, Victoria and Calgary, immeasurably better and they did it with much grace.

We lost Murray Fraser last week, far too young, far too soon.

● (1410)

To his wife Anne, his three sons, all his family and to the larger community that mourns him across our nation, we send our sympathy and our tribute to a truly wonderful man. We loved him.

* * *

WAR CRIMINALS

Hon. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Friday, March 21 marks the international day for the elimination of racial discrimination, an important time for all of us to reflect on and rejoice in the values inherent in living with respect and understanding for the diversity of our people in both official languages.

Our charter speaks to non-discrimination as a goal yet to be reached in our evolving history of growth and development. There have been many breaches in the contract of fairness, equality and tolerance that must be challenged and overcome.

Today, on the 10th anniversary of the Deschenes commission report, I met with private investigator Steve Rambam on the issue of Nazi war criminals fraudulently making a home in our country. While 12 such cases are presently being reviewed, other criminals must also be pursued, for he presented a very disturbing portrait of

S. O. 31

the RCMP's lack of serious pursuit and investigative tactics against these perpetrators of horrific crimes.

It was a damning criticism of our respect for the value of our own humanity, our own citizenship, and this is a matter of international justice and human rights, not revenge.

The Speaker: The hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka.

* * *

GRAVENHURST CUBS

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour one of our great Canadian traditions, the game of hockey, and a fine young team from my riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka.

Today I salute our league champions, the Gravenhurst Cubs junior C hockey team from my home town, which won the mid-Ontario junior C championship series and is in the midst of the all-Ontario playdowns, a best of seven series.

So many of our young people take up the game of hockey and so many are inspired by our hockey greats, those who have gone on to become national heroes: Wayne Gretzky, Mario Lemieux and from my home riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka, Bobby Orr.

It takes a lot of hard work and even more commitment and skill to play hockey well. It takes teamwork and tremendous personal drive. It takes the dedication of parents, volunteers and coaches. It takes the loyalty and enthusiasm of the countless fans.

I join with those fans in wishing our Gravenhurst Cubs the best of luck as they skate, shoot and score their way to the championships.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC ESTIMATES

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the president of the Quebec treasury board tabled the 1997-98 estimates. Next year, the province's health, education and social assistance expenditures will be cut by \$1.6 billion.

For the same year, federal cash transfers to Quebec in these areas will be reduced by exactly the same amount as in 1996. The painful cuts now facing the Government of Quebec are, make no mistake, the sad result of decisions by Canada's finance minister and this Liberal government.

In making such cuts in the social transfers to the provinces, the federal Liberals are condemning them to paying the political price

of improving federal public finances, all the while unfairly claiming credit for managing the country well.

The next election will provide an opportunity to remind Quebecers that the Liberal government must bear most of the blame for the closure of hospitals and cuts to education in Quebec.

* * *

[English]

COPYRIGHT LAW

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, oh what a tangled web we weave has never been more true than the heritage minister's attempt to cobble together an updated copyright law.

On Monday in this House Liberal backbenchers, like cloned sheep, rose and offended such organizations as the Canadian Alliance of Students Association, the Association of Colleges and Universities, the Canadian Restaurant and Foods Association, Canada's radio and television broadcasters, church organizations, charities that depend on telethons, consumer groups, genealogists, archivists, and the list goes on and on.

Canada's hardworking private broadcasters should pay particular attention to the vote of their local members of Parliament. Certainly Canadian students and university associations have noted that the Liberal government, while talking the talk of supporting them financially, has walked the walk of ripping off each student an average of \$1,600 by the Liberal ill conceived shutdown of easy access to used study texts.

The precedent set by this minister's tangled web of copyright revisions phase II is a pattern which will be carried into phase III. Confusion, concern, consternation, what a cop out.

* * *

● (1415)

[Translation]

REHABILITATION OF CONTAMINATED SITES

Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the secretary of state for regional development in Quebec has just announced an investment of up to \$30 million to establish a centre of excellence in the rehabilitation of contaminated sites in Montreal.

The centre's concept is both simple and promising. During an initial five year period, researchers at the NRC's Biotechnology Research Institute will work in co-operation with authorities in Montreal to develop a technological platform for the rehabilitation of contaminated sites.

They will develop an expertise that will lead to the effective and economic rehabilitation of contaminated sites and the transfer of

Oral Questions

technology to the private sector. Many firms have already indicated considerable interest in the project.

This is another of our government's achievements for Montreal and Quebec.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

ORGANIZED CRIME

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in response to pressure from Quebec's Minister of Public Security, Quebec City area mayors, police forces and official opposition members, the Minister of Justice finally realized that urgent action was required with respect to the biker war. The minister agreed to meet with stakeholders from the Quebec City area who are grappling with the war between the Rock Machine and the Hell's Angels.

In his meeting in Quebec City tomorrow with area mayors and the provincial Minister of Public Security, what concrete proposals does the minister intend to put forward?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time the Government of Canada has expressed its views and shown an interest in this situation.

We have already met with police forces from Montreal and elsewhere to discuss possible amendments to the Criminal Code in order to resolve this matter.

But, as I said yesterday, I intend to meet with Mr. Perreault and others tomorrow to discuss all the possibilities and strategies open to the Government of Canada in order to work with the Government of Quebec, with municipal governments and with police forces in order to deal with this difficult situation.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, of course there is interest, I would hope so, but interest is not enough. I do not imagine the minister is going to Quebec City to put on a show for the media. He is going there to intervene, at least I would hope so.

I ask him if, when he is in Quebec City tomorrow, he intends to propose exceptional measures to resolve this exceptional situation, as area mayors and the Quebec Minister of Public Security are requesting him to do.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, because of the wording of the hon. member's question, I must repeat that we have already taken action as a government and passed concrete and effective measures to improve the Criminal Code as it relates to organized crime. For

example, in Bill C-17 we proposed and are now adopting valid measures in this regard.

Once again, as I said, at the meeting we will be holding with Mr. Perreault in Quebec City tomorrow morning I intend to discuss and examine with him and other individuals involved all the approaches open.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Leader of the Opposition, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the means decided on to date, the amendments made so far, are not enough. The police do not have all the tools they need to go after biker gangs.

Quebec City area mayors and the Quebec Minister of Public Security have certainly pointed out to him that more substantial amendments to the Criminal Code are required. What does the Minister of Justice intend to reply to Mr. Perreault, who is calling for urgent amendments to the Criminal Code to deal with the Hell's Angels and the Rock Machine?

• (1420)

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Perreault also said there was no magic or simple solution, such as an anti-gang law.

We must work together, in good faith, setting aside partisan politics. We must work together constructively in the search for solutions. Of course, police forces want tools to help them in their work.

But as I said, we have already taken action, and if it is possible to identify other approaches, I am prepared to take action again.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the minister understands the reality and the great urgency involved, and particularly the fact that there are major faults in his system.

Need we remind the minister that we again had proof of this yesterday, when a certain Daniel Nault, a Hell's Angels sympathizer, was acquitted, thanks to the Criminal Code the minister refuses to amend, although he had been arrested with a working bomb in the trunk of his car.

I am asking the Minister of Justice whether he does not acknowledge that this is striking proof that the Criminal Code as it stands is not strong enough to stop the motorcycle gang wars?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, may I express my disappointment at the tone and the approach taken by the Bloc Québécois in relation to a matter which should engage our serious and non-partisan attention.

There are people in communities in Quebec, in Ontario and across the country who are worried about their personal safety by reason of organized crime, motorcycle gangs and bombs exploding in the streets. In that atmosphere the answer is not to exchange partisan barbs in some political exchange. Rather the approach

Oral Questions

should be to work constructively to see what can be done to improve the situation, and that is what I intend to do tomorrow morning in Quebec City.

The fact that these crimes are being committed may have something to do with the need for improvements in the criminal law. It also has something to do with the ability of the police to work in a co-ordinated fashion with the municipal and provincial governments, using powers within their jurisdictions, with the allocations of resources by municipal and provincial governments.

The member should not pretend that this difficult situation will be resolved simply by changing words in the federal statute.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wonder what tone I am supposed to take in addressing this House. Since yesterday, because no action was taken, there have been two more deaths in a bomb explosion in Quebec. I think the minister needs to wake up and smell the coffee, and do something as soon as possible.

He also needs to keep in mind that there are at least 15 biker clubhouses in Quebec, 15 fortresses, and the gangs continue to wreak havoc.

The Minister is going to Quebec City, and not to see the sights. The mayors are waiting for an answer to their questions. In order to settle the problem of these fortified biker clubhouses once and for all, and to do away with all the nasty business they are involved in, is the minister prepared—and this is a serious matter—to announce tomorrow to Minister Perreault and all the mayors who are waiting for some action, that, as soon as possible, he will propose to the Canadian Parliament legislation that will ban motorcycle gangs once and for all?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has no monopoly on concern. The members on this side of the House, the members of the government caucus, are just as concerned about the safety of communities in the country as are the hon. member and his colleagues.

If the hon. member thinks that the bombings taking place are going to be stopped because we change words in the Criminal Code of Canada, he is sadly deluded. What will make the difference is good, solid, co-ordinated police work with sufficient resources and municipal, provincial and federal governments working together constructively to do the job.

That is not achieved with narrow partisan political speeches. That is not achieved by pointing fingers and becoming flushed. That is achieved with good, solid, hard work, and that is exactly what the government is going to do.

• (1425)

EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the last two federal elections the leader of the federal party that ended up forming the government campaigned on the promise of jobs, jobs, jobs.

When Mr. Mulroney left office, the total number of unemployed was 1.5 million and the four years this government has been in office there are still 1.5 million unemployed.

My question for the Prime Minister is this. Why is his government's job creation record no better than Brian Mulroney's? Why has the Prime Minister, like Mulroney, failed to deliver on jobs, jobs, jobs?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last four years of the Mulroney administration about 150,000 new jobs were created. In less than four years 725,000 new jobs have been created in the economy. That is because we have managed the situation.

I know that the member is a former voter for Mulroney before he had the Reform Party obviously, unless he voted Liberal. That would be a big surprise but I am waiting for that judgment.

We have restored the finances of the nation. The low interest rates of today are the best in 35 years. People are using them because the housing market is increasing very quickly. People are buying cars and so on. However, we had to cure the mess that had been created by the Conservatives in the previous nine years first. Now the country is in much better shape and more than 725,000 jobs have been created.

As everybody knows, we will continue working because we are always preoccupied that whenever somebody wants to work we want to make sure that they can find a job. It is not easy but our record is much better than that of the Conservative Party.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, 1.5 million unemployed when Mulroney left office, 1.5 million unemployed today.

The Prime Minister just does not get it. Taxes, taxes, taxes are what are killing jobs, jobs, jobs. Seventy-one tax increases by the federal Tories, 37 tax increases by this government. The government now collects more taxes than any other government in Canadian history, including wartime. And there is a connection between those high levels of taxation and the record of unemployment, the worst record of unemployment since the depression.

Instead of trying to justify high unemployment, exactly like Brian Mulroney used to stand in this House and do, why does the

Oral Questions

Prime Minister not actually do something for the 1.5 million unemployed and start by lowering taxes? [Translation]

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have done a lot to create jobs. Look at the record, 725,000 jobs have been created.

More than that, 825,000 jobs have been created but both the federal and the provincial public sectors had to reduce the number of jobs by 100,000 to put the finances of the federal government and the provinces in good order.

We are doing better than any other nation of the G-7 at this moment. We have created more jobs than Germany, France, Italy and Great Britain together. However, it is not enough. We will be working on that.

I do not think the recipe proposed by the Reform Party is being taken very seriously because we have to finish the job of reducing the deficit and not try to buy votes with tax cuts for the rich like the Conservative Party and the Reform Party want to do.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Brian Mulroney always had an explanation for his dismal job record. Our interest rate was lower than Liechtenstein's, our growth rate is better than Antarctica, we have a better job record than somebody in the G-7.

What do we hear from this Prime Minister? Exactly the same thing. Our job record is better than somebody in the G-7. But there are still 1.5 million unemployed, two or three million under employed and one out of four workers afraid of losing their jobs.

• (1430)

Instead of trying to justify high unemployment records exactly like Mulroney, why will the Prime Minister not do something different and start by addressing the high tax levels in the country?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have not increased taxes.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice): We have had growth and therefore we have more revenue. He does not know the difference between the level of taxation and the level of revenue. We have not increased taxes at all. Oh yes, I am sorry, we have taxed the banks by \$200 million more.

We have plugged loopholes for some people who were not paying their fair share in the insurance business because they were abusing the system. But we have not increased taxes. We have a good, solid administration. Revenues have increased substantially. Because we had good growth and low inflation, 725,000 new taxpayers are now working who were not working when we formed the government.

COPYRIGHT

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is getting ready to break another of its election promises: to renew copyright legislation.

With the election deadline, the government is ensuring that Bill C-32 will die on the Order Paper by unduly delaying its legislative progress, and this will end up hurting authors, composers and performers.

My question is for the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Since the minister has said that the difficulties between herself and her colleague in industry were resolved, could she explain why she is running the risk of aborting Bill C-32 by postponing its third reading?

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well what he is saying is false.

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I remind the Minister of Canadian Heritage that, if the bill is not passed before the election is called, her government will have to bear the responsibility of depriving creators and performers of their rights.

Will the minister ensure Bill C-32 gets to third reading before the Easter break?

[English]

Hon. Sheila Copps (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and surprised that the member would try to misrepresent the position of the government. The member was in the House last Thursday when we agreed collectively to extend the hours of the House so that we could complete report stage in one day, a report stage which I might add was supported by every single member of the government.

[Translation]

I can assure the member on behalf of the entire government that third reading will take place in a few days.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on page 50 of the budget plan the finance ministers says the only way you can judge the impact of taxes is to measure them relative to the economy. Let us do that. I think that is a good idea.

Since the government came to office personal income taxes have gone up 15 per cent relative to the size of the economy. That contradicts what the Prime Minister just said. That means more money out of the pockets of every single man, woman and child in

Oral Questions

the country to feed a government who spends that money on things like golf carts, sock factories and of course the Hotel D' Shawinigan. We are talking billions of dollars.

Why will the finance minister not admit that he is socking it to Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when the government took office, revenues as a percentage of the economy were substantially higher than they are now. The conclusion of that is very clear, our take as a percentage of the economy has come down.

There are areas where we have absolutely changed the tax act. Tariffs are down substantially. Close to \$600 million is being put back into the hands of Canadians. On the other hand, and again if I could quote the Prime Minister: "Yes, there are areas where we have increased taxes," areas where the hon. member has objected to increasing taxes.

• (1435)

We have eliminated the tax advantages for family trusts. Reform opposed it. We took measures to combat the underground economy. Reform opposed it. We eliminated the preferential rate for large corporations. Reform opposed it. We increased the capital tax on financial institutions. Reform opposed it.

I could go on for a long time, but let me tell you those loopholes—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Medicine Hat.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it looks like I struck a nerve. You will notice that the finance minister did not try to answer my assertion directly. I said that according to the government's own statistics, personal income taxes have gone up as a percentage of the economy by 15 per cent.

Does the Minister of Finance deny that the government has raised personal income taxes so they have gone up 15 per cent relative to the size of the economy?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it only stands to reason that if 750,000 more people are working, it is quite possible that more people are paying taxes.

It only stands to reason that when loopholes are closed, and the \$100,000 capital gains tax exemption is eliminated, more people are paying taxes.

One really is entitled to a higher level of debate from an opposition party. Its members fail to understand that an economy that is growing will give the government more revenues. That is a good thing, not a bad thing.

[Translation]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, for several months now, the Minister of Finance has stubbornly refused to compensate Quebec for harmonizing the GST, although according to the calculations done by Quebec's Minister of Finance Quebec is entitled to \$2 billion in compensation for having harmonized its sales tax. This estimate, it goes without saying, is very different from the one arrived at by the Minister of Finance, and that is why it is becoming increasingly clear that the solution to this problem will be political rather than bureaucratic in nature.

Does the Minister of Finance realize that his compensation formula, the McKenna formula, that compensates a province if, and only if, it is losing more than 5 per cent of its revenues, is an arbitrary formula and that Quebec is actually entitled to demand compensation similar to that received by the three maritime provinces?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member must know that the formula by which only those provinces having lost more than 5 per cent of their revenues are compensated is perfectly normal. Five per cent includes normal fluctuations in a province's revenue from a tax source, in this case the sales tax.

The reality is that Quebec has not lost more than 5 per cent. Furthermore, if we look at the figures for the years since 1990, Quebec has made money by harmonizing and there is no compensation for a province that has not lost money. Nor is there any compensation for Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since the minister wants to talk about reality, here it is: there was a 20 per cent drop in QST revenues following harmonization in Quebec. Because of harmonization, we have had to compensate by hiking the income tax rate of SMBs by 66 per cent and payroll taxes by 23 per cent. That is reality.

It is so real that the premiers of British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario are demanding that the federal government give in to Quebec's arguments and pay \$2 billion in compensation for the Government of Quebec's losses. If that is not a consensus, we would like to know what the Minister of Finance is waiting for. These three provinces represent 85 per cent of the population.

• (1440)

I put my question to him. What is he waiting for to give Quebec what it is owed in all fairness for harmonizing the GST, because equity and only equity is what this is all about?

Oral Questions

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is very clear that Quebec is not entitled to compensation because Quebec has not lost any money.

I must point out that Quebec's former Minister of Finance himself, Mr. Bourbeau, indicated very clearly that Quebec did not deserve to be paid in this case because it had not lost any money.

That having been said, Mr. Bourbeau also pointed out that in other areas, such as technology and partnership for example, Quebec has received more than 60 to 70 per cent of all money, that Quebec, with 25 per cent of the population, receives 31 per cent of transfer payments, and more than 45 per cent of equalization payments.

It must be said that, when it comes to federal transfer payments to the provinces, Quebec is receiving its fair share.

* * *

[English]

TOBACCO PRODUCTS

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt the government's role in manipulating nicotine levels in cigarettes is plain. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada funds the scientists and the tobacco companies tell them what to do.

Did the health minister know this was going on and why did he not stop it?

Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premise the hon. member has brought forward is totally false.

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada is in harmony with Health Canada in our reduction of nicotine in tobacco products. There is no question we have funded a tremendous amount of money to help farmers leave the industry. The majority of our spending goes to give farmers an exit from the tobacco industry.

When we look at it, we have done what we can to make sure the industry is treated reasonably well, but we do not spend money enhancing nicotine. That is false.

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, they are treating the industry reasonably well, indeed. On March 13, 1996 the chair of a meeting between government officials, researchers and the industry said the following:

Lines crossed with U.S. and Canadian varieties will continue with emphasis on improving nicotine and grade quality.

Did the health minister know this was going on and why did he not stop it?

Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is

very important to realize that nicotine quantities in tobacco products are controlled internationally and that the industry itself has standards. The standard for nicotine in a tobacco plant is 2.5 per cent to 3 per cent. All products sold commercially in this country have to abide by between 2.5 per cent and 3 per cent.

Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada only monitors the tobacco plants to make certain that the industry standard is maintained and tobacco plants are within the standard accepted worldwide.

* * *

[Translation]

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

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

In Quebec, to defray the cost of harmonizing the QST, as my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot pointed out, the tax rate on the profits of small and medium size businesses increased by 66 per cent, and the contribution to the health services funds and the capital tax have both increased by 23 per cent. In the maritimes, however, there is no need for an increase, because of the \$1 billion that Ottawa paid out. Quebec therefore is being deprived unfairly of its sole tax advantage compared with these three provinces and is being penalized for its earlier tax choices, which are not those of the maritimes.

Will the Minister of Finance put a stop to the unfair competition from maritime businesses by giving Quebec the \$2 billion that would have cost a maritime-style harmonization?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc can keep asking the same question; the answer will not change. I have heard all I can stand.

Quebec has lost no money. It has lost no more than the five per cent. With the other programs, the transfers of technology and partnerships, the equalization payments, the transfers to help the aeronautical and pharmaceutical industries in Montreal, Quebec has received a lot from the federal government.

● (1445)

If Quebec deserved money for harmonizing the GST, it would have been given some. Unfortunately, for Quebec, it did not lose any money.

Mr. Roger Pomerleau (Anjou—Rivière-des-Prairies, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the premiers of the three maritime provinces are advertising in *Les Affaires* and the *Globe and Mail* the advantages of harmonizing the GST, which are greater for these provinces than for Quebec, simply because they have not had to pay the costs of harmonization. No wonder.

How long will the Minister of Finance continue to finance this unfair competition with Quebec and this shameless raiding of

Oral Questions

Quebec businesses with part of the taxes of Quebecers? When will he redress this injustice and pay the \$2 billion he owes Quebecers?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I speak now as a Quebecer. I think it is very dangerous for a member of the Bloc to complain when another region of the country is given help, because Canada's strength lies in the fact that regions help each other and that the federal government is always there when it is needed.

When the time came to help the Montreal aeronautics industry, the federal government was there. When the time came to help Quebec after the flooding in the Saguenay, the federal government was there. When the time came to make equalization payments, the federal government was there.

What I think the Bloc member should know is that Canada's strength lies in its regions' helping one another. We are a country, and he should stop trying to divide us.

Mr. McTeague: Mr. Speaker, I would like to obtain the co-operation of the Bloc Quebecois.

[English]

The Speaker: The hon. member for Ontario.

* * *

WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

On this the 10th anniversary of the release of the Deschenes commission report on war criminals in Canada, will the minister inform the House about the status of his department's efforts to bring to justice suspected Nazi war criminals who have sought to avoid persecution for their acts and who obviously believe that Canada is a safe haven?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am among those who believe that after the second world war too many governments did too little for too long to deal with the presence of alleged war criminals in Canada. What I can do today is provide an accounting of the efforts made by the government since it took office in late 1993.

Immediately after taking office we intensified efforts to prepare for prosecution those cases we felt were appropriate for criminal proceedings. In 1994 a Supreme Court of Canada judgment in the case of Finta made criminal prosecution a very remote prospect and very difficult practically.

As a result, in January 1995 the then Minister of Citizenship and Immigration and I announced that we would commence 12 cases within the following three years, civil proceedings asking the court

to denaturalize and deport those against whom we would allege that there was a lack of candour when they applied for entry into this country and those against whom we would allege there was evidence of complicity in war crimes during the second world war.

We will do better than the 12 over three years. By the end of this month we will have commenced all 12 of those cases. That is not to say we have done enough because we have not. We will continue to work on other cases where there is evidence to justify proceedings.

The government will continue to work because there is no statute of limitations on the moral imperative to act where there is evidence that there are such people among us.

One last thing, if I may, there are those in this country with information to assist us. I urge them to go to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and provide that evidence so we can act on it.

• (1450)

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, today the Canadian Jewish Congress has accused the RCMP of not taking action or even taking seriously information that was given to it on Nazi war criminals living in Canada.

Over the past 50 years successive Liberal and Tory governments have ignored the existence of Nazi criminals living in Canada. Why?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will deal with those aspects of the question other than the RCMP. I can answer for the Department of Justice.

In the period since we took office the Department of Justice has proceeded with cases where there is evidence to justify initiating proceedings. As I have just told the hon. member for Scarborough, we will continue in those efforts. The government believes as a matter of moral imperative that we must act where there is evidence to justify it.

As I also said very hurriedly a few moments ago, if there are those, whomever they may be, who have evidence that is relevant to this matter I urge them to turn that evidence over to the RCMP so that it can be evaluated and acted upon.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand there are over 1,000 names of suspected Nazi war criminals living in Canada. I also understand that the Canadian Jewish Congress has provided over 220 names to the RCMP and it has not responded. The department of immigration also has a list of over 200 suspected modern day war criminals.

What action will the government take beyond the 12 it is taking through civil proceedings to ensure that more war criminals are deported? One Nazi criminal in the past 50 years has been

Oral Questions

deported. What will the government do to ensure that not only Nazi war criminals but modern day war criminals—

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Justice.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I was saying to the hon. member for Ontario earlier this afternoon, the government is acting or there is evidence to justify action.

Before the hon. member becomes misled by claims of thousands of cases where action should be taken, I want her to bear in mind that the Deschenes commission, the 10th anniversary of which we are marking today as the member for Ontario said, identified far fewer cases. It identified about 29 or 30 priority cases where there was urgent evidence that action should be taken immediately.

It is from that list of cases that we have taken the ones on which we have acted immediately. We are not stopping at 12. There is no magic in that number. We will continue to prepare and proceed in cases where we believe there is evidence to justify it.

We do not have all the evidence from those who claim to have it in hand. I urge anybody who has evidence to give it to the RCMP so it can be evaluated and where appropriate acted upon.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MIDDLE EAST

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Yesterday, the Government of Israel authorized the start of construction for a new Jewish colony in East Jerusalem, despite strong Palestinian opposition. Yet a UN resolution has condemned this act, which may jeopardize the Middle East peace process.

Can the minister tell us whether he has contacted the Israeli ambassador, or plans to do so, in order to inform him of Canada's strong disapproval of the plan to set up a Jewish colony in East Jerusalem, an Israeli-occupied territory since 1967?

[*English*]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows well that the traditional and longstanding policy of the government is to oppose the expansion of settlement in those territories.

Our real interest is in trying to find ways of bringing about a peaceful process in the Middle East. We think the Oslo process that was set up is the best way of following that and therefore our stance has been very clear.

• (1455)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us clearly what the Canadian position is with respect to Israel's announced intention of surrendering only 9 per cent of the West Bank, rather than the 30 per cent the Palestinians were initially expecting?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I said, the Oslo process has clearly indicated the formulas for reconciliation between the two parties. We support the development of an agreement of understanding between the two parties in order to actively pursue the development of an agreement on the transfer of territories in this region.

* * *

[*English*]

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in November 1993 my colleague from Calgary Northeast and I met with the justice minister to encourage him to make significant changes to the Young Offenders Act.

Since then he has tinkered here, has tinkered there and has virtually accomplished nothing that reflects the wishes of Canadians, like lowering the age or publishing names.

Will he admit today that the latest dog and pony show costing several hundreds of thousands of dollars is a sham and that there will be no changes to the Young Offenders Act before the next election?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I remember clearly the very pleasant meeting I had with the hon. member and his colleague. I have a vivid recollection of the force with which he expressed his position.

Among other things he urged the government to change the Young Offenders Act to deal more effectively with violent criminals, particularly those aged 16 and 17. He urged the government to introduce stronger penalties for the most serious crimes of violence. He urged us to do something about safety in schools.

In June 1994, following my meeting with the hon. member, I introduced Bill C-37 which was subsequently adopted and proclaimed in force. Among other things that legislation doubled the maximum for first degree murder in youth court; provided for the transfer of 16 and 17 year olds charged with the most serious crimes of violence, except where they could satisfy the onus; and provided for the free sharing of information between police and school officials for safety's sake.

The hon. member and his colleagues in the Reform Party voted against that legislation. Mr. Speaker, you could imagine my

Oral Questions

surprise. Perhaps the hon. member would explain to his constituents why he did not support us when we acted.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the sad part about it was that when the legislation was brought forward we were here to support justice. This social engineer does not know the meaning of the word. He has not figured it out yet. That is his problem.

Could the champion of social engineering explain to the House today why after 10 or 12 years of Liberal law regarding young offenders it is 400 per cent worse than it was in the beginning?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have always preferred engineering to demolition. What we are really talking about here is more in the nature of architecture, building a better Young Offenders Act. We have been doing that.

Quite apart from the work we did with Bill C-37 which did not meet with the favour of the hon. member, we also had the justice committee spend the last 18 months travelling the country speaking to police, parents, school principals and young people themselves, and preparing architecture that will improve the Young Offenders Act into the next century.

One of the hard working and contributing members of that committee is the colleague of the hon. member, the member for Crowfoot. The member for Crowfoot would have hurt feelings to hear what the hon. member says about the work of that committee. The fact is that it is working hard. It is preparing a report. When we get that report we will give it the attention it deserves.

* * *

HIV-AIDS

Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fight to stop the spread of HIV-AIDS is of great concern to all Canadians.

The HIV trials network is an important and innovative part of the federal government's national AIDS strategy and keeps Canadian scientists and doctors at the forefront of research and treatment. Yet we hear concerns about the funding of this vital program extending beyond 1998.

• (1500)

Will the minister assure the House that the funding of this important trials network will continue beyond March 1998?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has worked tirelessly with me with regard to the clinical trials network which is based in St. Paul's Hospital in Vancouver but again is well grounded in every region of the country.

Very recently the clinical trial network here in Canada has formulated a partnership with the U.S. AIDS clinical trial group which will enable 500 Canadians living with HIV-AIDS to participate in this trial on protease inhibitors.

My government is able to provide additional funding for the years 1998-99 of \$2.5 million and in 1999-2000 an additional \$2.5 million.

* * *

HEALTH

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Health.

Canadians are speaking out across the country against attempts by the health protection branch to limit their access to safe natural health products, including Chinese herbs, and to charge exorbitant new fees which might drive them out of business and to restrict access internationally through the Codex forum.

Will the minister agree to impose a moratorium on these activities, these high fees and these attempts to attack the natural health products, which are driven by pressure from multinational pharmaceutical companies, until there has been a full public review by the Standing Committee on Health?

Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can jump to various conclusions but the role we play as the regulator in terms of Health Canada is to ensure that any products that come on to the market, in particular those which are to provide a remedy for a health matter, are safe and that all the appropriate tests have been done to ensure that the efficacy of the product will be realized.

If the hon. member has particular products in mind, I would of course raise this with the appropriate officials. I do not think it would be appropriate for the Minister of Health to give a carte blanche directive to the department when its very reason for existence is to make sure that the product is safe and efficacious.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of the House to the presence in the gallery of a parliamentary delegation from the Parliament of Ireland led by Mr. Michael Ferris, Chairman of the Joint Committee on European Affairs.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Colleagues, it has been written that if you want to look for the strength of a nation you should look to its laws and to its conquests, but if you want to look at the soul of a nation you should look to its artists, its poets and its writers.

Forty years ago this month the Canada Council was born by an act of this Parliament. Since that time the council has made an

immeasurable difference in the lives of Canadian artists and has helped Canada's cultural life flourish.

[Translation]

We have the honour of having a group of artists in the gallery today who are the incarnations of Canada's cultural success. They represent all of the talent and all of the creative spirit that nourish our cultural identity.

[English]

I am going to introduce these poets, these writers, these musicians and these artists one by one and I would like you to hold your applause until I have introduced all of them to you.

Please welcome these men and women who have told us about ourselves as Canadians and who helped define Canada for the world.

[Translation]

Father Georges-Henri Lévesque, a member of the Massey Commission which called for the creation of the Council, and its first vice-president. Would you please stand, Father Lévesque.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

• (1505)

The Speaker: Dear colleagues, I would ask you to hold on for a moment.

Second, novelist and poet Marie-Claire Blais. Please remain standing, Madam. Reverend Father, will you please remain standing. Angèle Dubeau, violinist; film maker Atom Egoyan; Celia Franca, founder of the National Ballet Company; actress Louise Marleau; Guido Molinari, visual artist; John Kimura Parker, pianist; Jean-Pierre Perrault, dancer and choreographer; Al Purdy, poet; Takao Tanabe, visual artist.

[English]

These are the Canadians we are honouring today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Colleagues, like you, I want to meet these people personally. They belong to us. I am having a reception for them and for you in room 216. Would you please join us after question period.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while we have all these people representing the arts in the gallery, why do we not agree to pass the copyright bill at third reading unanimously right now.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Do we have the consent of the House?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: I heard a no.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Reform Party, we feel we could do a lot better than Bill C-32.

[Translation]

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe, BQ): The Prime Minister's proposal is an excellent one, and one we support.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[Translation]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

* * *

ORDER IN COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to table in the House today, in both official languages, a number of order in council appointments which were made recently by the government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 110(1), these are deemed referred to the standing committees, a list of which is attached.

* * *

• (1510)

[English]

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS STRATEGY

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, Canada's international business strategy for the years 1997 and 1998.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table today the report on international business development. The document, entitled "Achievements of the International Business Development Program", responds to recommendations put forward in the November 1996 auditor general's report on Canada's export promotion activities.

The auditor general recommended that the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and Industry Canada establish

Routine Proceedings

mechanisms to measure the effectiveness of our international business development activities.

As recommended, we are establishing a performance measurement framework to determine the effectiveness of existing government programs and services and to help plan for the future.

The international business development report I am tabling today will serve as an annual report card updating parliamentarians on the results of our international business development activities.

[*Translation*]

We must ensure that the services we provide achieve their intended objectives at the least possible cost.

[*English*]

Next year's report will have much more detail than this initial endeavour and will discuss the preliminary results of our performance measurement system, including feedback from clients on our trade commissioner service, a review of the impact of the department's exports, investment and technology development activities. It will have baseline indicators that have been established to measure Canada's year over year success in terms of international markets and our promotion in those markets.

The government's international business development activities work hand in hand with a rigorous bilateral and multilateral trade policy agenda and clearly establish market access priorities to ensure that Canadian businesses have competitive access to world markets.

We are improving the delivery of services because international trade is an important part of the government's job strategy. The more companies we introduce to trade, the more jobs are created in Canada. To that end we have set a tangible goal of doubling the number of active exporters by the year 2000.

[*Translation*]

With exports accounting for nearly 40 per cent of our gross domestic product, international trade has become the engine that drives the Canadian economy.

[*English*]

For every \$1 billion in increased trade, we create or sustain 11,000 jobs in Canada, jobs for every community in the country. Promoting Canada's products and services is, however, only one part of the job.

We also must sell Canada as an outstanding place to invest. Foreign direct investment in Canada has a dramatic impact on job creation. Today three Canadian jobs out of ten, both direct and indirect, more than 50 per cent of our total exports, and 75 per cent

of our manufacturing exports are directly attributable to foreign direct investment in Canada.

Studies suggest that attracting a billion dollars of foreign direct investment into Canada results in up to 45,000 jobs over a five year period. That is why we have developed a specific agency, a specific program, to help bring in more of those investment dollars.

• (1515)

I cannot talk about international business development without referring to the success of the Team Canada trade missions led by the Prime Minister, together with the premiers, which have helped the private sector to bring home more than 550 business deals with more than \$22.1 billion for Canadian companies and resulting in Canadian jobs.

Canada is meeting the challenge of globalization and members have only to look at our track record.

The 1996 trade statistics are proof that Canada is succeeding internationally. Canada's trade surplus reached a record level of \$34 billion. That was \$6 billion more than in 1995. That is success.

This success has been built on the strength of the Team Canada partnerships. We have forged solid alliances with our provincial, municipal and private sector colleagues. By working together in Team Canada, we have been able to deliver the programs and services that Canadian companies need to compete internationally.

Finally, it is a pleasure for me to announce today that the 1997-98 Canada's international business strategy is now available to the Canadian business community. International business development programs and initiatives help Canadian businesses become export ready by providing access to key financial services, market information in export programs.

The federal government and its Team Canada partners continue to forge ahead in their international business development endeavours. Working together we are confident that Canada will continue to prosper as we expand and diversify our markets abroad and as we attract foreign investment and technology flows into Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I wish I could thank the minister on tabling this report, but that will unfortunately be impossible for a number of reasons.

I am pleased to rise in this House today to speak on the report on international business development entitled "Achievements, International Business Development Programs" tabled today.

But before I do, I would like, if I may, to tell the Minister of International Trade, through you, how the unacceptable attitude of his government and his department has saddened and annoyed me. Once again, this government and the minister's department have

shown disrespect for the opposition by waiting until the very last minute to tell us about the tabling of the report on international business development. This hardly gives us enough time to become properly acquainted with such an important report and to fully absorb all of its contents.

We know that documents could have been made available to us by the minister's office yesterday, and we would have known not to release this information, because we thought there was honest and sincere co-operation. We hope there will be honest and sincere co-operation in the future. This is not the first time that I have to raise this point publicly in the House. We do hope this issue will be addressed.

I will not go on about this, except to say that the government was unable or unwilling to take the necessary steps to ensure that we could carry out our duties properly; otherwise, we would have been afforded the opportunity to read and prepare comments on the report on international business development before it was tabled. After all, is that not what we are supposed to be doing here today?

According to the minister, his report responds to the recommendations made in the November 1996 auditor general report. The report includes the following:

—in spite of the some \$375 million spent by the federal government every year to promote trade, the data on the results of this activity is not gathered systematically and is not sufficiently objective. Moreover, a systematic and more objective feedback on the results would allow the government to be better informed about the eventual benefits of its action, and to better understand what adjudication process is required when co-ordinating and distributing its resources.

Finally, the auditor general pointed out "that the government must inform Parliament more systematically about the activities and achievements made under the international trade development program".

• (1520)

In short, the auditor general is saying that the government invests \$375 million per year in a program, without checking to see where that money goes. This is what the auditor general is saying.

Moreover, the auditor adds: "I noticed the same thing 10 years ago, and no change has been made since". So, \$375 million are invested to help small and medium size businesses, to help businesses export their products. Does the program work? Maybe, but we do not know, because the government does not conduct any audit regarding a meagre \$375 million invested haphazardly.

In light of all this, you can imagine my surprise when I noticed at the last minute that the report tabled today by the Minister for International Trade does not in any way address the Auditor General's recommendations, any more than it addresses the report

Routine Proceedings

of the committee on assistance to small export businesses. Because the minister was not called to order on one occasion, he has now been called to order twice: once by the Auditor General and once by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

We would have expected the Liberal government to explain in this report how it was going to come up with systematic and more objective feedback on the results obtained in international trade that would allow it to be better informed about the eventual benefits of its action, and to better understand what adjudication process is required when co-ordinating and distributing its resources.

Instead, the report tabled today looks more like a pre-election score sheet of the Liberal government's accomplishments with respect to international trade. The report, the minister's speech, far from making specific recommendations, only goes over the mechanisms already in place within this program, as well as the general directions taken by the government.

The minister should have done his homework. He wrote the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade asking for an examination of existing mechanisms. We did as he requested and, what is more, concluded our study and tabled our report. And they replied to it. They are telling us they will reply at some point. I am telling him he has already done so.

Moreover, the Minister for International Trade's letter of presentation with this report clearly stipulates that the mechanism for measuring the performance of resources allocated to the international business development program is not yet in place, and that further details will be forthcoming.

The auditor general has said: "We have been waiting ten years for it", and now the minister tells us that he is well aware of the fact that he needs to put feedback mechanisms in place, and that he will do so in future.

I would like to point out that we can easily be a bit sceptical about this. The government also wrote in its red book that two groups were going to be set up to examine trade disputes and anti-dumping problems. Both were to report to Parliament by December 1995. They are saying: "Trust us. We will make the reports by these two groups available during the next election campaign".

Asking the Canadian public, and particularly the official opposition, to trust the government is perhaps asking rather a lot of them. One might have expected that the government and the Minister for International Trade would have taken concrete steps to respond to the auditor general's concrete recommendations. It was not the nasty separatists, nor the Reform Party, but the auditor general who asked the Minister for International Trade to take concrete steps to correct the situation. The minister tells us: "Trust me, and you will see that, in future, we are going to correct this situation".

Routine Proceedings

In closing, I remind him that former Prime Minister Kim Campbell also said "Trust me" during an election campaign. So now there are only two of them left.

[English]

Mr. Lee Morrison (Swift Current—Maple Creek—Assiniboia, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to respond on behalf of the Reform Party to the tabling by the Minister for International Trade of the document entitled "Achievement of the International Business Development Program".

Although we have not yet had a chance to see the document, this is democracy at its finest. We are told that it responds to recommendations put forward in the November 1996 auditor general's report on Canada's export promotion activities.

• (1525)

Let us examine some of what the auditor general actually had to say about Canada's export promotion activities. His comments are somewhat less than flattering. "We concluded that Parliament needs to be better informed about the expenditures, outputs, revenues and cost sharing of Canada's export promotion efforts. This would help ensure that there is no undesirable overlap, that the distribution of expenditures reflects the government's priorities and that Parliament is kept informed about the progress being made toward the government's objectives".

I have to agree with the auditor general that there is a pressing need for the public to know how its hard earned tax dollars are being spent. For example, how much do all of our globe trotting Team Canada missions cost? We are always told that business people pay their own way, so "don't worry, be happy, it is not costing us anything".

I would remind the House that it is the taxpayer who picks up much of the tab for plane fares, hotels and food for all the government officials who lay the groundwork for these missions and for the PM's tag-along entourage. That is not paid for by the business community.

I have a sneaking suspicion that some programs for export market development money gets sprinkled around, as well as quite a bit from the Export Development Corporation. I would really like to know how much, to whom and did we get our money's worth. I challenge anyone to get that kind of information out of EDC. All you will get is a thousand and one reasons why such information is confidential, sensitive or none of our business.

I look forward with some eagerness to seeing what the minister proposes be done to keep Parliament better informed about expenditures on all aspects of trade promotion.

Directly related to cost is cost effectiveness. Here is what the good AG had to say on that score: "While we were unable to find

conclusive evidence about the direct effects of trade promotion, it is possible to measure the cost effectiveness of specific activities. To do this requires information on costs and systematic objective measures of the usefulness of specific activities to business or measures of their impact. However, both the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Department of Industry need better cost information. They need to obtain systematic and objective feedback to determine the value and utility of more of their key activities".

I know, and the auditor general knows, that the exact impact of government programs might be hard to measure. Did a foreign sale happen because of a government initiative or did it happen because a Canadian company had a superior widget and a lot of sales moxie and initiative? All that the auditor general is asking is for objective feedback about the key activities. He thinks that it can be done. I think it needs to be done and done often.

I would like to comment briefly on the puffery surrounding Team Canada's alleged success in snagging those ephemeral deals. The government needs to ask itself: What other factors play a role in determining our exporters' success? Really, if Team Canada's initiatives are all it takes to be successful abroad, then why would we not see our exports to China, Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, Chile, Argentina and Uruguay rising instead of falling after our big ticket missions there?

Mr. Eggleton: They are rising.

Mr. Morrison: The hon. minister says they are not falling. He should check the government's statistics which are a matter of public record. India, I recall, had a drop of 16 per cent.

• (1530)

There must be some other ingredients required in the foreign sales mix. A healthy economy is one. Strong companies and confident consumers who are not burdened with an unbearable tax load is another one. How about the ability to build some muscle through domestic trade by allowing companies to freely trade with neighbouring provinces?

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to tell the hon. member that he has the same amount of time as the minister, and that time has unfortunately expired.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 59th report of the Standing

Routine Proceedings

Committee on Procedure and House Affairs regarding the selection of votable items.

Pursuant to Standing Order 92, this report is deemed adopted on presentation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the 60th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, regarding the membership of the Standing Committees on Industry and on National Defence and Veterans Affairs.

If the House gives its consent, I intend to move concurrence in the 60th report later this day.

* * *

[*English*]

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-390, an act to amend the Food and Drugs Act (labelling for prepackaged foods).

She said: Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to propose this private member's bill which would amend the Food and Drugs Act to prohibit the retail sale of a prepackaged food containing an ingredient that has been genetically altered through a prescribed biotechnological process unless a label is attached stating that the prepackaged product has been genetically altered or contains an ingredient that has been genetically altered.

Since genetics engineering is racing full speed ahead with no checks and balances in place, the purpose of this bill is to protect the consumer so that the consumer knows what he or she is buying.

I am pleased to propose this bill today and I look forward to engaging in debate when the time comes.

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

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford, Lib.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-391, an act to amend the Criminal Code (penalties for sexual offences involving children).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today will do three things in amending the Criminal Code of Canada. It will provide a maximum punishment of life in prison with no parole for 25 years if guilty of sexual assault on a child under 8 or a child under 14 who is under the offender's trust or authority or who is dependent on the offender.

It will suggest an increase in the maximum penalty for forcible confinement to 14 years in the case of a parent or ward who confines a child and thereby harms the child's physical or mental health. It will provide assurance that the definition of publication in the case of child pornography covers transmission by electronic

mail or posting the material on the Internet or any other electronic net.

• (1535)

I would like to thank those who have supported me in this bill. I look forward to debating this issue in the House in the near future.

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

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PROCEDURE AND HOUSE AFFAIRS

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I move that the 60th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs tabled in the House today be adopted.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the parliamentary secretary have the consent of the House to move his motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.) moved:

That the third report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented on Monday, October 28, 1996, be concurred in.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, I am confused. When you are writing with one hand and listening with one ear, mistakes occur. Of course, we allow the report to be tabled, if it is not too late.

The Deputy Speaker: Everything is possible in the House if the House gives its consent to reconsider the motion of a few minutes ago.

[*English*]

The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to.)

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to the concurrence in the third report of this standing This was with regard to the family trusts that the Minister of Finance referred to earlier today in question period when he talked about how he had closed all tax loopholes and accused the other parties of not supporting tax cuts.

Routine Proceedings

When we look at the record of this government as it relates to issues such as family trusts, we find that the record is less than commendable.

Last May, I believe, the auditor general tabled his report regarding the family trust issue. He was very concerned about the situation where about \$2 billion had been transferred out of this country on a tax free basis.

The transaction happened in 1991 but the present government obviously concurred with the decision of the previous government because it did everything it could in its power to ensure that the decision of the previous government was retained and enforced and it stood by it.

After some months, after it became public, the Minister of Finance stood up in the House with a ways and means motion and closed the loophole but did not close it retroactively. What that meant was the issue of \$2 billion moving out of this country tax free by people of very substantial means. It is only people of very substantial means who can have \$2 billion to move anywhere, albeit out of the country on a tax free basis.

• (1540)

After the people involved and others who had the same opportunities available to them were able to take advantage of this loophole that had occurred in the law, the Minister of Finance stood in the House and closed the loophole. I find that abominable for the individual small taxpayer of this country.

As the House knows, the Reform Party in its fresh start introduced proposed amendments to the Income Tax Act and proposed that the basic exemption be increased from its current amount of around \$5,800 to \$7,900. That gives every Canadian in this country, rich or poor, working or otherwise, a tax break. However, it does not focus the tax break on the super rich. It focuses it on the working Canadians who carry this country on their backs.

We found that the Minister of Finance, by his actions and by his collusion with the decisions of the previous government, aided and abetted a situation where hundreds of millions of dollars of taxes went uncollected. On that basis, I find it rather appalling that the Minister of Finance would stand in the House, as the protector of the poor, and accuse the other parties of being otherwise when in fact it was his government that had it in its power to ensure that the rich and super rich pay their share and he did not do so.

These are the types of things that are abhorrent in this country. When we look to our parliamentarians for leadership, we find they make the rules according to those who have access, and for the small individual Canadian who just pays a bit of tax there is no opportunity for him to avoid or in any way escape the long arm of the tax collector. Yet others we find have had opportunities to walk

away with what appears to be several hundred million dollars of tax through a small loophole.

I was involved in the debates at the time through the public accounts committee. I was appalled by the way the deputy minister of finance and others in his department tried to justify this situation. It dealt with an issue called taxable Canadian property. Every tax practitioner I am aware of is fully aware that taxable Canadian property has always been referred to in the context of international transactions. No one but no one could find any reference in the Income Tax Act, the income tax publications, the income tax rules, the income tax books published by the CCH or anyone else for that matter that made any reference to Canadian taxable property as being part of the domestic tax scene. Yet we had the deputy minister of finance come before the committee and say "this was such a simple thing, it has been the rule since 1971, and it is so obvious that we did not even have to document it in this particular case".

The point is if it had been such a simple and obvious thing, if Canadian taxable property applied to domestic transactions, such as real estate transactions—I remember one official from the Department of Finance saying that every time a Canadian acquires an asset he is acquiring Canadian taxable property and that is the way it has been since 1971—not one publication, not one reference in the Income Tax Act and not one reference by tax practitioners would suggest this.

• (1545)

Members know of the ongoing dialogue between the accounting profession and the Department of National Revenue regarding the way the Income Tax Act is applied to profits. Over a period of 25 years not one reference was ever made to the fact that Canadian taxable property was part of a domestic transaction. Yet the government says it is so simple and it has always been that way.

How on earth could the practitioners deem that this particular transaction was an allowable one? We have had the senior officials in committee and the Minister of Finance in the House stand up and say absolutely that this is an obvious situation. That is what turns the small taxpayer against government and politicians.

When the Minister of Finance stood today and made specific reference to this trust and the fact that he had closed the loophole I took exception to his statement. I wondered what he was doing. Today he is trying to be the defender of the small taxpayer. He made reference to the fact that he had closed this massive loophole, yet everyone knows that he left it open a mile wide. Anybody who has the expertise, the desire and the motive can take advantage of it. People can even get what is called an advanced tax write-off to lock it in. After all that, we find out that the small taxpayer cannot do it.

Routine Proceedings

The member for Medicine Hat told us that personal income tax as a percentage of GDP has gone up 15 per cent. The Minister of Finance told us that he had not raised income taxes. The small taxpayer is carrying the country on its back, the wealthy have the opportunity to take advantage of the loopholes and the government allows them to go through before it closes the door.

I am going to close now because I am splitting my time according to the Standing Orders.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank the member who has just spoken and so eloquently at that. I am very pleased at the interest the Reform Party is suddenly taking in this committee's report.

However, I learned that the question of family trusts was not allowed to go to the public accounts committee. I would like the member to shed some light on these famous family trusts criticized by the Auditor General that should normally have been studied by the public accounts committee but were not.

I would like an explanation, and I would also like to hear a bit about this family trust scandal that, as my hon. colleague was saying, apparently left the small taxpayer stuck once again with the bill for this monumental blunder by the federal government. So I would ask my colleague to tell us a little more about that.

[*English*]

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to enlighten him on the problem. I am sure the Minister of Finance was well aware of the issue a long time before it became public through the publication of the auditor general's report last May.

• (1550)

When it became public, the Minister of Finance immediately referred it to the Standing Committee on Finance for study. It was studied for many months while the law remained in place with this great big, wide loophole that a truck could drive through. I am sure many people did drive a truck full of money across the border tax free because that is what happened when it went to the finance committee. The committee sat on it for months.

After the finance committee reported back to the House in September, three months after the general public became aware of it and this House became aware of it, the Minister of Finance introduced a ways and means motion. He could have stopped it the very day the auditor general made his report public and he did not.

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the remarks of the hon. member for St. Albert.

My colleague mentioned very clearly his concern about who pays taxes. He talked about the long arm of the tax collector. He also talked about the questions and answers of the Minister of Finance today in the House. The minister tried to make the case that the Liberal government was taxing banks and a variety of other rich people in Canada more now than before.

The story is unclear. During this term of the 35th Parliament we witnessed and know it happened, the Liberal government—the Minister of Finance was involved and a representative from the Montreal area—gave Bombardier \$100 million practically interest free.

An hon. member: It was \$87 million.

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): It was \$87 million. Well, \$87 million and \$100 million is not very far apart. By the time it gets an interest free loan it is soon going to be \$100 million. This is a company that made \$400 million in profits in the last year and could have financed \$87 million very easily.

This goes on and on. The Liberals try to claim they are defenders of the poor but at the same time they shovel the money out to the rich. The poor people are being held by the long arm of the tax collector. The tax collector grabs 40 per cent of the wages of young people so they cannot get ahead. I would appreciate a comment from my hon. colleague on that matter first.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. colleague has 30 seconds to reply.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I have said it once and my hon. colleague has said it again. We can repeat it many times and we will be repeating it many times on the election campaign.

The Deputy Speaker: There is 12 seconds left. Is the hon. member splitting his time? I have three members standing. Which member is speaking next?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I move:

That the member for Calgary Centre be now heard.

Mr. Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that the member for St. Albert, who originally had the floor, had indicated to the Chair and to the House that he was splitting his time. Perhaps you would go back to that order.

The Deputy Speaker: The difficulty the Chair has is that in fact I do not recall hearing the hon. member for St. Albert when he began his intervention say that he was splitting his time. I heard an hon. member say he did not hear him either. Can we have a small moment of reflection?

It has been pointed out that the hon. member for St. Albert indicated at the end of his remarks that he was splitting his time with the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. Under those

Routine Proceedings

circumstances I hope colleagues will agree that the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands can now speak. The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands can now speak.

• (1555)

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to move:

That the member for Calgary Centre be now heard.

The Deputy Speaker: It is one of those afternoons. Members on all sides of the House will appreciate that the peculiar requirements for making a motion on a point of order, as the Chair sees it, were met. The hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands had not said a word of his speech.

Accordingly, the Chair has no choice, as I see it, but to accept that the hon. member for Lethbridge has moved that the hon. member for Calgary Centre be now heard. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this 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, barely. On the basis that the yeas have it, I would declare that the motion is carried.

(Motion agreed to.)

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you will find, on my point of order, that we had more than five members rising. We want a standing vote.

The Deputy Speaker: Wonderful Wednesdays. The member for Calgary Centre was recognized on debate. The hon. member for Calgary Centre has the floor.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps the Chair can give us some clarification. There were two members standing. The member for Lethbridge stood up and asked on a point of order for the House to recognize a certain member.

The Chair realized that it had no choice but to seek the opinion of the House, which you did. When the yeas and nays were called, I believe more than five members stood up seeking a vote. Perhaps you can enlighten us why the bells have not been rung, and why the member which the member for Lethbridge wanted to hear has not been heard.

• (1600)

The Deputy Speaker: I basically agree with the way the member has stated it, except that when the vote was called for the yeas won it. Therefore, in my view, the motion had passed and accordingly the House is acceding to the motion which is to give the hon. member for Calgary Centre the floor on debate.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre has the floor.

Some hon. members: We need a ruling.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has made his point. I obviously have not answered it to his satisfaction.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre has the floor on debate.

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this concurrence motion on the third report of the public accounts committee deals with a very important issue. The issue is the fact that tax havens are a big concern to the government. I got that straight from the mouth of the Minister of National Revenue. I know she is concerned about this, as we should all be. It is a very important issue.

Apparently the government feels that it has closed this loophole, that the matter has been handled very fairly, and that in no way, shape or form will rich people be able to transfer assets within trusts, or assets outside trusts, outside the country without paying a fair percentage of taxes that one would consider to be right and fair.

My big concern is with the way the matter was handled. Right from the start the government was upset with the auditor general, our watchdog on government. Lord knows we need a watchdog on government. When we have cabinet ministers loose with a bunch of money, billions of dollars without having someone audit them, we can imagine what they could potentially do with it.

It should be the same as what we do with private citizens and corporations. We audit large corporations and small corporations. We audit individual taxpayers to ensure, as the Minister of Natural Resources likes to say, that we have integrity in our tax system and the volunteer system continues forward.

I do not think the government was very smart in attacking the auditor general. After all, there was confusion with respect to this family trust. It was a very wealthy trust. If the government is worried that they have done something wrong then it should have complained. If it was not worried it should not have complained. It looked bad for the government.

Mr. Hanger: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I would like a recorded vote on the motion put to the House by the member for St. Alberta. The House does not know who said yea or nay. It is my right to be able to ask for a recorded vote.

The Deputy Speaker: The Chair has already ruled on that matter. It may have been an erroneous ruling but the Chair has

Routine Proceedings

ruled on it and we have moved on to the matter of the hon. member's intervention which he is in the process of making.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would be so kind as to let me know when I have one minute left in my speech. With all these interruptions I am losing track of the points I want to make, and I want to make sure I finish with a bang.

I am concerned about this third report. After the government finally accepted the auditor general's criticism, looked into the matter and had the Standing Committee on Finance and the Standing Committee on Public Accounts review it, it became clear that something had to be done and the government acted.

Personally I feel the government has gone too far. It put in some strict rules that ultimately led to something everyone will see on their income tax form this year. They will see a foreign asset declaration section. Never in the history of the country has an income tax form been used to find out where everybody's assets are offshore. Because of this overreaction the government has put it in the income tax forms. It was done prematurely, with arrogance and with anticipation that the bill would pass and it has not passed. It is not even law.

• (1605)

Now we have confusion across this land. This will simply ensure the Canadian taxpayer will become more frustrated and angrier than ever with our taxation policies. Instead of simplifying our tax policies the government continues to complicate them in such a way that I think more money will go into the underground economy and more money will go offshore because of high levels of taxation.

More people will start investing in tax free jurisdictions through tax exempt companies. They will put their after tax dollars into those tax exempt companies. There are people from tax haven countries who tour across the country and advise people on how to do it. It is legal. Because of our high levels of taxation that is what will happen.

They set up a lot of people, a lot of Canadian companies. Large corporations have set up their head offices offshore so they will not have to report their income to the Canadian government. If Canadians are able to make investments in tax exempt companies legally with after tax dollars as the money grows and accumulates in whatever it has been invested in offshore; if they do not take a dividend; and if they do not take a salary, they can still live in Canada and enjoy our wonderful health care and education systems, which are shrinking thanks to the Liberal government.

Then what happens? The offshore money grows tax free. They can reinvest the offshore money tax free. Does that not sound like a good idea? More Canadians will look at that. They will find that it appeals to them, that they like it, that they enjoy it. They will do it.

That is where they will invest their money. That is what will happen.

Fewer and fewer Canadians every day have disposable income, including the Liberal Party whip who I know has some problems meeting his financial obligations in his household these days because he is taking home today much less money. I am making the same salary except for the whip money. He is taking home \$3,000 less today than he was four years ago thanks to his own government. I hope he finds he can make ends meet with \$3,000 less. In his tax bracket that is what the government and the finance minister have cost him.

Why are Canadians investing offshore? I made a list of why I think more people will invest less in companies in Canada and will go elsewhere because of the growing global economy. Here is what most Canadians feel about our country's taxation system. The current system is not fair. People perceive it to favour the rich and politicians at the expense of hard working taxpayers.

People question the value for money they are getting from politicians who do not know how to invest their money and do not have the business acumen to invest in businesses. Why are government officials investing in businesses and competing with the private sector? We could look at the bungling of the Pearson airport and the huge grant to Bombardier of over \$1 billion over the years. This past year the company made a \$400 million profit.

The Saskatchewan Conservative Party is being raked over the coals and being sent to jail for misuse of funds and raising money the wrong way. These are the things that scare people.

Let us look at the changes to the RRSPs for retired people. Now they have changed it from 69 to 71. Reducing taxes is difficult. Because of our confusing, complicated and convoluted Income Tax Act there is a fine line between tax avoidance which is legal, taking advantage of the loopholes, the exemptions and everything that is there, versus tax evasion. I have no respect for those who are guilty of tax evasion. Our bureaucracy in Revenue Canada is huge and costs a lot of money.

• (1610)

Yesterday in the public accounts committee we were reviewing the issue of large corporations. Of the large corporations there are 6,000 plus 200 super huge conglomerates that they audit 100 per cent every year. I asked whether any of them ever got through without having to be reassessed. The answer was not one.

That does not mean these people are trying to evade taxes. It means they are trying to avoid taxes wherever they can legally but there is always a difference of opinion. Five or six people disagree.

There is a reluctance to address debt. I could go on and on, but before my time is up and since I am having a hard time getting everyone's attention I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Routine Proceedings

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. 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 nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1650)

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

*(Division No. 273)***YEAS**

Members

Blaikie	Cummins
Epp	Gilmour
Grubel	Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Jennings	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest/Sud-Ouest)	Meredith
Morrison	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Thompson	White (North Vancouver)
Williams—19	

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Arseneault	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bachand
Bakopanos	Barnes
Bélanger	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bergeron	Bernier (Beauce)
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Bhaduria
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Campbell
Cannis	Canuel
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Crête
Culbert	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	Daviault
Debien	Deshaies
DeVillers	Discepola
Dumas	Dupuy
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Frazer	Gaffney

Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gauthier
Gerrard	Godfrey
Godin	Graham
Gray (Windsor West/Ouest)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jackson	Jacob
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Langlois
Laurin	Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)
Lebel	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Leroux (Sheffield)
Lincoln	Loubier
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	McTeague
Ménard	Mercier
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Nault
Nunez	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Paré	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Pettigrew	Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Speller
St. Denis	Szabo
Telegdi	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—151	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Brien	Calder
Chamberlain	Collins
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	English
Fry	Gagnon (Québec)
Goodale	Guay
Guimond	Lalonde
Landry	Lefebvre
McKinnon	Patry
Rocheleau	Steckle
Vanclief	Venne

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. Paul Zed (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): I move:

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

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

Routine Proceedings

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.

And more than five members having risen:

The Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

• (1730)

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

(Division No. 274)

YEAS

Members

Arseneault	Assad
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Barnes
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	DeVillers
Dingwall	Discepola
Dupuy	Fewchuk
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Graham
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Hopkins	Irwin
Jackson	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Kraft Sloan	Lee
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Manley
Massé	McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew
Pillitteri	Proud
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Serré	Shepherd
Sheridan	Simmons
Speller	St. Denis
Szabo	Telegdi
Valeri	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Whelan
Wood	Young
Zed—91	

NAYS

Members

Althouse	Blaikie
Cummins	Epp
Frazer	Gilmour
Grubel	Hanger
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
Meredith	Morrison
Schmidt	Solberg
Speaker	Thompson
White (North Vancouver)	Williams —20

PAIRED MEMBERS

Brien	Calder
Chamberlain	Collins
Dubé	Duceppe
Duhamel	English
Fry	Gagnon (Québec)
Goodale	Guay
Guimond	Lalonde
Landry	Lefebvre
McKinnon	Patry
Rocheleau	Steckle
Vanciel	Venne

After the taking of the vote:

[Translation]

Mrs Dalphond-Guiral: Mr. Speaker, members of the official opposition would like to vote on the motion.

An hon. member: They had their chance.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. members: No, no.

[English]

The Speaker: I called on three separate occasions during the taking of the vote for all those who were in favour of the motion to rise. Not seeing anyone, I called—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: I called for all those who were in favour of the motion on three occasions. Not seeing anyone, I called for all those who were opposed to the motion and we voted on that.

If there are other members who are opposed to the motion, they can vote now, but the voting for those who are in favour has passed.

I declare the motion carried.

• (1735)

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport and the Minister of the Environment entered the House after the whips had walked up the floor and they voted on the motion just taken. Therefore, I think that their votes were out of order.

The Budget

The Speaker: The hon. members who were mentioned are here in the House now. Did they enter after the vote was called?

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I would happily take my name off the list of those who voted if it offends the hon. member. I do not wish to hold the House up any longer on this point.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to follow the leadership of my friend from British Columbia.

The Speaker: Are there other points of order?

[Translation]

Mrs. Tremblay: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify things, I did rise. When I looked, people at the end had not risen. It seemed they were not going to rise. The Prime Minister said—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Speaker: Is it the same point of order?

Mrs. Tremblay: Our rights have been trampled.

The Speaker: I put the question and, for some reason, members did not want to vote. They will not vote this time around. Is there another point of order?

The hon. member for Richelieu.

Mr. Plamondon: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services also came in late for the vote.

Mrs. Marleau: Mr. Speaker, if it can put an end to this silly game, I will follow in my colleagues' footsteps.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I believe we are ready to proceed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

THE BUDGET

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

The House resumed from March 18 consideration of the motion that this House approves in general the budgetary policy of the government; and of the amendment.

The Speaker: It being 5.40 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment relating to Ways and Means Motion No. 15.

Call in the members.

• (1755)

(The House divided on the amendment, which was negatived on the following division):

(Division No. 275)

YEAS

Members

Bachand	Bélisle
Bellehumeur	Bergeron
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel	Chrétien (Frontenac)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
Daviault	de Savoye
Debien	Dumas
Fillion	Gauthier
Godin	Jacob
Langlois	Laurin
Lebel	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Leroux (Shefford)	Loubier
Ménard	Mercier
Nunez	Paré
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)—34

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Arseneault
Assad	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre/Sud-Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Bhaduria	Blondin-Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cowling	Culbert
Cullen	Cummins
DeVillers	Dingwall
Discepola	Dupuy
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Fiis	Fontana
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Graham
Grubel	Guarnieri
Hanger	Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Hart
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Iftody	Irwin
Jackson	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lavigne (Verdun—Saint-Paul)	Lee
Lincoln	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi	Maloney
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	McCormick
McGuire	McLellan (Edmonton Northwest/Nord-Ouest)
McTeague	Meredith
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	O'Brien (London—Middlesex)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Pettigrew

Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Schmidt
Serré
Sheridan
Solberg
Speller
Szabo
Thompson
Valeri
Walker
Wells
White (North Vancouver)
Wood
Zed—127

Proud
Regan
Rideout
Robillard
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Simmons
Speaker
St. Denis
Telegdi
Torsney
Volpe
Wappel
Whelan
Williams
Young

PAIRED MEMBERS

Brien
Chamberlain
Dubé
Duhamel
Fry
Goodale
Guimond
Landry
McKinnon
Rocheleau
Vanclief

Calder
Collins
Duceppe
English
Gagnon (Québec)
Guay
Lalonde
Lefebvre
Patry
Steckle
Venne

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

Mr. Gagliano: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wish to inform the House that Friday rather than Thursday will be the fourth and final day of the budget debate.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bill to which the concurrence of this House is desired: Bill S-15, an act to amend an act to incorporate the Bishop of the Arctic of the Church of England in Canada.

This bill is deemed to have been read the first time and ordered for a second reading at the next sitting of the House.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CANADIAN VOLUNTEER SERVICE MEDAL FOR UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING ACT

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-300, an act respecting the establishment and award of a Canadian peacekeeping service medal for Canadians who have served with an interna-

Private Members' Business

tional peacekeeping mission as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-300 provides for a Canadian peacekeeping service medal to be awarded to Canadians who have participated in peacekeeping, peacemaking, peace enforcement or humanitarian assistance missions which have been sanctioned by the Government of Canada.

In my opinion these would be accurately described under the umbrella term international stabilization missions. They do not always have identified direct connection or impact on Canada but Canadians, as compassionate citizens of the world and as international traders, recognize the need and propriety of the involvement of Canadians in these places to better the lot or improve the situation for the people who find themselves in these trouble spots.

The Canadians who respond to these calls willingly forego the comfort of home, the companionship of family and the opportunity to train and better their qualifications, to often place themselves in uncomfortable, dangerous situations.

• (1800)

In so doing they have brought great honour and pride to Canada, including the award of the Nobel Peace Prize to those who served the UN prior to September 1988. Some 150 of them have paid the supreme sacrifice and many more carry the wounds and disabilities that resulted from their participation in these activities.

In the past their contributions have sometimes been recognized by the United Nations and other organizations, but until now there has been no way for Canada to provide individual recognition of the honour and pride they have brought to Canada. Today true Canadian recognition for their individual service in the cause of international stabilization, past, present and future, is one step closer to becoming a reality.

Bill C-300 has undergone a metamorphosis, emerging at today's pivotal point after having benefited from incorporating enlightened and thoughtful input from hon. members of the House, from interested Canadians across the country, and from the Canadian Armed Forces. As a result I believe, with the exception of specifically recognizing those who won the Nobel Peace Prize, it now gives Canada the ability to acknowledge those military, constabulary, medical or other Canadians who have given of themselves to help others.

This will only happen if Parliament gives its approval, both this House and the other place, prior to the dissolution of Parliament. If not, all these efforts will have been in vain.

For Bill C-300 to have reached report stage and third reading today is an exemplary display of what can be achieved when members of all parties see the worth of a measure and set out to see it proclaimed into law. I am truly honoured that members of the House have given their consent by special order to move Bill

Private Members' Business

C-300 quickly up the order of precedence to be debated at report stage and third reading today.

I much appreciate and wish to thank the chief government whip for his support and introduction of the motion making this debate possible. I extend my sincere gratitude to all members of the House for their tremendous support and constructive input both on an individual basis and through debate. Many of the recommendations which they offered have indeed strengthened and enhanced Bill C-300 as they were adopted in committee on March 12 and are now reflected in the bill reported to Parliament yesterday.

The co-operation afforded by members of the House of Commons Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs and the ensuing discussions on various aspects of the bill have been most helpful and are gratefully appreciated.

The committee chair, the member for Halifax, and all members are to be commended for their co-operation in moving my bill quickly through committee. I should additionally thank the former committee chairman, the member for Hillsborough, for his contribution and support.

The expert testimony, advice and recommendations received in committee from Major General Dallaire, the chief of staff for the assistant deputy minister of personnel; Major Bev Brown of the directorate of history and heritage, medals and honours; and Major Gallagher, special assistant to the judge advocate general called on as witnesses proved to be invaluable.

The defence department witnesses were able to give us the guidance necessary to ensure that Canadian recognition for peacekeeping service would be appropriately directed. I am most appreciative of their support.

It was at second reading on February 3, 1997 that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence and Veterans Affairs advised the House that the government would not oppose the bill. Thus I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge and thank the Minister of National Defence and Veterans Affairs for the courtesy extended to me and the tremendous assistance provided by the minister and his staff, in particular Margaret Penniston.

There is every indication that it will be the will of the House to pass Bill C-300 this evening. The only remaining obstacle will then be approval in the other place. From communications I have had with some members of the other place it would appear there is a good chance that it will pass quickly and thus be in a position to be proclaimed into law before the 35th Parliament is dissolved for an election.

With that I will conclude, leaving the fate of Bill C-300 in the hands of hon. members of the House.

Ms. Mary Clancy (Halifax, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is with very great pleasure that I stand to speak in support of Bill C-300. I

return the favour and thank the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for his kind words to members of the standing committee, to members of the minister's staff and to others who assisted with the bill. It is my great pleasure to pay tribute to the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands.

• (1805)

Too frequently in the House we are accused, and sometimes rightfully, of partisan behaviour. In this case the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands brought the bill forward and worked diligently and with great perseverance with all our colleagues in the House. There was also assistance from hon. members of the official opposition.

I for one am pleased to have been involved in a small way in the hard work put forward by the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. The only thing I would add is a reference to one of the high points of this exemplary piece of legislation. It can be given to persons not just in the Canadian forces but those involved in activities in the peacekeeping area such as policing, local administration, the delivery of aid, medical assistance or election assistance.

I conclude by thanking and congratulating the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands. I am very pleased to have had a very small part to play in the bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, first I want to congratulate the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands for his great tenacity and for his sense of duty.

As we all know, the hon. member had a long and distinguished military career. He has made a major contribution to the defence committee, because of his expertise and also because he is a true gentleman. Indeed, the hon. member has provided a lot of input in the work of the defence committee.

Today, the Bloc Québécois, on whose behalf I am speaking, is pleased to support this bill, which will allow peacekeepers throughout the world to promote democracy and to preserve freedom, so that the world can become a better place. As I said, we are pleased to support this bill.

Ever since the UN was founded, Canada has been taking part in peacekeeping missions all over the world. However, there is currently no medal awarded to the military, civilians or policemen who serve with a peacekeeping mission. Under this bill, we would now be able to award such a medal.

Canada is aware of the many limitations of peacekeeping operations. Canada, which is an average size country, must continue to take part in these missions but, as we have always pointed out, it must do so according to its means. I think that, as a career military person himself, the hon. member for Saanich—Gulf Islands understood that we can acknowledge such contributions, but do it our own way. We need not compare ourselves to the

Private Members' Business

greatest and wealthiest of this world, but only to ourselves and see what we can offer.

Since Lester Pearson, Canada has deployed forces wherever they were required to uphold principles. I think that, through this bill, through the hon. member's tenacity and, of course, through the government's support for this bill—everyone agrees on this—we now have a bill providing that all these men and women who participated in peacekeeping missions can be honoured. We cannot put a price on that, I feel. It is not the metal that counts, but the symbol.

• (1810)

I find it interesting that, under this bill, the medal can be awarded posthumously. There are people who sacrificed their lives and their family will receive this honour on their behalf.

As I said earlier, the Bloc Quebecois members are very happy to support this bill. I think it promotes democracy and at least those people who participated in peacekeeping missions will have a tangible reminder of their deed.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, March 18, 1997, all questions necessary to dispose of Bill C-300 at report and third reading stages are deemed to have been proposed, put and carried.

[English]

Accordingly the bill is concurred in at report stage, read the third time and passed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.)

* * *

CANADIAN CENSUS

The House resumed from February 6 consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise to speak on Motion No. 277 of the hon. member for Beaver River. It is a topic which is very dear to my heart.

I raised this issue on September 29, 1995 in question period and again on October 2, 1995 in question period because it was brought to my attention that the option of claiming to be a Canadian would not be on the new census.

Having been one of the Canadians who had a long census form to fill out, I found it very interesting, particularly Question No. 19 and

its confused language, nationality, geographic origin and colour. Trying to answer Question No. 19 became extremely difficult.

One of the options under Question No. 19 was other. Because Canadian was not listed anywhere in that question, I had the uncomfortable situation of having to place Canadian under other. I refused to identify myself as a colour, as belonging to some geographic region or as someone who speaks a certain language. For a government not to allow Canadians to identify themselves as being Canadian is not progressive.

I am faced daily with people who are assumed to be immigrants and newcomers to Canada. Some of these immigrants have lived in Canada for 20 or 30 years. Because we as a government insist on breaking people down based on the origins of the family trees of individuals who are Canadians in all sense of the word—they pay taxes, use and pay for the facilities, the hospitals and the schools, have citizenship and vote in elections—they are not able to call themselves Canadians on our census form.

I do not want to leave the impression that I do not believe it is important to accumulate statistics. It is very important. It is acceptable for persons to be asked in a straightforward manner their racial background and left to determine what they want to put down, whether it is Irish, Scottish, Jamaican, Korean or whatever. They should not be asked if they are white or black, from the Philippines or from the Punjab. That is the wrong way to ask for a person's racial background or nationality. It is for statistical reasons only.

• (1815)

Canadians must be allowed to proudly claim that they are Canadian. I do not care whether a person is a brand new Canadian who got his or her citizenship the day before the census form arrived, or are Canadian born, or are a Canadian who has been here for 30 or 40 years. People who have come to this country or who were born here and are proud of being Canadian should be encouraged to state that on a census form.

It was with trepidation that I filled Canadian under other. It is a disgrace to have to put Canadian under the category of other. I also took the opportunity to fill in my lineage which was quite an interesting experience since I am a typical Canadian. My parentage is Scottish, Irish, Pennsylvania Dutch, German, Swedish and a few other things to boot. That is what being a Canadian is all about. I felt I was not able, through the census form, to indicate honestly what I felt: I am proud to be Canadian. I am proud to be a third or fourth generation Canadian. I was saddened that my children could not put down that they are Canadians.

My hon. colleague's motion asks to return to the use of the word Canadian in questions like question No. 19. I do not buy the answers I received to my questions in question period. I quote the Minister of Industry: "On the issue of race, in the past people have

Private Members' Business

made calculations based on language rather than a specific question on racial origin. This time we think the provision of fuller information will give us a much better understanding of the make-up of Canadian society that should be beneficial for a wide range of purposes”.

I would like to know what is the “range of purposes”. I would like to know what the government is planning. It feels it has to segregate little communities. Depending on how it feels it must segregate them from each other. I really think this is a very divisive way of dealing with new Canadians.

My hon. colleague from Beaver River is looking to the unity of the country when she suggests that the federal government should be concerned about those things that bring Canadians together, about recognizing Canadianism. The identification of being Canadian is one of those things that will unify the country rather than divide it.

Any government program that is designed to give special consideration to any individual over another is wrong, particularly if it is based on gender, race, religion, geography or colour. Any government legislation that does not treat all Canadians equally is wrong. I fully support my colleague from Beaver River. I appreciate her efforts in trying to return some pride in being Canadian and in trying to return the ability to exercise the right to put Canadian down not as other, not as an afterthought, but very proudly to claim oneself to be a Canadian. I look forward to the next census I have to fill in where I can mark Canadian rather than other.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I too would like to commend the member for Beaver River for bringing this motion forward. In particular, I would like to thank that member for allowing me the opportunity to speak to the motion.

• (1820)

We are in an age where government seems to be intruding into so many areas of our lives. I can name a number of bills recently introduced in the House that do exactly that. One has to ask the question why. For example, think about the Canadian Wheat Board and its impact on many farmers in the country, especially western farmers, in how they sell their product. Some desire to sell their own grain but cannot do so because of the restrictions placed on them by the government.

I look at the gun control bill and see again a very intrusive feature. Some sections in the gun control legislation impact directly on law-abiding people. I do not think that is acceptable to the majority of people in the country.

Some of the more recent broadcasting legislation impinges on those who have businesses in that area. We see control on what can

be broadcast, what can be sent out over the airwaves and what cannot. That is not to say that there should not be some legislation or restriction, but here we have restrictions that are going much deeper than what should be.

Coming up to the census, Statistics Canada, under the Department of Industry, claimed that the purpose of the question, in particular question No. 19 on the long form, was to organize population by selected ethnic origins. Those are the reasons it gave for collecting this data. This, irrespective of the politically correct spin bureaucrats and social engineers attempt to put on it, is nothing more than the labelling of people on the basis of race. Most people just want to be called Canadians.

I look at my own riding. I live in a very multicultural riding. I have neighbours who are from India, Jamaica and the Middle East. For the most part, they would like to be considered as Canadians. They came to Canada just for that reason. They do not come here to be hyphenated Canadians, which is what is the official multicultural policy of this Liberal government, which unfortunately was introduced some time back into the House and imposed on the people.

I refer to a statement made by Bruce Petrie, the StatsCan official overseeing the census. He said that question 19 was changed on the 1996 census from other past censuses “because too many minorities born in Canada were listing themselves as Canadian”. This upset Mr. Petrie. One would have to ask: Why would this upset Mr. Petrie? I might point out that this quote came from the *Fredericton Daily Gleaner* newspaper of May 13.

Mr. Petrie goes on to say: “So someone who is black and speaks English and was born in Canada puts Canadian— That gives us no information to estimate the number of black visible minority people. We are not trying to measure race per se. We are purely and simply trying to enumerate visible minorities under existing federal legislation”.

Again one would have to ask why. Why would the government want to enumerate visible minorities under the existing legislation? There is no question that it is a divisive form of regulation.

Let us go a little bit deeper. I have had the opportunity to speak to RCMP officials. In fact in the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs this point was brought up. They want to have a quota system on the different visible minority groups in the country. The only way they can do that is to determine the number or percentages of those different visible minorities through the census.

The whole point is being missed if we engineer, for instance, a police force, selecting those according to their race as opposed to choosing the best there is regardless of race.

• (1825)

Canadians know and feel that this is a form of social engineering, and they do not care to hear that kind of spin. Mr. Petrie would certainly fall into that category because it is people such as himself who really drive this kind of a policy, with the blessings of the government, in particular the Liberal government.

Putting a hyphen before Canadian, so people become French-Canadian, Turkish-Canadian, Greek-Canadian, Somali-Canadian, Israeli-Canadian, Hungarian-Canadian or whatever, has to be the most divisive aspect of Canadian society. It puts us all into little boxes and categories. I suggest this undoubtedly is the purpose of the census information. It is going to be used for that very reason.

I am going to speak again of my own riding, a very multicultural riding. I see evidence there of this form of blocking of the community by race or background. That does not enhance unity, nor does it benefit those who come here from different ethnic backgrounds or countries.

Canadians are painfully aware that Liberal politicians use the information gathered from question No. 19 on the Canadian census to appease minority groups to attract votes, so it has another purpose. Vote buying.

Mr. Bodnar: Ludicrous.

Mr. Hanger: The member across the way said it is ludicrous to say that, but that is exactly what is happening. The Liberal Party has been a master at such manipulation.

Mr. Bodnar: You should be embarrassed at what you are saying.

Mr. Hanger: No, I am not embarrassed by what I am saying. I think that it is important that Canadians hear it.

These same politicians also create quota systems for public service jobs. It is a quota system that only impacts in areas where the ruling party of the day allows it to take place. It is a form of reverse discrimination. It is contrary to the equality of all citizens. It sullies our reputation as a country which selects people for jobs on the principle of merit rather than socially engineered notions of race and entitlement.

Let us look further into this point of the census. The state is demanding answers that are none of its business. The census also asks Canadians to divulge other information: the marital status and sex of room mates and/or inhabitants of their home; how much money they make; how many books they have read in the past six months; how often they take a vacation without the children; how many windows they have which face north. That sounds like a real valuable piece of information.

The government assures respondents that the information collected from the census is confidential. I have been in the House for about three and a half years. I realize that the information gathered

Private Members' Business

in many of the departments within the government is not confidential. It is like a sieve and it leaks out all over.

The notion that the records will be kept confidential in my opinion is absurd. I believe that a lot of Canadians have the fear that it is not as safe as what the government would lead people to believe.

For the reasons that I have outlined I have to urge that all members of the House carefully examine Motion No. 277 and support it in a vote.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I too am pleased to be able to have the opportunity to speak to the motion of my colleague from Beaver River. I am especially thankful for this opportunity, having become a Canadian by choice.

• (1830)

When I received the census form this year I was one of the individuals who received the long one. I cannot say exactly what people feel like coming to a country and choosing it to be their land. My wife and I came here in 1968 and fell in love with the country and wanted to call it home. We chose to be Canadian.

Then along came this long census form. We saw choices of what to mark but could not mark Canadian because it was not on the form. I must admit the hairs on the back of my neck, because that is the only place I have any, started to rise. I was getting angry.

I thought for a minute I should send a message by putting in cocker spaniel. However cocker spaniel did not fit the way I felt at the time and I thought pit bull would be better. I wanted to put in something to drive home the point that I would like very much as a person who has chosen Canada to be my home to write Canadian and be proud to do so.

I wrote in the word Canadian. I was not going to sit back and say it was crazy. I just cannot say how pleased I was to hear from the social engineers on that side of the room. That is all this is, social engineering. I probably would be one of those who would get in trouble for not obeying the rule. We are required to obey rules.

However this leads to things that really bothered me. After we arrived here we had one child born in Canada. He by birth is a Canadian and very proud of it. As a Canadian he took advantage of some of the opportunities available to him. He joined the air cadets as a young man and spent five to six years in them. He was very pleased with that program and I was pleased he did well. After graduating from high school it was his desire to become a soldier. He wanted to be a little better trained so he decided to go to university to take some computer courses, which was a wise thing to do, and to join the militia in Red Deer, Alberta.

He got acquainted with a group of people and spent two to three years in the militia, along with getting some computer training at

Private Members' Business

university. When he turned 22 he decided it was time to fulfil his life dream to become a soldier in the Canadian army.

That is when everything fell apart. At the recruitment office in Calgary he was told that because of his physical make-up there would be no need for him to apply as a soldier in the Canadian army for at least six years. It was necessary to fill the positions available with other types of individuals.

That is totally shameful. That is exactly what happened. I hope the member from Saskatchewan will not bother me with heckling, nonsense and hogwash about quotas. I now have a son whose life dream is being fulfilled. He got to be a soldier. It is only because of where we came from that he was able to go south of the border. Within three days the United States army took him because of his qualifications. He has now been serving for over a year. He has received a promotion and is doing very well. They were quite intrigued with his qualifications and took him.

In the Canadian army he was told: "Maybe in six years, but we must fill these positions with other types of people". I thought Canadians should be able to fill those positions, particularly Canadians who believe in the sovereignty of the land and are willing to defend that sovereignty. Then along comes this form which does not include the word Canadian.

• (1835)

A lot of things make me very proud to be Canadian. We flew the flag shortly after we came here as immigrants, before we qualified to become citizens. We were proud to be in Canada so we flew the flag. We could not be called Canadian at that time because we had not had the opportunity to become one. We went to citizenship court five years later when we qualified and walked away very pleased to say we were Canadian.

Ministers and social engineers on that side of the House figure that if they give out 20 million flags and get people to fly them everywhere it will be a good sign of their love and pride for the country. They have it all wrong.

As a result of this census and their so-called magnificent employment equity bill, somewhere down the road through all this social engineering and finagling even the people in private industry will be forced in some way or another to make sure jobs are filled with a certain quota. It is there already in a lot of places and it will be worse.

At least on the census form we could have the word Canadian. I really do not think it is a whole lot to ask for. I live in Canada. I love the country. I am a member of Parliament. I would have liked to be able to freely circle the word Canadian on that long form, and it was not even there. That is why I felt like putting pit bull on the form.

The social engineering that goes on in the House when it comes to this kind of stuff makes me feel like a pit bull more days than I would like to.

I have a son serving with the United States army in Georgia. He does not like it down there. He would like to be in the north. He would like to be in Canada. People who sit here and heckle, like the member from Saskatchewan who heckled my friend from Calgary Northeast when he was making his points, make life very difficult for those who truly want to be a Canadian and to serve their country in the best way they possibly can. They ought to be ashamed of themselves for making it virtually impossible for a number of Canadians to be able to do that.

Flying the flag is not the only thing. There are many other things we can do and they do not see it. They are too busy social engineering and doing the best they can for themselves.

Let us include the word Canadian in these census forms and be proud we put it there. It will give people an opportunity to say they are Canadian.

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a delight to stand in the House today to lend my support to the motion proposed by the member for Beaver River.

Sometimes I am asked what it means to be a Canadian. I have a number of different pictures in my mind of what it means to be a Canadian that are very strong, very emphatic.

I am privileged by the fact that my grandparents were literally chased out of their home country in 1923. They suffered great persecution there. A number of my relatives were unjustly murdered. My grandparents knew it was not a safe place for our family and wondered where to go. Through various circumstances which I do not have time to relate tonight they were able to find their way to this wonderful country, Canada.

• (1840)

I have recollections as a child growing up in a little farmhouse in Saskatchewan where I was born and raised. I remember overhearing my parents, grandparents, uncles, aunts and some of their friends talking about the life they had experienced in what they called the old country.

They talked about some of the hardships and difficulties they had gone through and some of the ways in which their freedoms had been totally taken away: their freedom to make a living the way they wanted to make a living and their freedom to worship the way they wanted to worship. Those freedoms were wrenched away from them and they came to this country. I remember them talking about how grateful and how blessed we were as a family because we could be Canadian.

I remember being at the home of my grandparents many times. Whether it was to celebrate a birthday, Easter or Christmas we would get together as a family and my grandparents would lead us

in family prayers. My grandmother was more expressive than my grandfather. In her prayers she would say over and over: "Thank you for the privilege of living in this wonderful free country". They came here with 10 children. As an aside, until last year all of them were still living. The youngest was 75. I come from hardy stock. We live long.

My grandparents, my uncles and aunts on both sides of my family came to this country as immigrants, worked hard and helped to open up the west. They helped to till the land to produce food to feed themselves and others. They were as proud as we are to be part of this country. My parents were 12 years old when they came to Canada so I am a first generation Canadian. I was actually born in Saskatchewan. I called that home until I married and moved to Alberta. I have very strong attachments.

There is especial attachment to the country when one grows up in a farm family and tills the soil. There is an attachment to the land when one actually works the soil and grows food for sustenance, because we all know that without food we would not survive.

I have other recollections about being in this country. One of the most valuable ones was that of my son who has served in different places in the world where people were experiencing the same kinds of hardships my grandparents experienced. Because of our family heritage, partially at least, he felt it was a useful to spend part of his life helping others who were in difficult circumstances. He worked with various relief agencies around the world, carrying and wearing a Canadian flag. He went there not only in the name of the organization he was with but also in the name of our country.

A most recent recollection I had of the value of being a Canadian was a very moving experience for me. I participated for the first time ever in the ceremony of welcoming new Canadians at a citizenship court. It happened last year on July 1. We were in the historic court house in Fort Saskatchewan. As I recall the court house was built before Saskatchewan became a province and joined Confederation. It was an historical court house. There we were up on the second floor with a number of different people who were making Canada their home.

One lady in particular struck me. As she reached out to take from the presiding judge her citizenship papers there were tears literally streaming down her cheeks. It touched me because I had the recollection of my grandmother who had that same emotional reaction, that tie, that love of this country.

• (1845)

When I talked to her afterwards she said essentially the same thing that my grandmother had said: "I came from a country of great strife and I am so proud, so happy and so blessed to be a Canadian".

I do not believe that I can express more strongly or with more emotion my support for the bill before the House today. It is a bill which says let us call ourselves Canadians. This is the most valued

Private Members' Business

part of planet Earth. It is the most enviable place to live. There are people around the world who would literally give anything they have to live here, but for some reason we are hesitant to say that we are Canadians.

I thank the House for the opportunity to speak to this motion. I urge all members on all sides of the House to support the motion not because of any partisan consideration but simply because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am very glad to rise to speak to the motion which was introduced by the hon. member for Beaver River.

I guess you might call me a new Canadian, having been born in Scotland. I came here when I was 23 years of age. Unfortunately that is quite some number of years ago. I cannot do anything about that. Nonetheless, I am a new Canadian.

When I go back to Scotland to visit the many relatives and friends I still have over there, after a few short weeks I want to come back to Canada. This is my home.

I have family here. I have a wife and two fine young boys. My wife was also born in Scotland. My boys were born here and they are Canadian. They think of themselves as being Canadian. They have lived in this country or all their lives, apart from a few weeks when they visited Europe. What are they forced to put down on the census form? Certainly not Canadian.

The Prime Minister stands in the House and tells us about how this is the greatest country in the world. I endorse that statement. I think this is the greatest country in the world and millions of people would agree with me. However, let us remember that these people built the greatest country in the world. It does not matter if they are of Scottish origin, like I and my family, or of the different origins which we have heard about in other speeches. They all came here with a dream, with a hope, with an aspiration for a new beginning, wanting to be Canadian.

I came here thinking that I wanted to be Canadian. For over 20 years I have held a Canadian passport. I am proud of that, yet there is nothing I can put down on the census form which salutes and recognizes that fact.

We have heard other speakers tell about the tragedies of where their families came from. One of the great heritages of Canada is that while, for example, Scotland has a great history of emigration, Canada has a great history of immigration. That is what has made this country strong.

My Scottish history tells me that a couple of hundred years ago the Highlands clearances occurred and Scottish people's houses were burned down and the kids were left to starve in the snow. Some of them were able to make their way across the great Atlantic Ocean to Canada. While they may have a strong emotional

Private Members' Business

attachment to Scotland and call themselves Canadians with Scottish roots, many of them have never left this country, and yet they cannot call themselves Canadian.

• (1850)

I think back to the last war when Canadians liberated Holland. The people of Holland are proud of it and grateful. As we know, every year there are hundreds of thousands of bulbs sent over here from Holland because the Canadians liberated their land. They were not hyphenated Canadians, coloured Canadians, white Canadians or other kinds of Canadians. All they know is Canadians liberated their land.

Even when I was a little fellow back in Scotland they talked about how the Canadians had worked around where I grew up and the sawmills they built and the work they had done for the war effort. They talked about Canadians. When I go over to Scotland on a holiday, again these people see us as Canadians and are proud and envious of what we have. Yet here in Canada we do not even want to recognize who we are with our history of immigration.

While people have come from all around the world and from desperate situations, each and every one of them has found freedom. However, now we find that our freedoms are being eroded. They are being pigeon holed, classified and counted according to groups so that this government can come out with a little subsidy program to say "we are going to give some money to you and to you" because we are all categorized into different groups. There are some of Scottish heritage, some of other heritage, some who are black, some who are white, some who are crippled, some who are handicapped and so on. The government is going to count them all up so that it can see what the differences are. That is divisive.

When the pioneers came to settle the prairies, I do not think they cared two hoots about where a person came from. It was can he work and can he put his shoulder to the wheel and does he believe in building this wonderful land that we have. That was all that mattered.

Now, in this great social engineering world that we are in, we have to get everybody categorized and pigeon holed so that we can design a program to fit them and have them developed down one certain road. We are going to help other people develop in a different way and somebody else go off in a different way so that we can keep ourselves apart. How are we ever going to build this national unity, national concept that we are Canadians from coast to coast, each and every one of us?

It can be done and it will be done eventually in spite of this government and in spite of government programs given enough time. However, it will take a very long time if we continue on with these divisive types of attitudes, categories, pigeon holes and labels and count them all one to ten. Do we deny some people access to a career even though they may qualify in merit but they happen to come out of the wrong pigeon hole?

I have had this happen in my own riding. I have had people in my office who had wanted to be members of the RCMP so bad that they could taste it. I can think of one fine young gentleman with a college degree who spent six hundred hours a year volunteering for the RCMP. His older brother is a member of the force. He would dearly love to be a member of the force. Wrong pigeon hole. He cannot join. He has every qualification in the book that is required and then some; yet wrong pigeon hole and he does not qualify.

This is the same as the member for Wild Rose. His son, wrong pigeon hole and cannot qualify.

I dearly love, as a new Canadian, speaking in this House. Think what that means when I travel back to Scotland and people say "you are a member of Parliament in Canada" and I say yes. They say "that is fabulous, how you have prospered over there". I have prospered. This country has been very good to me. Why, oh why do we deny ourselves the right to call ourselves Canadian? Do we deny the concept that we are Canadian, which could build unity and harmony within the country, rather than the divisiveness that the government wants to devise another program to solve. It is easy, Madam Speaker. Listen to the people. Do not listen to the government.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Ringuette-Maltais): Pursuant to order made Tuesday, March 18, 1997, the question is deemed to have been put and a recorded division deemed deferred until Monday, April 7, 1997.

It being 6.55 p.m., this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 6.55 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 19, 1997

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

John Pahapill	
Ms. Augustine	9209
Municipality of grosse-île	
Mr. Langlois	9209
FAMEX	
Mr. Forseth	9209
Immigration	
Mr. Blaikie	9210
Justice	
Mr. Bodnar	9210
Literacy	
Mr. Alcock	9210
Canada council	
Ms. Torsney	9210
Family violence	
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	9210
Health	
Mr. Hart	9211
Official Opposition	
Mr. Bhaduria	9211
The Late Murray Fraser	
Ms. Clancy	9211
War Criminals	
Mrs. Finestone	9211
Gravenhurst Cubs	
Mr. Mitchell	9212
Quebec estimates	
Mr. Bélisle	9212
Copyright Law	
Mr. Abbott	9212
Rehabilitation of contaminated sites	
Mr. Bertrand	9212

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Organized crime	
Mr. Duceppe	9213
Mr. Rock	9213
Mr. Duceppe	9213
Mr. Rock	9213
Mr. Duceppe	9213
Mr. Rock	9213
Mr. Bellehumeur	9213
Mr. Rock	9213
Mr. Bellehumeur	9214
Mr. Rock	9214
Employment	
Mr. Manning	9214
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	9214
Mr. Manning	9214

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	9215
Mr. Manning	9215
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	9215
Copyright	
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	9215
Ms. Copps	9215
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	9215
Ms. Copps	9215
Taxation	
Mr. Solberg	9215
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9216
Mr. Solberg	9216
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9216
Goods and Services Tax	
Mr. Loubier	9216
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9216
Mr. Loubier	9216
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9217
Tobacco Products	
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	9217
Mr. Pickard	9217
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	9217
Mr. Pickard	9217
Goods and services tax	
Mr. Pomerleau	9217
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9217
Mr. Pomerleau	9217
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	9218
War Criminals	
Mr. McTeague	9218
Mr. Rock	9218
Ms. Meredith	9218
Mr. Rock	9218
Ms. Meredith	9218
Mr. Rock	9219
Middle East	
Mr. Bergeron	9219
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9219
Mr. Bergeron	9219
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	9219
Young Offenders Act	
Mr. Thompson	9219
Mr. Rock	9219
Mr. Thompson	9220
Mr. Rock	9220
HIV—AIDS	
Mr. Graham	9220
Mr. Dingwall	9220
Health	
Mr. Robinson	9220
Mr. Dingwall	9220
Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	9220
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	9221

Mr. Solberg	9221
Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	9221
ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS	
Government response to petitions	
Mr. Zed	9221
Order in Council Appointments	
Mr. Zed	9221
International Business Strategy	
Mr. Eggleton	9221
International Business Development	
Mr. Eggleton	9221
Mr. Sauvageau	9222
Mr. Morrison	9224
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Mr. Zed	9224
Food and Drugs Act	
Bill C-390. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	9225
Mrs. Jennings	9225
Criminal Code	
Bill C-391. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	9225
Mr. Finlay	9225
Committees of the House	
Procedure and House Affairs	
Motion to adopt the 60th report	9225
Mr. Zed	9225
Public Accounts	
Mr. Williams	9225
Motion for concurrence in third report	9225
(Motion agreed to.)	9225
Mr. Lebel	9227

Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	9227
Motion	9228
(Motion agreed to.)	9228
Mr. Silye	9228
Motion	9229
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 19; Nays, 151	9230
Mr. Zed	9230
Motion	9230
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 91; Nays, 20	9231

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

The Budget

Financial Statement of Minister of Finance

Consideration resumed of budget motion and amendment	9232
Amendment negatived on division: Yeas, 34; Nays, 127	9233

Message from the Senate

The Speaker	9233
-------------------	------

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Canadian Volunteer Service Medal for United Nations Peacekeeping Act

Bill C-300. Report stage	9233
Mr. Frazer	9233
Ms. Clancy	9234
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	9234
(Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.) ...	9235

Canadian Census

Consideration resumed of motion and of amendment	9235
Ms. Meredith	9235
Mr. Hanger	9236
Mr. Thompson	9237
Mr. Epp	9238
Mr. Williams	9239
Division on motion deferred	9240

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.**