



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 058

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, April 27, 1994

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, April 27, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

[Translation]

Prayers

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[Translation]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard): Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity today to express my concerns about recombinant BST or bovine somatotropin.

Although this hormone is found in cattle in its natural state, artificially increasing the rate of BST will not improve the quality of the milk, which is the most important consideration here.

Furthermore, the consumer backlash may be substantial. There is no particular rush to approve the use of this hormone, especially not before appropriate consultations with consumer associations.

* * *

[English]

NATIONAL PAROLE BOARD

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose): Mr. Speaker, last week I attended a justice meeting in which a review of the National Parole Board was the topic of discussion.

The result of this meeting left me questioning the accountability of the parole board. During the course of the discussion it was proven again that the current system is flawed. One of the results of the meeting was the Solicitor General's proposing a disciplinary scheme for members of the parole board. The time and thought given to these cosmetic disciplinary changes has been wasted time. We should not be spending time on how to get rid of people, we should be ensuring that the board is competent from the beginning.

The public wants concrete changes, not cleanup measures. For accountability to be restored it has to begin at the top. This means the Solicitor General should consider placing a moratorium on the release of dangerous offenders coming up for parole until this whole system is revamped and meets the standard.

IMMIGRATION

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec): Mr. Speaker, in the years to come, Quebec will receive a major influx of immigrants. The need to make these people welcome and to integrate them into Quebec society would seem paramount, not only to guarantee the continued existence of the French language but also to strengthen economic links between new immigrants and Quebec's institutions.

The Mouvement des caisses populaires Desjardins, one of the motors of Quebec's economic development, has shown leadership in this field.

* * *

[English]

SOUTH AFRICAN ELECTIONS

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Foreign Affairs it is my honour to pay tribute to the democratic process which is unfolding in South Africa today.

The Government of Canada is committed to the advancement of human rights and our support continues with some 150 Canadians currently in South Africa to observe the elections and to provide electoral expertise in the first democratic and non-racial elections.

At present the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa is leading the official bilateral team of electoral observers, while many other Canadians are serving with the United Nations, the Commonwealth and non-governmental organizations during this historic transition.

I salute all the people of the new South Africa. Today marks an end to the past and is hope for the future.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mrs. Eleni Bakopanos (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I celebrated Earth Day with students from the Collège de Bois-de-Boulogne, some of whom are here today. We released the results of environmental programs put in place at the college

S. O. 31

and officially launched the composting system set up by the students.

I would like to draw your attention more particularly to the work of Environnement Jeunesse, ENJEU, which makes students more aware of and educates them about the environment in Quebec. I was delighted and inspired by their commitment and the projects they have started. They have convinced me of the need to provide strong support for all youth initiatives.

[English]

In a time when we are desperate for more opportunities and initiatives for youth, Collège de Bois de Boulogne has succeeded in creating new and innovative ways to involve its students and enhance their awareness of the issues.

This demonstrates that with perseverance and commitment success is possible. Projects such as these are great achievements and should serve as an example for all our youth to follow.

I applaud the college administrators, the private sector and the community for making this idea a reality and I urge my fellow colleagues to encourage such initiatives.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform this House of meetings I hosted with regard to the social security review.

Residents in my riding had three opportunities to make their views known on the changes they feel would help to modernize our social security network.

Today I was able to present a report on behalf of my constituents to the Minister of Human Resources Development. The minister has assured all members that our constituents' opinions are important to this process, and I ask the hon. members opposite to stop characterizing such meetings as smoke screens to hide something which they suggest has already been decided. The people of Canada may conclude that the opposition is out to torpedo the work that is being done through these public consultations.

(1405)

In closing, I want to thank the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Human Resources Development for speaking at my public meeting and for listening to the concerns of my constituents.

* * *

[Translation]

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Gaston Péloquin (Brome—Missisquoi): The Supreme Court decision handed down yesterday with regard to telecommunications did not surprise anyone in Quebec. For the third time since 1993, Quebec is having powers in the area of

communications torn away by the federal government. After broadcasting and cable television, Quebec is now losing control over telephone companies, control which is essential to the province's social and economic development as we embark on the electronic highway.

Once again, the Supreme Court takes a "Canadian" and centralizing view of the Constitution to continue chipping away, little by little, year after year, at the powers of the Quebec National Assembly. That is the true face of federalism in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

This Supreme Court decision confirms the necessity and urgent need for the people of Quebec to have a sovereign state of their own.

* * *

[English]

OVERSEAS TAX CREDIT

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, thousands of Canadians who work abroad in natural resource industries benefit from the federal overseas tax credit. In return for spending six months of the year away from their families and working often under very difficult conditions, these Canadian workers have had their annual tax liabilities reduced by the credit.

Now as reported by *Alberta Report* magazine, Revenue Canada has decided to retroactively disallow the overseas tax credit to those Canadian workers employed by U.S. parented companies. In some cases this disallowance may extend back three years. This move will be an annoyance to the companies in question but it will do great harm to hundreds of ordinary Canadian workers, most of them Albertans.

I am told that the unforeseen tax bill of up to \$50,000 will cause some of them to lose their homes. This is a shameful way for the Minister of National Revenue to accomplish his goal of closing a so-called tax loophole.

* * *

ROUGE RIVER VALLEY

Mr. John Cannis (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the opportunity along with my family to participate in a reforestation project in the Rouge River Valley system.

The 10,000 Trees for the Rouge River Valley program has been operating for five years and has steadily increased its profile within the community. This year over 1,200 Scarborough residents planted 8,000 trees. Over the past five years this program has planted close to 60,000 trees on about 80 acres of land.

The Rouge Valley is a unique and valuable environmental resource and I urge the Minister of the Environment and The Minister of Canadian Heritage to continue their support and

negotiations with the provincial government and to move quickly to protect this region.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mrs. Pierrette Ringuette-Maltais (Madawaska—Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Reform Party said last week that he will gore the Official Languages Act, therefore attacking our Charter of Rights and Freedoms, our Constitution, our history, our country.

To bring some perspective to the leader of the Reform Party's goring agenda, I want him to know that his goring expedition—

The Speaker: Order.

* * *

KIDS SENSE WEEK

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean): Mr. Speaker, April 27 through May 1, 1994 is Kids Sense Week across Canada sponsored by the International Council of Shopping Centres, a non-profit trade organization. Shopping centres across Canada as we know are significant contributors to the economy as well as entertainment centres and effective forums for public service programs.

This morning I was pleased to be at the Merivale Mall in Nepean along with kids and parents and police and others. We could see that the Merivale Mall and all other shopping centres are providing important community services. They are raising awareness of safety issues in conjunction with the national observance of Kids Sense Week.

I am delighted that this week is Kids Sense Week in Ottawa—Carleton and I encourage our young people and their parents or guardians to involve themselves in this vital community service activity.

* * *

SARAJEVO

Mr. David Iftody (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of all members of Parliament a letter and a painting I received from a constituent of mine, a 7-year old girl whose name is Milaine Curé.

The painting depicts a house getting blown up by a tank and shot at by people with guns.

(1410)

The letter reads: "Dear Mr. Iftody, how can I help the children of Sarajevo? The children are very sick and they do not have any medication".

S. O. 31

We often forget how news can have a profound effect on our children. I felt the fear of this child by the madness and suffering that have resulted from this war. Yet, I also felt the promise of hope from our own children.

Canadians care and we will not abandon our duty as citizens of the world.

* * *

[Translation]

PROVINCIAL ELECTION

Mr. Gaston Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Prime Minister could barely hide how anxious he is to take an active part in the coming election campaign in Quebec. What is disappointing is that he refused to promise publicly to abide by the spirit of the Quebec legislation on election expenses. The Bloc Québécois strongly deplores that the taxpayers are made to pay against their will, through their taxes, such breaches to democracy.

Also, in light of the Prime Minister's refusal, are we to understand that he intends to authorize massive, illegitimate expenses to be made in Quebec during the election campaign, as was done at the time of the 1980 referendum? We believe that the Prime Minister should take the advice of the Quebec Premier and mind his own business.

* * *

[English]

BATTLE OF THE ATLANTIC

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 1 will commemorate the Battle of the Atlantic across Canada. We will honour the Canadian veterans who fought so courageously and with such great sacrifice to keep the enemy from our shores and to gain control of sea lanes so that allied forces could bring World War II to an end.

We honour those who served in the RCAF coastal command, the Royal Canadian Navy and our merchant navy. During the bloody and bitter conflict in the Atlantic, each one made a vital contribution to destroying the German U-boat menace which extended from Britain right into the St. Lawrence.

They made possible the transport of vital troops and supplies to beleaguered Britain. Without their heroic efforts there would have been no Normandy landings on D-Day.

This year we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II through the Canada Remembers program. This Sunday let every Canadian who cherishes freedom remember those who fought so well and who made the supreme sacrifice in the Battle of the Atlantic.

*Oral Questions***COMMUNITY VIOLENCE**

Mr. Harbance Singh Dhaliwal (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House an issue which has brought tremendous sorrow and shock to members of my constituency.

Last Saturday a deplorable tragedy occurred in Vancouver south. Mr. Glen Olsen, an innocent bystander, was shot and killed while walking his dog down a street in my riding.

It is with profound sympathy that I pass my condolences on to Mr. Olsen's family and friends. I want them to know that the horror of this event has not gone unnoticed.

I have spoken to the Vancouver police department and I have full confidence that it is doing everything possible to bring those responsible to justice.

As the federal representative for my community I would like it to know that I will do everything in my power to ensure that these types of incidents do not occur in our communities. I will continue to fight for stricter gun control and stronger crime prevention measures so that tragedies like this do not occur in the future.

For the sake of the victims I implore all members of this House to support initiatives which will make our streets and our communities safer places.

* * *

TOBACCO TAX

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the lowering of the cigarette tax this party presented several very good reasons why it should not be done.

It would increase smoking among youth according to Statistics Canada and would also increase smoking among the general population and add to our health costs.

Today we see that total Canadian production of cigarettes reached 5.8 billion in March, the highest in eight years. Clearly the policy of this government to reduce cigarette taxes is going to add to our health care costs, add to the illness of Canadians.

I call on the Minister of Health to finally stand up for the health of Canadians, to fight on behalf of Canadians and to fight this policy which has only led to more smoking among Canadians and greater health risks.

* * *

(1415)

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, the federal government has decided to build its own \$11.9 million office complex in Sault Ste. Marie. This steel,

brick and glass building will include 120,000 square feet on two storeys to house the Canada Employment Centre, the Income Securities Office, Revenue Canada, Health Canada, Public Works and Government Services, and the RCMP.

Local property managers are outraged by this needless political project. A recent survey indicates there is over a 20 per cent vacancy rate in major downtown buildings. There is existing vacant office space, and a new federal building will create more vacancies.

Does the government not have better ways to put people back to work than pumping money into unneeded facilities in competition with the private sector?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

HIGH-SPEED TRAIN

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Speaking yesterday to the greater Montreal Chamber of Commerce, the Chairman of VIA Rail unveiled his agency's proposal for a high-speed train in the Quebec City—Windsor corridor. VIA Rail is proposing that the federal government support the project financially using part of the grant it awards each year to the agency. This would allow the government to build the HST without it affecting Ottawa's budget.

Can the Prime Minister tell us if the government is interested in VIA Rail's proposal which has the advantage of requiring no additional outlay on the part of the federal government?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have indeed indicated that we are interested in this venture. We have said that if this project can be carried out without the government having to incur significant costs, then we would be happy to proceed with it. However, if one proposal seems more acceptable at this time, I am certain the government will review it carefully. There could be a problem though in that it will be hard for a high-speed train linking Montreal and Toronto to be forced to stop for inspection at the border, once Quebec becomes independent, as the Leader of the Opposition hopes will happen.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I asked a serious question to someone who, I thought, took things seriously. Instead, he responded in a joking fashion.

The HST project has been under consideration for many years. Governments have been studying it for at least three years. Why is the Prime Minister so reluctant to announce his support for the HST, given that this project will generate

Oral Questions

activity, create thousands of long-term jobs and, at the same time, strengthen our competitive position in a high-tech sector?

Hon. Douglas Young (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition surely knows that the governments of Quebec, Ontario and Canada have already invested just under \$6 million in a high-speed train study. The three governments expect the report to be ready by this summer and we will, of course, be reviewing it with a great deal of interest. The study is being carried out jointly by the aforementioned three governments and I hope the Leader of the Opposition is interested in seeing the results, just as these three governments are.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, what reasons can the Prime Minister give, I wonder, for his reluctance to state clearly what he thinks, and where he stands on the HST project, when all the while, the federal government has invested and will continue to invest—I would even say waste, at least in the case of Hibernia—billions in Hibernia, not to mention the exorbitant sums spent on upgrading the rail system in the West?

Why is the Prime Minister holding off on disclosing his views on an HST that will link Quebec and Canada with the United States?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if we want to talk about decisions made by this government, I would point out to the Leader of the Opposition that the most successful company in Montreal is Canadair. It was during my tenure as Minister of Industry and Trade that the government bought Canadair back from private interests, got it back on track and invested money to develop the Challenger jets and other aircraft responsible for Canadair's current success. This was all due to the intervention of this government.

(1420)

The Leader of the Opposition is always asking us to work with the provinces, but the Minister of Transport has just said that he is working very closely with provincial governments on this matter. Now the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we not listen to the provinces.

We do listen to them and, when the proposal is ready, we will respond. If it represents no cost to us, then of course the project will get the green light. However, if the costs are exorbitant, we will have to take into consideration this government's financial situation.

* * *

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, according to the Minister of Industry, the federal government apparently wants to review the drug-patent law. This legislation extended to 20 years, need we remind you, the protection offered to

patented drugs and led to the announcement that nearly \$1 billion would be invested in research and development in Quebec by 1996. By the year 2000, the total value of investment projects could reach \$5 billion in Canada.

Does the minister admit that it is because of pressure from lobbyists representing the interests of generic-drug companies, mainly concentrated in Toronto, that he is about to review the drug-patent legislation?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that I have no interest in lobbyists' efforts. What I care about the most is Canadians' interests.

We promised during the election campaign that we would review Bill C-91, and that is what we explained again yesterday. We are interested in drug prices and in the investment and R and D track record here in Canada.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, Quebec's Minister of Industry and Commerce stated this morning before a parliamentary committee in Quebec City that the mere mention of a review of Bill C-91 caused the immediate postponement of a \$50-million investment in Quebec's pharmaceutical industry.

Does the Minister of Finance, who is also responsible for regional development in Quebec, admit that a review of the drug-patent legislation would be disastrous for the brand-name drug industry, which is mainly concentrated in Montreal?

[English]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, this is the same kind of exaggerated hyperbole that we have heard on both sides of this debate for too long.

We are trying to deal with the facts and we are going to determine what the facts are. The facts will indicate what policy direction the government should take in the future.

I want the hon. member to understand, because he was not here when Bill C-91 was passed, that law contains within it a statutory review that would occur within four years of its enactment in 1993. That is already in the bill. There is nothing new about saying that we will review legislation passed by the previous government.

* * *

HEALTH CARE

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Recently the Minister of Human Resources Development was forced to cancel a federal-provincial meeting on job training because several of the provinces objected to the federal government's approach.

Now it appears the Minister of Health may scuttle the planned forum on national health care with her ill-advised tax on provincial health care initiatives in Alberta and British Co-

Oral Questions

lumbia. National health care reform requires more co-operation, not less, between federal and provincial governments.

Will the Prime Minister instruct his Minister of Health to stop antagonizing and start listening to the provinces on health care reform?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have a very clear law of Parliament that medicare in Canada is free for everybody.

(1425)

We have a law in Canada that says there will not be a two tier system of medicare, one for the rich and one for the poor. We also have a law in Canada which says that if one province is engaged in that direction we shall cut off funds to it.

The minister is doing what is right. She is making sure that the laws of Parliament are respected.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, the root of the financial difficulties of health care lies in the fact that federal transfers to the provinces in support of health care have consistently declined over the last 15 years. Just last week the finance minister promised further cuts to federal transfers.

If the Prime Minister is really committed to health care, will he commit today to maintaining federal transfers to health care at present levels and to making deeper spending cuts elsewhere required to support that commitment?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is another good day. Now the leader of the Reform Party is pleading with us not to cut. I hope the Minister of Finance will note that.

In our platform we said that we were to maintain the level of transfers to the provinces, that they were not to be reduced, and they were not reduced in the last budget.

We say to the provinces that we want to sit down with them. The Minister of Health is organizing the conference that I will be presiding over in June wherein we will make sure that free medicare is portable for all our citizens whatever their financial means, respected and operated efficiently. We will have that meeting to do that and I hope the Reform Party will support this process. In fact, yesterday when I said that we should keep that system in Canada I saw many of his members applauding.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is avoiding the issue. When national medicare was introduced the federal government made a solemn commitment to carry 50 per cent of the cost to the provinces.

Today federal transfers in support of health care in provinces like British Columbia cover only 36 per cent of the cost. Yet the federal government continues to use the Canada Health Act to tell the province how to finance and operate the system. In other

words, health care is being choked between reduced federal transfers and an outdated national health care act.

My question to the Prime Minister is very simple. Will he stop the choking? Will he promise that federal transfers in support of health care will be maintained and instruct the health minister to give the provinces more latitude, not less, in developing solutions to their health care needs?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, of course there are some problems in the administration of medicare. We have said that and we have said that is why we need a conference.

It has been a good system. It is a system the Canadian people want to maintain. We have to sit down with the provinces to make sure that it is revisited at this time and that it is operating properly. It has been a great service to Canada since it was established. I think all Canadians want to keep it.

We want to work to maintain it. I am happy to see the Reform Party supporting the notion that we should have free medicare and not two types of medicare for people in Canada.

* * *

[Translation]

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. After 22 months of waiting, BioVac has still not received approval for its BCG cancer vaccine, while Connaught of Toronto obtained such approval after only a 14-month wait. I reminded the minister yesterday that her department was applying a double standard.

My question is this: Now that she has had the time to do the necessary checks, can the minister tell us when BioVac will receive its authorization?

(1430)

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, an application for the BCG therapeutic product used in treating cancer of the bladder was filed by Connaught Laboratories on March 2, 1989. The notice of compliance was issued on April 25, 1990. The approval process thus took 13 1/2 months.

The Biochem file on BCG cancer, a product intended to treat bladder cancer, was received on June 10, 1992. The hon. member must realize that we receive a growing number of submissions of new research drugs and new drugs that qualify for priority evaluation; this increase is mainly due to progress in the biotechnology industry.

These priority applications take precedence over regular ones that are already being processed in order of receipt. Many physicians wishing to obtain the product from Biochem in order

Oral Questions

to treat patients in their care can do so through the Emergency Drug Distribution Program.

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, I personally met with the minister. I wrote to her. I asked her a question in the House yesterday. I ask her the same question again today: When will BioVac have its approval? When? Is that clear?

[English]

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, let me remind the hon. member that my function is to ensure that any medication which receives a notice of compliance is safe and efficacious.

I will only issue a notice of compliance when my department and scientists are absolutely sure it is safe for the people of Canada.

That is the process we follow. It is the process we will continue to follow.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of immigration.

It has been revealed that one of the individuals arrested in Toronto in connection with the Just Desserts killing had an ongoing involvement with Canadian immigration officials and the minister's department.

This individual had been ordered deported in 1992 but had been given a stay of proceedings on that deportation order again by the minister's department in 1993. Had this individual been deported on time he would not have been charged in connection with the murder of Georgina Leimonis.

Why was this individual given a stay on his deportation order in 1993 by the minister's department?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult situation. We should be careful and try not to be in contempt of court so as not to prejudice this very important case many Canadians are looking at. Let me say this tragedy moved more than the city of metropolitan Toronto. It moved the whole country to think about that senseless killing.

Let me also put into focus this department moved on the basis of inadmissibility grounds to deport that individual. I can tell the hon. member and this House I believe when we moved to deport that individual the case was made before an immigration appeal member. This is not controlled by my department but is a quasi-judicial independent tribunal.

I will say the system failed us on this case. That strengthens my convictions that the amendments I have been discussing with

my officials to strengthen the criminality provisions and to close the loopholes are the right course.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast): Mr. Speaker, the individual in question was issued a stay on his deportation order in 1993 despite the fact he had a criminal record as long as his arm, and that was with the knowledge of the department.

(1435)

When will the minister finally acknowledge that his department's system of background checks and enforcement is not working? How many more lives are going to be lost before the minister takes action to ensure the safety of Canadians?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this member of Parliament does a disservice to the facts of the issue and to the concerns both of us and both sides of this House share. You do not have a monopoly on concern—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: I would remind hon. colleagues to please address the Chair.

Mr. Marchi: Mr. Speaker, my department wanted and pushed for deportation. An independent quasi-judicial body stayed the deportation. The adjudicator who made that decision was not reappointed to that board. She was not reappointed by this minister. Therefore we need no lessons from the hon. member.

[Translation]

DEFENCE INDUSTRY PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAM

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette): Mr. Speaker, in the past, the Liberal government has recognized on numerous occasions the need to set up a reconversion assistance program for the defence industry. Indeed, the situation of these companies is very precarious and no specific assistance is currently provided to those interested in restructuring their operations.

Does the Minister of Industry recognize that the defence industry productivity program, or DIPP, does not provide any specific assistance for conversion purposes, and that the defence industry wants a fund to be set up, using money from the current DIPP budget to support conversion initiatives? Indeed, the budget of this program should be used for that purpose.

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear the hon. member refer to that project, because the rules regulating DIPP will be expanded so as to include conversion projects for the defence industry.

Mr. Réal Ménard (Hochelaga—Maisonnette): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the minister is referring to the future, because right now this program cannot be used to support conversion initiatives by these companies.

Oral Questions

Consequently, why does the minister not give us a concrete and specific schedule regarding his conversion support strategy?

[English]

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I do want to assure the member that as was announced in the budget, the broadening of the terms of the DIPP is being worked on at the present time.

The member is aware of the financial limitations the government has. That is why we are also looking not only at making the DIPP contributions repayable in their entirety, but creating a revolving fund. Therefore not only do we aid projects that are directed at defence conversion presently, but we build a fund based on commercial viability that will sustain such projects and those companies that are involved in those sectors of our industry into the future.

* * *

CHALLENGER JET

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

It is with a heavy heart that I once again must ask the Prime Minister why he continues to waste tax dollars, this time on a sun and fun holiday among the palms of a Caribbean island.

It is reported the Prime Minister not only used a Challenger jet for a personal vacation, at a cost of slightly more than \$250,000 using the Auditor General's formula, he allowed his hangers on and his flight crew to enjoy 10 days in the sun as well.

When will this Prime Minister realize Canadian taxpayers will not accept his free spending ways?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have already explained they have asked me to travel on these planes for security reasons. I was already in Mexico and I stayed south for a few days. The member would have complained if the plane had travelled back and forth like it did when it was a trip for the Governor General.

(1440)

I think they are doing a big disservice to an industry. I was talking with Canadair the other day. That type of question talks down on Canadian airplanes because you pretend it costs tons of money and that is not true. The figure you use is not the real one.

The Speaker: Colleagues, I recognize that in the heat of debate we sometimes forget the Speaker. I would ask all of you to please address your remarks to the Chair.

If the right hon. Prime Minister has not finished, I invite him to finish. If he has, I will go to the next question.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What did not happen was we did not address the extravagance. It sounds like a two tier system to me. Security for the Prime Minister is extremely important. We realize that.

Did the Prime Minister check the private charter prices? I did and he could have saved \$125,000. Why not save money for a change? Quit being so reckless. Will he stop being reckless?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am doing that. It is a plane that is owned by the Canadian government to be used by the Prime Minister of Canada.

I have checked too. I asked Canadair if these planes were transferred to them how much they would charge the government for travelling. They said it would be less than \$3,500 an hour. That is the real cost of using these planes.

Not only that, when you calculate the cost of the pilots, you have to understand these are national defence pilots. They have to be in the air so many hours in a month anyway to keep their licences. However you charge the cost to the government when a minister is on board and you do not complain when they use the plane for training.

Be a bit respectful. The Prime Minister of the country should be able to travel like the RCMP requests.

* * *

[Translation]

SOCIAL PROGRAM REFORM

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

Profound differences remain between Ottawa and the provinces regarding the reform of our social programs. As you know, a federal-provincial conference on the subject was cancelled at the last minute because of objections raised by several provinces.

Furthermore, the minister promised to release a policy paper early next month, setting forth the government's choices and options. Does the minister intend to proceed according to schedule and release his action plan next week, as he promised?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the hon. member alleges, all the provinces are still very much committed to participating in the process of reform.

I spoke to provincial ministers over the last several days both face to face and by telephone. All of them indicated a continued willingness to work together to find important measures to

Oral Questions

deliver programs more effectively and more efficiently to Canadians.

When the hon. member asserts there is great conflict and problems, he is not describing what in fact takes place. We postponed the meeting for a period of a couple of weeks to allow the provinces to have more time. I have indicated that we will have a meeting of deputy ministers within a couple of weeks to go over this documentation and based upon that we will then set a new timetable for ministerial meetings.

(1445)

[Translation]

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): Mr. Speaker, will the minister confirm that the federal-provincial conference, already cancelled once, has been postponed once again, this time indefinitely, because of the continuing deadlock with British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario and Quebec?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member lives in a world of fiction and fantasy. He simply makes up things and then tries to launch them as facts.

That is simply not true. I told him before he read the second question he had prepared that I have talked to all provincial ministers in each province who have indicated their continued willingness to co-operate to get social reform in this country, to put people back to work, to provide a better sense of security and to give some hope back to Canadians.

* * *

INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. Tony Ianno (Trinity—Spadina): My question is for the Minister responsible for Infrastructure.

As the government moves forward with the renewal of Canada's environmental, communications and transportation infrastructure, many of my constituents in Trinity—Spadina are looking forward to the new jobs that will be created by the program for today's and tomorrow's economy.

Can the minister tell us how many jobs Canadians can expect to have generated by this program and its spinoffs and when will these badly needed projects commence?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question which gives me the

opportunity to give more good news to this House on how this Liberal government is getting Canadians back to work.

Since I reported last Friday, we have an increase of \$8 million of projects that have been approved, another 400 people, and we are now up to 5,500 jobs. We have approved over 350 applications and we have another thousand in the pipeline. What is more, there are people in rural Saskatchewan at this very moment constructing and reconstructing roads for the benefit of the citizens in those communities.

Finally, the original estimate of 60,000 jobs has now been revised as a result of accurate data from Statistics Canada.

* * *

TOBACCO

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

When the federal government lowered the cost of cigarettes in an attempt to cut off smuggling, it spawned new problems including increased smuggling of alcohol and interprovincial smuggling of cheap cigarettes.

I ask the Prime Minister if the government has any realistic plans to put out the fires that his cigarette policies have lit.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the program that we put in place to stop the smuggling of cigarettes has been a great success. There were reports that there was an increase in smoking but the articles did not report the fact that cigarette export sales declined while domestic shipments increased.

In terms of consumption, when you look at the total number of cigarette shipments a year ago compared to the total number of cigarettes shipments this year, there was a decrease of 3 per cent.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for the Prime Minister.

Earlier this month the premier of Alberta in his role as chairman of the most recent western premiers' conference wrote to the Prime Minister asking for his co-operation to combat the potential flood of smuggled tobacco from central Canada into western Canada. One of the recommendations was to implement a uniform federal tobacco tax rate across all of Canada to lessen the incentive for interprovincial smuggling.

Can the Prime Minister tell the House if he has made any effort to adopt this proposal from the western premiers?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we made exactly the same offer to all the provinces. Some decided to take it, others decided not to take it. We have offered exactly the same to all the provinces. We did not treat any province differently.

Oral Questions

(1450)

[Translation]

COLLÈGE MILITAIRE ROYAL DE SAINT-JEAN

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence has repeated many times that the government would soon make public its decision on the future of the military college in Saint-Jean, on the basis of consultations and recommendations, especially from the Government of Quebec.

Can the minister tell us his intentions on a new military role for Saint-Jean and report on the outcome of the negotiations with the Government of Quebec?

[English]

Hon. David Michael Collett (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, who is ill today, is looking into the alternate uses of the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean but I wish to reaffirm that the government in its budget of February 22 did announce that we will be moving to one college which will be located in Kingston, Ontario.

I made a statement yesterday in the House and the member's colleague from Charlesbourg replied on behalf of his party in terms of how we will make Kingston much more bilingual than it is already. I also announced that the commandant of the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean, General Emond, will start in July of this year as the new commandant of the Collège militaire royal located at Kingston to ensure that there is an equitable transition and to make sure that we do indeed continue the very excellent tradition of having a bilingual officer formation in the Canadian Armed Forces.

[Translation]

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean): With reference to the minister's statement yesterday, Mr. Speaker, he announced two plans: one to make the military college in Kingston bilingual and the other concerning curricula.

Can the minister tell us how much these measures will cost and can he confirm that these additional costs will cancel for all practical purposes the meagre amounts he intended to save, starting next year, by closing the military college in Saint-Jean?

[English]

Hon. David Michael Collett (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have covered this a number of times in the House.

We expect the closure of Royal Roads Military College and the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean to accrue about \$35 million annually to the federal treasury. There are one-time

costs associated with the reformation in Kingston but that was all in the budget statement. The hon. member should read that.

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Last week the minister's parliamentary secretary confirmed that Canada Pension Plan premiums will have to be increased from the current 5.2 per cent of earnings in order to cover payments to our aging population. In fact at the current rate in less than 25 years these premiums will eat up 10 per cent of every worker's paycheque.

Has the minister looked at this problem? What is he doing to keep premiums in check?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, I want to report to the hon. member that I have read the press reports.

It would be very important to refer him to a study or assessment that was undertaken by the Canadian Institute of Actuaries which noted that the financing of the Canada Pension Plan is on an actuarially sound basis. The formulas are there.

We all understand that as the population changes and as we go into the future where there will be a larger number of Canadians who are in retirement age, there will be some pressures on the Canada Pension Plan. That is the reason why my colleague, the Minister of Finance, announced in the budget that we will put forward a paper that will make some assessment and analysis of what those kinds of issues will be. We will have an opportunity for a public debate, assessment or dialogue on what some of the resolutions or responses should be.

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, we look forward to that public debate.

The surplus fund or contingency fund that the minister mentioned is presently invested in low interest provincial government bonds that subsidize the debt of provincial governments.

What is the government doing to ensure a better return on investment so that Canadians can count on having the pension they spend their whole lives contributing to?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification): Mr. Speaker, just to put this matter in its proper context, the managers of the fund have maintained throughout that this was not an unexpected development of the contingency fund, that it would have some pressures.

Oral Questions

Certainly for the next three years it has full funding to cover any possible change or alteration in the situation of the fund. It is certainly actuarially sound and has sufficient contingency funds within it.

As the hon. member knows, according to legislation there must be changes in premium rates along the way. That is one reason why we have emphasized in the budget the importance of bringing down the cost of payroll tax, things like UI premiums and CPP premiums, so that we can maintain an active incentive for the private sector. That is one reason why the paper that the Minister of Finance announced will be a very important document for us to study.

* * *

(1455)

GROUND FISH LICENCES

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

In December 1992 the government announced a freeze on all inactive groundfish licences. As a result of this, in order to demonstrate their attachment to the fishery and to avoid losing their licences, fishermen felt compelled to increase their fishing effort. Last week, in announcing the Atlantic groundfish strategy, the minister promised that he would review this policy.

Will the minister advise the House as to what action has been taken on this issue?

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for the question. Indeed, he and virtually every other member of the Atlantic caucus raised the issue of frozen or inactive groundfish licences with me.

Following consultation with members of the Atlantic caucus and consultation with the Canadian Council of Fish Harvesters, I have come to a decision to put in place a new professional standard affecting the fishermen that will have the effect of thawing or releasing the freeze on the vast majority of those so-called frozen groundfish licences.

This decision will have the effect of contributing nothing to capacity as it affects only professional or bona fide fishermen. It will increase not one cent the cost of the Atlantic groundfish strategy, but it will do a great deal in the sense of fairness and, may I say, simple justice to restore the trust between fishermen, professional fishermen, bona fide fishermen and their government.

I thank the member and indeed all members of the Atlantic caucus for their active input in assisting me in making this decision. I think we sure tried.

[Translation]

REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

Last February 9, the minister stated that the recommendations in the Baird report on new reproductive technologies were being thoroughly reviewed, but the government has still not indicated what it intends to do with these recommendations. I want to point out that Canada is one of only a handful of industrialized countries with no legislation on reproductive technologies.

Does the minister agree on the need to act and regulate practices related to reproductive technologies, as is recommended in the Baird report, and will he undertake to table a bill before the House recesses for the summer in June?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I decline to give the undertaking. I think it is premature. The royal commission which reported in February delivered some 300 recommendations to government, most of which were for my colleague, the Minister of Health, but many of which affected the Ministry of Justice in so far as they suggested changes to the Criminal Code.

As I mentioned to the hon. member on the last occasion when she raised this important matter, there are complex questions arising from the recommendations such as, for example, the intersection of criminal law where it tries to prevent horrendous interference with genetic matters and, on the other hand, legitimate research in the university setting which can go to push back the frontiers of medical knowledge.

I say to the hon. member that I share her sense that these issues are important, that they should come before Parliament, but I will not bring them here until we have assessed them thoroughly so that we can form the issues properly and members of this House can make a decision based on all the facts.

[Translation]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert): Mr. Speaker, does the minister intend to amend the Criminal Code and prohibit the marketing of human embryos, which is a measure recommended in the Baird report and largely supported by the public?

[English]

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member, I decline to give a piecemeal position of the government on these issues. I would rather have the matter come forward in its

Routine Proceedings

entirety with the complex underlying issues fully assessed. Therefore, I will respond to her question at the appropriate time.

* * *

FIRST NATIONS

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The wife of the chair of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development has been hired by a federally funded Assembly of First Nations as a media relations officer.

My colleague from the Official Opposition has asked for the chairman's resignation. A spokesperson from the Prime Minister's office is quoted as saying of this arrangement: "This is not a conflict". Does the Prime Minister agree with this statement attributed to his office?

(1500)

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I am answering the question in my capacity as House leader. I point out to the hon. member that a committee chairman is not a member of the government. Therefore the concerns which underlie the hon. member's question do not apply.

Furthermore, I think we have reached the time in our society when spouses can be considered independent of members of Parliament and have their own careers.

The Speaker: Order. As I mentioned last week in a brief statement which I made, committees really stand on their own. Questions with regard to the specifics of committees should probably be addressed in the committees themselves. If, however, there are questions of a general nature which I feel impact upon the administration of government then by and large I would permit these questions to be in order.

I would urge hon. members, if they have questions with the administration of government in mind as opposed to committees, to put them as such.

Mr. John Duncan (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, this is another example of the need for this long awaited ethics counsellor.

Will the Prime Minister agree that the long awaited ethics counsellor would find this arrangement to be a blatant conflict of interest?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer given by the House leader is the appropriate one.

In our society a member of Parliament is a member of Parliament and the career of his or her spouse should not be affected by the status of a member of Parliament.

There are some restrictions for cabinet ministers that must be respected, but spouses of members of Parliament have the right to earn a living. They have the capacity to earn a living. This is the fundamental right of equality in our society.

* * *

HANDGUNS

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

On Monday the Minister of Justice met with representatives of Concordia University, the Canadian Safety Council, the Canadian Bar Association, the Ottawa Chief of Police and others who asked for a ban on handguns.

Since handguns are not used for hunting but are very often used for criminal purpose, will the minister propose legislative amendments to implement these proposals? What was his answer to these groups on Monday?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed the meeting on Monday. The delegation that came to see me in my office was as described by the hon. member and served to remind me that the vast majority of Canadians want effective gun control in the country.

It is recognized that this is only part of the solution. It is recognized that we have to deal with the smuggling of illegal arms and deal properly with those who use firearms in the commission of offences. At the same time it is important to recognize that guns are used in suicides, over 1,000 each year, and that 3,000 firearms are lost or stolen from the homes of lawful owners each year and then turn up in the hands of criminals who subsequently injure or kill with them.

While respecting the legitimate rights of lawful gun owners in the country, the government is committed toward more effective gun control. We will be responding to concerns such as those expressed on Monday last in my office by those who visited on the occasion described by the hon. member.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

(1505)

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

Mrs. Beryl Gaffney (Nepean) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-241, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (child support payments).

She said: Mr. Speaker, the current tax treatment of child support payments requires custodial parents to pay taxes on the support they receive while non-custodial parents are allowed to fully deduct the amount.

Routine Proceedings

Canada's tax policy taxes child support payments unlike what we see in the United States, Australia, Britain, Sweden, and many other countries of the world.

While the average child support order covers less than half the minimum cost of raising a child, up to one-third or more of the support payments that are meant to help feed and clothe children are taken away in taxes.

This private member's bill will alleviate this injustice and will work to bring fairness into our tax system, particularly as it relates to the future of our children.

I might add that I am paralleling this private member's bill with my private member's motion. The issue is relevant and this injustice to our nation's children must be corrected.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier): Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions signed by about 40 constituents of mine.

The first petition deals with the sanctity of human life. The petitioners pray that Parliament ensure that the present provisions of the Criminal Code of Canada prohibiting assisted suicide be enforced vigorously and that Parliament make no change in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

The second petition deals with the sanctity of life but for a different reason. The petitioners pray that Parliament act immediately to protect the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

PORT OF CHURCHILL

Mr. Elijah Harper (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have the honour to present certified petitions from over 100 of my constituents and others in support of the increased use of the port of Churchill.

The port of Churchill is an untapped national resource. The petitioners call on Parliament to direct the hon. minister responsible for the wheat board to maximize the port's use and to ship at least 5 per cent of Canada's annual grain shipments through the port.

The Canadians who built the port and the railway to Churchill had a vision of Canada and of the north. I join the petitioners in hoping that this vision can live on.

(1510)

ETHANOL

Mr. Jerry Pickard (Essex—Kent): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to present a petition on ethanol. The ethanol industry will certainly create a boon for the agricultural industry. Ethanol is one of the most environmentally friendly fuels available.

Residents in the Chatham, Essex and Kent county areas are very concerned that the government show a consideration on taxation with regard to ethanol.

They humbly ask the Parliament of Canada to allow a decade of tax allowance in order that the industry may get under way. The economic values to the industry are far greater than the tax costs.

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I too rise in the House today to present a petition in support of ethanol as a fuel. Its time has come in Ontario.

Some 200 petitioners call on the government to extend the exemption on the excise portion of ethanol for a decade to allow the strong and self-sufficient ethanol industry in Canada to go forward.

I present this petition on their behalf.

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present on behalf of the constituents of Lambton—Middlesex and area a petition which has been duly certified by the clerk of petitions.

It requests Parliament to maintain the present exemption on the excise portion of ethanol for a decade, allowing for a strong and self-sufficient ethanol industry in Canada to go forward.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs)): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Hon. Fernand Robichaud (Secretary of State (Parliamentary Affairs)): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree?

Speaker's Ruling

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

PETITIONS PRESENTED IN THE HOUSE—SPEAKER'S RULING

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleagues, the Chair is now ready to deal with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Chicoutimi, on Monday, April 18, 1994, concerning the manner in which certain petitions have recently been presented in the House.

The right of the public to petition Parliament is very important because it constitutes the only means by which individual Canadians can directly place grievances before this body and make their concerns known. As is noted in *Bourinot's* Fourth Edition at page 231, the signing and presentation of public petitions is highly appreciated by Parliament and in many cases assists it in forming its opinions and in taking appropriate action.

[English]

Since individual Canadians are not permitted to address the House directly, as members know, petitions are presented by members. Groups and individuals with petitions for the House must therefore enlist the aid of MPs to have their petitions certified and presented. Citation 1038 of Beauchesne's sixth edition states that members are not bound to present petitions and cannot be compelled to do so. Nevertheless, it is not unusual for members to present a petition to the House whether or not they agree with its contents.

Under the provisions of the standing orders a petition may be presented in one of two ways. Standing Order 36(5) states:

A petition to the House may be presented by a Member at any time during the sitting of the House by filing the same with the Clerk of the House.

This is also known as tabling by the back door. The second method of presenting a public petition is prescribed by Standing Order 36(6) which states:

Any Member desiring to present a petition, in his or her place in the House may do so on "Presenting Petitions", a period not to exceed 15 minutes, during the ordinary daily routine of business.

As noted at page 111 of the Annotated Standing Orders, several conditions apply to the presentation of petitions in the House during Routine Proceedings, the most notable of which is the prohibition contained in Standing Order 36(7) on "debate on or in relation to" petitions presented.

On February 26, 1986, Speaker Bosley issued guidelines which not only reiterated provisions of Standing Order 36(7) but

also invoked the practices which had evolved here on the manner of presenting petitions, and I quote:

In presenting a petition during Routine Proceedings, the member may make a brief—

(1515)

I underline the word brief.

—summary of the prayer of the petition, state the parties from whom it comes and the number of signatures it contains, but may not make a speech or enter into debate on or in relation to the petition. The member should also indicate that the petition has been certified in order, pursuant to the standing orders.

[Translation]

Therefore, commenting in any way on the merits of a petition could be considered a form of debate on the petition. In this Parliament, on several occasions some Members have commented favourably or adversely on the petitions they are presenting, prompting other members to voice various objections to those comments.

Since there is only a limited period during each sitting when members may present petitions, saying anything other than what is normally permitted takes time away from other members who wish to present petitions. Members should bear in mind that the Member presenting a petition in the House or filing it with the Clerk is acting as a messenger or intermediary between Parliament and the petitioners.

If the rules permitted debate on petitions or if the subject of the petition were to come before the House for debate in some other manner, the member's view on the subject matter would be relevant and vital to the process. As things stand, however, the role of the member, while essential, is limited.

Therefore the Chair would ask members to refrain from commenting on petitions they present other than to simply note the prayer of the petition, the number of signatories, and their place of residence.

[English]

Finally, should members choose to present petitions with which they disagree they may do so during Routing Proceedings without comment or simply file them with the Clerk of the House at any time.

Both methods of presentation fulfil the requirements of the standing orders and both are equally valid.

[Translation]

I hope this brief statement will help explain the procedure on presenting petitions to the House.

I thank the hon. member for Chicoutimi for raising this matter and thus allowing the Chair to provide the House with an explanation of the process.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

PEARSON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AGREEMENTS ACT

The House resumed consideration from April 26 of the motion that Bill C-22, an act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment; and of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-22 will be an opportunity for me to demonstrate the unfair treatment given Jean Lesage Airport in my riding, compared with other Canadian airports.

Since the opening of the 35th Parliament on January 17, we have on many occasions heard Liberal and Reform Party members boast of the advantages of Canadian federalism for Quebecers. In my speech on Bill C-22, I will try to show how different the real situation is by looking at the problems we have with air transportation.

First of all, we condemn the centralizing approach of Transport Canada in decisions that affect Quebec. For instance, there is the story around the selection of Mirabel as a second airport for Montreal. The result: 20 years of economic disaster. Mirabel is still finding its feet, Dorval has stagnated, and Toronto has emerged as the big winner from Transport Canada's planning disaster. From 1970 to 1991, Air Canada moved 12 per cent of its employees from Montreal to Toronto, and from 1977 to 1991, Montreal lost 22 per cent of its pilots, while the number of pilots in Toronto increased by 34 per cent. In 1988, Air Canada transferred its pilot training services to Toronto, and in 1991, 12 management positions were transferred as well.

The centralizing approach of Transport Canada has affected air traffic control as well.

(1520)

Terminal control units have been transferred to regional control centres. Halifax, Thunder Bay, North Bay, Regina, Saskatoon and Sault Ste. Marie each lost their radar control facilities.

The terminal at the airport in Quebec City will be closed in July 1994, which means that after that date, aside from the seven regional control centres, only Ottawa and Calgary will be allowed to maintain their air traffic control units.

Nearly \$1 billion has been spent as part of a plan that has created a number of security problems by making vast areas extremely vulnerable, in case of a malfunction in regional radars

Government Orders

or if regional control centres have to be evacuated in an emergency, and I will get back to this later on.

I would now like to make some comparisons to illustrate how ignorant Liberal and Reform Party members are when they claim Quebec is complaining on a full stomach.

The airport in Quebec City was built on 633 hectares of land, the airport in Halifax on 930 hectares, Winnipeg on 1504 hectares, Toronto on 1714 hectares and Edmonton on 2669 hectares.

Liberal and Reform Party members will have to admit that Quebecers paid approximately 25 per cent of the cost of these locations, which are much bigger than the site at Jean Lesage Airport in Quebec City.

These properties have cost Quebecers a lot of money. Only the airports in Newfoundland, Charlottetown, Regina, Yellowknife and Whitehorse are on sites smaller than the location in Quebec City.

If we compare air terminal areas, Quebec has 12,126 square metres, Ottawa has 18,044, Winnipeg has 24,834, Halifax has 24,870 and Edmonton 34,374. Liberal and Reform Party members will have to admit that Quebecers paid 25 per cent of the cost of the air terminals in these Canadian cities, while they have to make do with an area two to three times as small. Once again, the other provinces have cost Quebec a lot of money.

My Liberal and Reform Party colleagues might want to justify Transport Canada's neglect of Quebec, by assuming that the volume of air traffic at the airport in Quebec City is smaller than at other Canadian airports.

Here are some more figures to demonstrate the greed of Transport Canada. What we have here is the increase in trans-border and international flights from 1988 to 1992: Halifax went up 12.5 per cent; Winnipeg, 13 per cent; Calgary, 15 per cent; Quebec City, 179 p. 100.

I did not make this up. These figures are from Transport Canada.

This was about increases in volume. If we compare the flight volume in Quebec City with the volume at the other airports I mentioned, we see that these volumes are comparable. It is therefore not surprising that, with a comparable flight volume and an operating area two to three times as small, the quality of service provided by Transport Canada at Jean Lesage Airport is very poor. In fact, according to Transport Canada's own criteria, the level of service at the airport in Quebec City, rates an F, which means: system saturated, congestion and unacceptable delays. So much for the profitable federalism you are trying to sell Quebecers!

Everyone refers to Jean Lesage Airport as a bush airport. Considering the millions of dollars invested in other Canadian airports and especially in Toronto, the situation in Quebec city is

Government Orders

a disgrace. The only explanation is the irresponsible attitude, if not bad faith, of Transport Canada and the Liberal and Conservative members who sat and sit on the benches opposite.

This is one more indication that, under Canadian federalism, Liberal and Conservative members from Quebec have always done the bidding of the English Canadian majority and never had any real power. The presence of Prime Ministers from Quebec was, and still is, merely an illusion of power.

(1525)

Let us now go back to air traffic control. While the regional centres in other provinces serve, on average, some 2.6 million people, in Quebec, according to Transport Canada plans, the Montreal regional air traffic control centre will be serving a population of 7 million. This is what we mean by profitable federalism for all Canadians, except Quebecers, who are paying to provide other provinces with services they can only dream of.

We are not fooled by all this! Why is Transport Canada trying to close the Quebec City airport terminal air traffic control unit? The reason invoked is savings. However, we do not believe it, because we can prove that a series of decisions proposed by Transport Canada will require much larger investments than what is requested by the people involved in the Quebec City area. We believe that the real reason, although nobody would admit to it, is the elimination of a French-speaking air traffic control centre. Then Canada would be left with only two officially bilingual centres, one in Montreal and one in Ottawa.

Speaking of bilingualism at the Ottawa airport, how do you expect francophones of this country to feel that they get some respect, when they know that Transport Canada has been trying unsuccessfully for five years to render air traffic control bilingual at the airport of the national capital of a country which claims to have an official languages policy. This is the Prime Minister's Canada.

By the way, why was the Ottawa airport terminal air traffic control unit not transferred to Toronto, like all other units within a given region? Air traffic control in Ottawa was supposed to become bilingual, so if it were to be transferred to Toronto, could that centre be expected to become bilingual one day? The answer is obvious.

This is one more example of the so-called profitability of federalism as it applies, this time, to air transportation. Over the years, Quebecers have come to realize that Canadian federalism cannot be reformed and cannot be profitable. I should add, by the way, that if the other provinces had not come to the same conclusion, that is to say that Quebec is profitable for them, why would they be so strenuously opposed to Quebec sovereignty?

As for the possibility of the Canadian government compensating people who were about to extort millions of dollars from

Canadians, it is outrageous. If we should compensate friends of Liberal and Conservative regimes for profit losses, how should we compensate Quebecers for 125 years of federalism that kept them unemployed and dependent? This unfair treatment of the people of Quebec began in 1840, when England imposed the Act of Union between Upper and Lower Canada. In doing so, England wanted to make Canadians living in Lower Canada, French Canadians, pay part of Upper Canada's debt. Quebec has already paid its share of compensation and then some.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, clearly, I will vote against this bill.

Mr. Mark Assad (Gatineau—La Lièvre): Mr. Speaker, listening to the analysis presented by our colleague opposite, it appears to be a black and white issue. His view of history betrays prejudices which have no room in our world.

Sure, if you look at our history, you will find that not everything was perfect, but an analysis such as yours is bordering on slander. I wonder where you found all those data to reach such a negative conclusion. It is unfair. There are two sides to every story and you must take it into consideration when analyzing situations like this one, especially going all the way back to 1840.

Would you be willing to consider the benefits of our confederation, one of the best in the world? It will be difficult to convince you that, were it not for the Canadian federation, you would not have been able to maintain a second official language. It would have been impossible anywhere else but in Canada. We are the only living proof of that in the world.

The Deputy Speaker: Before recognizing the member, I would like once again to ask you to address your remarks to the Chair. It lowers the chances of friction.

(1530)

Mr. Paré: Mr. Speaker, most of the data I quoted in my speech come from reports published by Transport Canada. To compare the situation at the Quebec City Airport with that of airports in other capitals, be it in the provinces or the Northwest Territories, I relied mainly on statistics from Transport Canada. To compare the increased frequency of flights between those airports, I used Transport Canada data. To compare air traffic, again I used Transport Canada data.

Mr. Speaker, Quebecers have studied history. We may not have had the same history books as our colleagues opposite, however, I can assure you that, in the next few months, we will be prepared for the upcoming debate on nationhood for Quebec. Rest assured that the system has given us all the arguments we need to prove what I just started demonstrating. It is only a matter of time. We only have to read the official reports published by the federal government and Statistics Canada, to find the necessary data. We will make them public and circulate

Government Orders

them among Quebecers, who will, no doubt, come to the proper conclusion.

The Deputy Speaker: I inform the House that, after five hours of debate, we will now proceed to the ten-minute allotted time period for speeches without questions or comments. The member for Chicoutimi.

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the amendment to Bill C-22.

First of all, I would like to briefly review the sequence of events. In 1989, Paxport Inc. spontaneously submitted a proposal for the privatization of Terminals 1 and 2. The government of the day nixed the idea. That was in 1989. However, in October of 1990, the government invited the private sector to submit proposals for the redevelopment of Terminals 1 and 2. In 1991, Terminal 3 opened for business under the management of Claridge Holdings Inc. On March 11, 1992, the government formally issued requests for proposals for the privatization of Terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson. This preceded the decision on the proposed expansion of the runway system at the airport. Only a one-phase process was called for, involving no prequalification, whereas the bidding for the privatization of Terminal 3 involved a two-stage process, initially soliciting interested parties and selecting a short list of bidders, and then encouraging detailed submissions.

As for the competition process itself, the Nixon report states the following on page 2, and I quote: "The Request for Proposals did not set out many of the fundamental aspects of the proposed development, but left these to bidders to define for themselves". Therefore, it was left to bidders to make projections on passenger traffic at the airport. Yet, data on passenger traffic is critical to determining the pace and scope of the redevelopment. With a project of this magnitude, how could it have been left to the bidders to define such crucial parameters?

Moreover, only 90 days were provided for responses. This is an unusually short deadline, considering that we are dealing with a highly complex, long-term contract covering a period of 57 years. What reason could there be for setting such a tight deadline if not to give an advantage to certain companies, such as Paxport which had submitted an earlier privatization plan in 1989, and Claridge which was already managing Terminal 3 at Pearson? In the end, the government received only two bids, one from Claridge and one from Paxport.

On December 7, 1992, the Paxport proposal was selected as the best of the two bids. The company was required to demonstrate by February 15, 1993 that its proposal was financially viable.

(1535)

As it could not do so nor, according to its president, obtain the necessary capital from other sources, Paxport and Claridge established T1 T2 Limited Partnership less than two months

later. In fact, Paxport created a joint venture with its only competitor.

Why did the government then in office award a 57-year contract worth hundreds of millions of dollars to a financially-troubled company that was also close to the party? All interested parties in the Toronto region knew at the time that Paxport was in financial difficulty. The government cannot claim it acted in good faith.

As you may recall, one of the reasons Paxport was chosen was to encourage healthy competition between the manager of Terminals 1 and 2 and the manager of Terminal 3.

On August 30, 1993, the Minister of Transport announced a general agreement between the two parties. He promised that a final agreement would be signed in the fall.

On September 8, 1993, the Government of Canada called an election. The Nixon report summarizes the events as follows: "Prior to the conclusion of the legal agreement the Leader of the Opposition (now the Prime Minister) indicated clearly that parties proceeding to conclude this transaction did so at their own risk and that a new government"—that is, the people opposite—"would not hesitate to pass legislation to block the privatization of terminals 1 and 2 if the transaction was not in the public interest". The legal agreement was signed nevertheless.

Under the pressure of public opinion, the government ordered a review of this highly controversial deal and the Nixon report was published on November 29, 1993. On December 3, 1993, the Prime Minister announced the cancellation of the agreement.

The Nixon report outlines the process and argues that it strongly favoured one of the proposals since Paxport had already submitted a privatization proposal.

The report itself describes in plain language the abuses that were committed in this deal: "Other management and construction firms not having been involved in the maneuvering preceding the RFP had no chance to come up to speed and submit a bid in the short time permitted".

Other companies should have been invited to bid and should have been given a reasonable deadline. No prequalification financial analysis was required in this request for proposals.

Finally, the Conservative government signed the contract in the final stretch of an election campaign. Allow me to quote from the report. "It is a well-known and carefully observed tradition that when governments dissolve Parliament they must accept a restricted power of decision during the election period". The report concludes that the privatization process was far from promoting the interest of the public to the fullest.

Government Orders

We demand a royal commission of inquiry. The Nixon investigation was conducted in private. In the red book, the Liberals say that people are irritated because key parts of public business are conducted behind closed door.

The government keeps harping on about transparency. Here is a chance to show us they believe in their principles and can apply them responsibly.

A government that preaches transparency has to shed some light on this whole issue. Taxpayers have the right to know and to be provided with inside information on these transactions. The government cancelled the privatization plan, yet this bill provides for compensation, although the parties were aware of a possible contract cancellation.

(1540)

The Crown does not have to compensate investors for miscalculations. Clause 10, paragraph 2, reads as follows:

No amount is payable under an agreement entered into under this section in relation to (a) any loss of profit, or (b) any fee paid for the purpose of lobbying a public office holder, within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the *Lobbyists Registration Act*, in connection with any agreement.

It has to be stronger than that. Public funds are at stake.

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the doings of some politicians in this country. More particularly, I intend to denounce the almost incestuous practices which are part of the culture of some people who try every day to influence government decisions, using all the means at their disposal, from childhood friendships to services rendered, including election organizing and political party financing.

These people try to change the normal course of events, to trade the public interest for private gain and, sadly, to relegate to the background parliamentarians' role as their constituents' elected representatives. I therefore speak on this bitter taste left by Bill C-22, the uncertainties surrounding the privatization of Pearson Airport in which lobbyists, politicians, former senior civil servants and friends of the government seem to be involved.

The Pearson Airport issue is worth considering, beyond Bill C-22. The government is wrong in refusing to clear up the whole matter. By simply clamping a lid on it while clause 10 would pay generous compensation set in secret and at its discretion, without consulting parliamentarians, the government is showing the people of Quebec and Canada its true colours, while its red book talked about a code of ethics for lobbying.

Has the powerful lobby around it made the government change its mind? If not, as I hope, the government has the ideal issue before it to show its good will, to set a new path in the

conduct of affairs of state and to give back to our fellow citizens a minimum of trust in their political leaders.

At a time when polls and all opinion surveys agree that the people mistrust and doubt their political leaders and hold them in low esteem, is it not worth confronting the old demons which haunt the halls and corridors of government and giving the people what they want: honesty, openness and the plain simple truth? The Pearson Airport issue is perfect for this exercise and I am convinced that, in a free vote, parliamentarians would listen to their conscience and go for transparency, legitimacy and restraint.

The government has the duty to hold a public inquiry on the privatization of that airport. By refusing to do so and not following the suggestion made by the Bloc Québécois, the government would not fulfil its responsibilities; it would renege on its election promises, and it would in fact endorse methods used by Conservatives. The government would merely replace a few beneficiaries.

As Mr. Nixon mentioned in his report, the privatization of Pearson Airport is an obvious example of political interference, irregularities and maneuvering. This is why, if the government has nothing to hide or to protect, the issue must be thoroughly examined and must stand as an example to ensure that such a situation does not occur again.

(1545)

In 1987, when the federal government implemented a new management policy regarding Canadian airports, it did so mainly to involve local authorities in the development of airport sites. This was the case for Vancouver and Montreal, among others, where non-profit corporations manage airport facilities. In Toronto, the situation was very different, perhaps because Pearson Airport was the most profitable in Canada. In a context of freer trade, which is a sacred cow, the thinking goes like this: Why should the government keep a profitable venture when it can look after so many non-profitable ones?

Far from promoting public interest, the transaction took place in the midst of an election campaign, for the benefit of the only two bidders, former competitors now united to reap the profits. Paxport Inc., whose bid had been approved by the government without any prior financial analysis, was not able to come up with the funds necessary to conclude the transaction involving terminals 1 and 2. Paxport joins forces with Claridge Inc., which already controls terminal 3 via Pearson Development Corporation.

This merger produces T1 T2 Partnership. And there you have it! Pearson, which is a very profitable airport, is completely privatized for the benefit of a single group. The financial details of the deal are kept secret, but when reviewed by Robert Nixon and other Ontario investigators, they do not seem to be compatible with public policy. How many millions of dollars are we

Government Orders

talking about? We have to know in order to determine how much we are ready to pay to show our appreciation to government supporters. It is in the best interest of Canadians to know these things, because it is their money the government is squandering and wasting away on such schemes.

It is also in the interest of the public to find out who took part in those deals and how they managed to come up with such irregular and intricate deals. This information will only come out of an in-depth inquiry, which the government must set up.

Right now, we only know who the lead actors in the Pearson deal were and notice that they all are closely linked either to the Conservative Party or the Liberal Party. For instance, Claridge Properties Inc., belongs to Charles Bronfman, who is well-known for his ties to the Liberal Party of Canada. Senator Léo Kolber sat on the board of directors of Claridge when the deal was signed and, during the election campaign, he held a party at \$1,000 a plate, which Mr. Bronfman and the current Prime Minister, among others, attended.

Herb Metcalf, a lobbyist for Claridge, is a former political organizer for Mr. Chrétien, while Ramsey Withers, deputy minister of Transport at the time of the request for proposals process concerning Terminal 3, is another lobbyist well-known for his close ties to the current prime minister.

At Claridge, to strike a balance between red and blue, there were also Conservative lobbyists involved in this deal: Pat MacAdam, a college friend of Brian Mulroney, Bill Fox, former press secretary to and personal friend of Brian Mulroney, and finally Harry Near, a long-time party activist.

Paxport Inc. also has some Conservative friends even though it reportedly also maintains close ties with the Liberal Party of Canada. There is Don Matthew, former chairman of Brian Mulroney's leadership campaign, former chairman of the Conservative Party and of the party's fund-raising campaign. Another former chief of staff of Brian Mulroney, Fred Doucet, acted as a Conservative lobbyist for Paxport while the consortium with Claridge was being planned. Other lobbyists, like Bill Neville, Hugh Riopelle and John Legate, are all known to have easy access to Brian Mulroney Cabinet members.

Given this information and all the disturbing matters raised in the Nixon report, the government simply cannot brush aside this issue, as it is trying to do with Bill C-22.

(1550)

In his report, Mr. Nixon talks about political manipulation, which is a serious allegation. Will we encourage this by handing to the minister, under the cover of section 10, a blank cheque for

the payment of compensations as he sees fit? The Nixon Report indicates that financiers and lobbyists tried to put one over on us, the taxpayers of Canada and of Quebec, with this project. Will we help them to con us even more?

The answer is no, and I will conclude with this. Taxpayers have already paid too much, and they need to know why. Thus, we must reject Bill C-22 and soon proceed with a royal commission of inquiry.

Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau): Mr. Speaker, lobbying has evolved considerably over the last few years. The real transformation came about in the early 70s. Before then, Canadians thought that lobbying was virtually non-existent and this subject was seldom discussed. However, in the early 80s, lobbying became part of the federal decision-making process.

In its famous red book, the Liberal Party talks about making government more transparent in order to restore public confidence. However, it is mentioned in the Nixon report that some politicians showed an enormous interest in the Pearson Airport transaction. In his report, Robert Nixon states, and I quote: "My review has left me with one conclusion, to leave in place an inadequate contract arrived at with such a flawed process and under the shadow of possible political manipulation is unacceptable".

I will now summarize the evolution of lobbying before telling you about the real players in the Pearson Airport deal.

In view of the recent death of Richard Nixon, I do not need to remind members of the Watergate scandal in the 1970s, a scandal which shook the confidence of our neighbours to the south in their political system. Need I remind members also of the Canadian Pacific scandal in the 1870s, one of the first political scandals to take place in Canada. That scandal was about making donations to the election fund. In fact, Sir Alexander Mackenzie had made honesty the theme of his Liberal election campaign, and in the process brought down the government of Sir John A. Macdonald.

Later on, under the Conservative government, draftsmen began to work on a bill stating the basic principles of a lobbyists registration system. Its foundation was Bill C-82, now entitled "Lobbyists Registration Act", afterward referred to as R.S., 1985, c. 44, assented to September 13, 1988 and in force September 30, 1989. That act was subsequently amended by Bill C-76, passed February 22, 1993.

Let us ask ourselves: What is really a lobbyist? A lobbyist can be defined as an individual or a corporation which, for payment or other compensation, makes representations for a client to ministers or officials. The basic principles can be summed up

Government Orders

this way: public access to government; transparency of dealings with governments; simplicity of the system's administration.

The Ninth Report to the House of Commons by the Standing Committee on Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Government Operations, tabled in 1993, stated and I quote: "When lobbying is conducted away from public view, there is a greater opportunity for decisions that undermine the public interest".

(1555)

Thus, lobbyists are required to file returns with registrars. There are now different categories of lobbyists.

First, there are professional lobbyists who, for payment and on behalf of a client, undertake to arrange a meeting with a public office holder in an attempt to influence him or her on legislative proposals, on the passage or defeat of a bill or on the awarding of monetary grants or government contracts. These lobbyists are subject to very strict regulations.

And then, there are the other lobbyists. They are employees who, as a significant part of their duties, communicate with public office holders. Let us note that the registry of lobbyists may be consulted by the public. This second category of lobbyists is a problem because they are not subject to the same disclosure procedures.

In 1993, the standing committee recommended the elimination of distinctions between different categories concerning mandatory disclosure. It is crucial that we support those recommendations by the standing committee, since many lobbyists do not abide by the law. An anti-avoidance rule is needed. Obviously, staunch opposition is to be expected from many lobbyists.

The concept of openness should also apply to the financing of political parties. Incidentally, on March 13, my colleague, the hon. member for Richelieu, introduced a motion to restrict donations by individuals to \$5,000 a year and to eliminate all corporate contributions.

That motion reminded us that the real bosses are the voters and not the big backers.

The hon. member for Richelieu went on to say: "Although the proportion has changed, the amount provided is still significant and a potential source of conflict. Since the reform of 1974 and the ensuing evolution of fundraising, small contributions from private individuals account for a larger share of the financing of political parties. Such democratization is very much due to the institution of a federal tax credit on political contributions, which was adopted in 1974".

Mr. Speaker, some people may think the current legislation is an adequate means to limit influence peddling and that there is no need to impose a ceiling on donations. However, the accusations of influence peddling made in the last ten years against members of the Senate or the House of Commons tend to prove otherwise.

More and more, Canadians and Quebecers are demanding openness. This disproportionate influence must stop and the people must regain control over our electoral system. Quebec's legislation is a model for all aspects of the electoral system. Popular financing and the requirement to disclose the source and amount of contributions are an integral part of Quebecers' customs.

The last point I want to mention is the recommendation of a code of ethics for elected representative and senior managers, which would allow for more transparency in the registration of lobbyists. This recommendation leads me to the Pearson Airport affair.

Many players are involved and the two principal political parties were largely implicated in this scheming. We find the following companies: Claridge Properties Inc., Paxport Inc., Pearson Development Corporation, and names like Peter Coughlin, Senator Leo Kolber, Herb Metcalfe, Ray Hession, Don Matthews, Otto Jelinek and Fred Doucet, to name only a few.

(1600)

So it is not without reason that Robert Nixon, Jean Chrétien's investigator, recommended cancelling the contract last November. Having named all these players, we have to conclude that a code of ethics for elected representatives and senior managers is essential.

Given all the disturbing facts of the Pearson Airport affair, it is of the utmost importance to ask the Prime Minister to appoint a royal commission of inquiry to get to the bottom of the dealings of those involved. Transparency must prevail if Canadian democracy is to regain its true meaning.

Mr. Maurice Godin (Châteauguay): Mr. Speaker, today's debate challenges all our political morals, our habits, our customs out of this Chamber, our relations behind the political scene and the influence peddling that usually remain hidden from the public. The study of Bill C-22 provides a unique opportunity to ask ourselves about the interaction that may exist between the political authority of a government and the economic power of large corporations.

We have before us a holding which resorted to the most extreme schemes to acquire terminals 1 and 2 of Pearson Airport in Toronto. The report by Robert Nixon, who was responsible for examining the deal, is very critical in that regard. Corporate transactions, transfers of senior departmental officers, exceptional tendering procedures, no requirement for a prior financial analysis, clauses benefitting the airport at the expense of others, everything led the investigator to believe that such an inadequate contract signed in such an irregular way was unacceptable.

One can understand Airport Development Corporation, Claridge Holdings Inc., Paxport Inc. and their consortium T1 T2 Limited Partnership. Pearson Airport was a jewel for developers in the air transport industry. With 20 million passengers each year, an area covering 1 792 hectares, three terminals, 15 000 employees, and 800 airplanes landing or taking off every day for

Government Orders

300 destinations in 60 countries, Pearson airport is the hub of air transport in Canada.

According to a Transport Canada study dating from 1987, Pearson airport has direct economic spin-offs amounting to \$4 billion for the Ontario economy and it employs 56 000 people. Yet, not long ago, it was Montreal that was the hub of air traffic.

The federal government is responsible for major changes that have affected the location of the poles of economic activity. Quebec has long been suffering from federal interventionism within its economy. Pearson airport is benefitting from the side effects of one of these federal interventions, namely the building of Mirabel International Airport.

The Mirabel decision had horrible consequences for Quebec in several regards. Initially, the idea was to meet a demand that Dorval airport could no longer satisfy. Why not stick to consolidating Dorval infrastructures into one modern efficient airport that would have confirmed Montreal as the hub for the next 50 years? No. Politicians at the time agreed to build a second airport in Mirabel, 40 kilometres from Montreal and about a hundred kilometres from Ottawa, at a spot Highway 13 has not even reached yet.

Meanwhile, Quebec representatives were thinking about locating that airport in the Montreal–Sherbrooke–Quebec triangle in order to serve adequately the metropolitan area, as well as the old capital, while opening up, through Sherbrooke, to the big market of the East coast, with several million people. The federal government refused to listen and, while Quebec was pursuing its actions and its consultations, the federal government made a unilateral decision on March 27, 1969. Its airport would be located in Mirabel to serve, it was claimed, both the federal capital, Ottawa, and the Montreal metropolis.

(1605)

The federal government, with our money, was making a poisoned gift to Quebec. What a gift. It was depriving us of 95,856 acres of one of the best farming land. But most of all, Mirabel airport would gradually cause the Montreal area to lose its status as the hub of international air traffic in favour of Pearson airport in Toronto. While Mirabel was being built, the federal government was giving permission to all international airline companies to use the airport in Toronto, which could then provide all these services and keep expanding in one single airport.

A plot to move this economic activity 500 kilometres to the West could not have been more successful. This federal intervention resulted in a significant loss of jobs for Quebec. And who paid the bill? Quebecers themselves, with the taxes they are sending to Ottawa.

This kind of deplorable intervention by the federal against Quebec's interests is not the first and will not be the last, as long as Quebec remains in this federation. Interventionism has also affected all our oil and petro-chemical industry. In 1957, the Diefenbaker government established a Royal Commission on Energy chaired by Henry Borden. Of the six commissioners, Jean-Louis Lévesque, from Montreal, was the only one representing Quebec. The mandate of the Borden Commission was to examine all issues relating to energy, such as size of the domestic market, security of oil supply, the export volume and price.

The commission was anxious to develop this sector of the economy to become less dependent on other countries and at the same time reach the U.S. market. There was more to it, however. A jealous eye was cast on the oil refineries in Montreal, which some people wanted to see transferred to Ontario. The commission heard representations from independent producers who were in favour of building a pipeline from Edmonton to Montreal, so that Alberta crude would displace imported Venezuelan crude being refined in Montreal. However, Ontario was not really interested in this pipeline or western natural gas but in Montreal's major refineries.

Once again, as in so many other cases, the influence of the lobbyists was decisive. The project was opposed by the major oil multinationals. Finally, the commission recommended drawing a demarcation line along the Ottawa Valley. It recommended securing all markets to the west of this line for producers in Alberta. The federal government implemented this recommendation in 1961. Since the pipeline went to Toronto, Sarnia was born. The next step was to extend the pipeline to Montreal, and after taking away our refineries, English Canada was to take over the Montreal market.

We owe the disappearance of an entire petrochemical industry in East Montreal to Canada's national policy initiatives. Richard Séguin, one of our great singers from Quebec—the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry referred to him on February 9 as a great artist—tells us in one of his songs about the incredible human cost of the disappearance of East Montreal's refineries. At the end of his song he says to his father: “J’vais prier pour toi”.

Another example, equally important, is the St. Lawrence Seaway. We all know that this access way to the Great Lakes, built with our taxes, sounded the death knell of the Port of Montreal. It contributed substantially towards shifting certain activities towards the West, while destroying Montreal's position as a transit zone for goods, services and people. We could have made Montreal the biggest interior port in the world, a real international hub.

Government Orders

Today, a special committee is considering the future of the Seaway, but we are stuck with it, and it will probably cost too much to undo.

(1610)

As an economic activity, transportation is central to many other activities. This is why maritime, rail, pipeline and air transportation play a role in the development capabilities of other economic activities. You can sense the appeal of that. This is clearly the reason why big investors, lobbyists and friends of the government are doing their utmost to lay their hands on this sector. Wolves follow their prey, and if we are not vigilant, private interest will prevail over public interest.

I will conclude by saying that for too long our taxes have been used against us in this federation. We no longer want our taxes to be used to enrich the friends of the government, we want them to be used to reduce the debt. The financing of our party, the Bloc Québécois, is a model to follow. Money comes from individuals, not from large companies or interest groups seeking favours by giving money to the main parties, irrespective of their leanings. We do not owe anyone anything, our hands are not tied.

We are here to defend Quebec's interests, and they include a sound management of public funds. This is why the Bloc Québécois is asking for a royal commission of inquiry. While waiting for Quebec sovereignty, we will try to improve Canada. Be assured that we are going to try to clean up its act.

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, several questions have been raised since yesterday regarding the famous Bill C-22, an Act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport.

Several questions, to the total amazement of our friends opposite, had escaped them, not all of them though. Some Liberal members are more lucid than others, such as the member for York South—Weston, as demonstrated on page 3539 of yesterday's official report. I quote what he said:

I would submit that it would be unconscionable if they were paid any money whatsoever not only because of what was said during the election campaign, and what happened behind the scenes, but also because of the very clear statement and the request for proposals that was put out in March 1992. At paragraph (8.6.3.), it says this. Again Mr. Bronfman and all those who were participating in this contract were well aware of what was in the request for proposals.

It said: "All costs and expenses incurred by proponents relating to proposals will be borne by the proponents. The government is not liable to pay such costs and expenses or to reimburse or to compensate proponents in any manner whatsoever for such costs and expenses under any circumstances, including the rejection of any or all proposals and the cancellation of the project".

This paragraph shows very clearly that clause 10 of Bill C-22 makes no sense whatsoever, unless the minister, the Minister of Transport in this case, has to, heaven forbid, reward friends of his party.

Liberal members are surprised by our relentless attacks on this bill but what has happened to their commitment to transparency, now that they are six months into their mandate?

Among the promises which filled a whole chapter of the red book, what has happened to the ethics counsellor in charge of advising ministers, MPs and other public officials? The government could really use somebody like that, these days. What progress has been made in the drafting of a code of conduct for Parliament? It seems to me that it has fallen by the wayside.

What has happened to the new rules regarding lobbying? The Liberals will undoubtedly answer that it is a priority for them, but if we were to make a list of the priorities they have been talking about since January 17, I would feel sorry for issues that did not make it in their eyes because, for this government, everything is a priority, or rather, nothing is.

(1615)

With respect to the new lobbying rules, we learned only yesterday from a report in *La Presse* that the federal government had decided to extend by one year very lucrative advertising contracts prior to establishing its new lobbying rules.

Clearly, there must be some mistake, Mr. Speaker. And yet, the government is now giving us the impression of taking care of its friends, before passing legislation to protect them, as I just mentioned. Perhaps we are mistaken, but the perception is rather different. And perception is the key to whether or not the public trusts the government. In this particular case, positions are relatively clear.

With your permission, I would like to quote the hon. member for Red Deer who stated the following yesterday, which appears on page 3529 of Hansard. I quote:

—I certainly agree with that. I would agree wholeheartedly with the member's comments that they know better and they obviously should not be expecting any compensation.

As you can see, I have introduced quotes from Liberal and Reform members who agree with our amendments, but none from Bloc members.

It is clear that Bloc members stand solidly behind this amendment, as do Reform members and even a few Liberals. Therefore, they have no business saying that we are being paranoid and that we are nitpicking.

Not so very long ago, in addition to the member for York South—Weston, the Minister of Immigration himself, the President of the Treasury Board and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry spoke out on this agreement. Even the

Government Orders

Minister of Transport said that the federal government was considering setting up a royal commission of inquiry into the privatization of Pearson Airport. This fact was reported in *La Presse* on November 29 last. The Minister of Transport himself suggested that such a commission be established.

Why then are our colleagues opposite so surprised when barely a few months ago, they shared our position on this issue? Could it be because the members on this side have not changed their minds and are not in the habit of doing so every few months?

Why did we not change our minds? Why are we asking for a royal commission of inquiry to save millions of dollars, perhaps hundreds of millions in the long run, to the taxpayers, but above all to clarify whether the government's hands are clean? That is the whole question.

Why is it that, while the Nixon report, which surprisingly enough took only 30 days to produce, states that there has been wrongdoing in connection with lobbying, it gives no specific example of such practice?

Also, why compensate people for costs incurred in such instances? My mother used to tell me, as a child, that honesty pays. Was she right or not?

Why does the government continue to refuse to release the privatization contract concerning Pearson Airport? There are many unanswered questions, are there not? Many questions that will do nothing to improve the Liberal Party's credibility rating, if it has any credibility left.

The reason we are opposing Bill C-22 and asking the government, for its own good and in the interest of the Canadian population as a whole, to shed light onto these obscure dealings is to get all these questions answered. Of course, that is if the government has nothing to hide; otherwise, its reluctance is understandable.

In closing, let me repeat the amendment moved by the Bloc Québécois:

"This House declines to give second reading to Bill C-22, An Act respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport, because the principle of the Bill is flawed due to the fact that it contains no provisions aimed at making the work done by lobbyists more transparent."

We also support the amendment to amendment moved by the Reform Party to add "in Canada" after the word "lobbyists".

(1620)

Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have been doing for two days, I want to speak on the shady privatization of Pearson Airport. It is obviously a question of money but it is also a matter of principle concerning the

very foundation of the federal system, namely the financing of political parties.

When stories such as this still make headlines in 1994, we wonder if democracy has made progress or if we are still facing the dubious tactics of the good old 1940s. Now, my dear friends, Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate to you a story my mother and father told me more than once. My father, an important lumber dealer and a highly-regarded Liberal organizer—back in the 1940s, of course—who raised enormous amounts of money for the Liberal Party, had the opportunity to acquire machinery no longer needed after World War II, such as tracked vehicles and tanks. He leased flat cars from Canadian Pacific in Toronto and he was always telling me what a good deal it was. He told me: "I sold one and all the others were free and clear". He was of course a friend of the government. All his friends in the community tried to buy some but they were all gone, as friends of the government had bought everything they could lay their hands on at ridiculous prices.

Before the last election, I was living quietly in my little community and looking from afar at what politicians with various levels of credibility were trying to do. Sometimes they did well, other times not so well. Political criticisms and analyses always apply to what the media choose to report. We are not so gullible as to believe that newspapers are always unbiased and always report all the facts. Not everything should be taken for granted.

So, the media report horror stories suggesting that the government is not doing its job. We object and say it makes no sense, but, deep down, we wonder what is true. Barring some exceptions, nothing is black or white. For example, there was the Malaroi case, where virtue was pitted against bureaucracy, and where my colleague from Québec-Est spared no effort. Normally, sensationalism is profitable, not subtleties. As to the case before us today, even if we were not in the House when the story first broke, we realize that the more we learn from the media, the less we understand.

Even if all members in the House know the story, I will summarize it briefly as I, the member for Frontenac, see it.

The contract to privatize Pearson Airport was signed on October 7, 1993. As we all remember, that was only 18 days before the defeat of the Conservative government. And in Quebec, like elsewhere, polls were conducted almost every day. And the closer we got to October 25, the lower the Conservatives were in those polls. Time was of the essence; this could not wait until after the election; the Conservatives were no longer in the picture. You remember as well as I do what happened. Two bidders fought hard to get a contract worth several million dollars. To succeed, the two finally merged and got the contract on October 7.

Government Orders

(1625)

During the last election campaign, the Liberals, and particularly those from the Toronto area, promised to cancel that contract. These same Liberals are now attempting to cancel the contract, but they are also trying to compensate the promoters. It must be pointed out that, under Bill C-22, the government does not have to compensate these people but the legislation authorizes—and this is what I strongly object to—the minister to make certain payments to promoters, at his discretion. Let me remind you that, according to recent polls, politicians are far from being popular.

When I meet people from my region, they say: “You are O.K., but we do not trust the others. Try not to stay in Ottawa too long, otherwise you will turn out like them”. My colleague for Terrebonne says that politicians are less popular than used car dealers. We do not give rebates. When such sordid stories are found out, how can you possibly hope to improve the image of politicians in Quebec? When the reputation of one of us is tarnished, we all pay a price.

The first thing that comes to mind is the fact that there is no smoke without fire. If everything is honest and transparent in a contract, why be so secretive? Why not appoint a royal commission of inquiry? If the Liberal government opposite does not have anything to hide, such a measure would settle the issue and the Conservatives might be the only ones in hot water. But the Liberal Party is afraid to set up a royal commission of inquiry with the power to question all the players in the Pearson Airport saga.

What seems contradictory at first glance is that a contract signed under suspicious circumstances by the Conservatives is not being denounced by the Liberals, who now form the government and have the necessary tools to shed some light on this transaction. Yet, during the election campaign the Liberals kept referring to the importance of transparency.

(1630)

When I taught my ecology students the transparency of water, I told them: “It is like when you look down into a lake and you see the bottom”. We say that water is transparent when we see through it. Can we say that we see through the Liberal government today? I am asking them.

Yet, in the red book, it is all there in black and white: the government is committed to more transparency. It has been six months and we are still waiting for this same transparency. This would have been the opportunity, I think, to prove that it was the transparency of a notion that was dear to them and not a media show.

Unfortunately, I was able to deliver only one part of my speech. If one of my colleagues would want to take it, I could have it passed on to him or her. I thank you for your patience, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Yves Rocheleau (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take my turn in this debate on Bill C-22 respecting certain agreements concerning the redevelopment and operation of Terminals 1 and 2 at Lester B. Pearson International Airport in Toronto.

I assume that, after listening to all the speeches we have had so far, you have realized that the very serious reservations of the Official Opposition about this bill concern section 10, which reads as follows:

10. (1) If the Minister considers it appropriate to do so, the Minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into agreements on behalf of Her Majesty to provide for the payment of such amounts as the Minister considers appropriate in connection with the coming into force of this Act, subject to the terms and conditions that the Minister considers appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I imagine you have also understood that the opposition approves of cancelling this highly improper contract because there are many reasons for doing so. I became convinced after reading the Nixon report several times from start to finish. I found out why, although Mr. Nixon is as Liberal as they come—a very well connected Liberal who is very close to the circles we are talking about, including the friends of the Prime Minister—why his intellectual honesty and his sense of responsibility forced him to use the word “maneuverings”.

After carefully reading his report, one realizes why he had to use this word, which could be translated in French as “*magouillage*”. The *Petit Robert* defines the word “*magouille*” as follows: “*Manœuvres, tractations douteuses ou malhonnêtes*”. The English definition is: “Maneuverings, questionable practices or shady dealings”. So this is pretty strong language.

I thought I would simply bring to the attention of this House a few passages from the Nixon report which are self-explanatory and which illustrate the murky and shocking aspects of this affair, and as some people are saying, we may need a royal commission of inquiry to determine whether bad faith was involved.

For instance, on page 5, there is a short paragraph that gives us an indication of the maneuvering, and a theme that runs through the entire Nixon report, and I quote:

In the calculation of gross revenue (on which rent will be based), there are 10 deductions which I am advised are unusual in commercial transactions.

Mr. Nixon also said that T1 T2 Limited Partnership, which would manage the airport, is a multi-purpose rather than a sole-purpose corporation.

The lease does not restrict the freedom of T1 T2 Limited Partnership to carry out an undertaking other than the management, operation and maintenance of Terminals 1 and 2. Therefore, the financial health of T1 T2 Limited Partnership could be adversely affected by the financial failure of a venture which has nothing to do with the management, operation and maintenance of Terminals 1 and 2.

The report also says, with respect to air traffic:

Government Orders

The Government of Canada undertakes not to permit development of any airport facility within 75 km of the T1 T2 complex that would reduce passenger traffic at Pearson by more than 1.5 million persons per year, until the volume of passenger traffic at Pearson reaches 33 million people per year. Present projections predict this number to be reached by approximately the year 2005. If the Government of Canada chooses to engage in such proscribed development—

(1635)

—we can see the manoeuvring, the understanding which exists among people who are close to the government, have undue influence and who may even, and we will see this later on, condition and intimidate senior officials—

—it must either pay economic loss to the Tenant

—we know who that is—

—or provide the Tenant with access to Area 4 at Pearson, an area explicitly excluded from

the RFP.

Another interesting and revealing point.

About the end of September 1993, T1 T2 Limited Partnership represented to the Government that it had entered into 10 contracts with non-arm's length parties—

—in other words, parties connected with and involved in the project—

—prior to October 7, 1993. One of these was said to be a construction management agreement with Matthews Construction. This information was not publicly disclosed.

The point is that Matthews is directly concerned and involved in the whole transaction and was closely connected with the activities of Paxport.

The report also says the following:

After permitting the privatization of Terminal 3 at Pearson, the process to privatize Terminals 1 and 2, the remainder of the largest airport in Canada, is inconsistent—

—this is fundamental—

—with the major thrust of the policy of the Government of Canada announced in 1987.

It was on the basis of this policy that the offer made in 1989–90 by the same parties was turned down by the government. With the passage of time and as a result of intense lobbying, the government became very interested in 1993, and we know what happened.

Another consideration in the Nixon report, a very important one this time, concerns the time frame the parties were allowed to submit their proposals.

The RFP having as it did only a single stage and requiring proponents to engage in project definition as well as proposal submission and, all within a 90 day time frame—

—we are talking about an investment of \$700 million, and people are being given 90 days to position themselves.

—created, in my view, an enormous advantage to a proponent—

—Paxport—

—an enormous advantage—

—this is the maneuvering—

—that had previously submitted a proposal for privatizing and developing T1 and T2.

This was referred to earlier. It was the proposal turned down in 1989.

Other management and construction firms not having been involved in the maneuvering—

—this is Nixon speaking—

—preceding the RFP had no chance to come up to speed and submit a bid in the short time permitted. With little construction and development occurring—

—by honest people—considering the state of the economy in Toronto as well—

—others should have been sought out and given reasonable time to participate.

Further, it is significant that no financial pre-qualification was required in this competition. For a project of this magnitude the selection of a “best overall acceptable proposal”—

—that was the basic criterion—

—without complete assurance of financial viability seems to me to have been highly unusual and unwise.

Finally, the concluding of this transaction at Prime Ministerial direction in the midst of an election campaign where this issue was controversial, in my view flies in the face of normal and honourable democratic practice. It is a well known and carefully observed tradition that when governments dissolve Parliament they must accept a restricted power of decision during the election period.

There is no question that a financial deal of this magnitude—\$700 million—which would have privatized a public asset for 57 years should not have been signed at that time.

(1640)

I will end with one of the conclusions of Mr. Nixon, who believed that the process: “to privatize and redevelop Terminals 1 and 2 at Pearson fell far short of maximizing the public interest”. Therefore, considering all that surrounded the “negotiation”, it is imperative—and one is astonished that the report does not make any recommendation to that effect, and that the Prime minister who preaches openness in the red book has not taken any action in that direction—that we have an inquiry that can get to the bottom of that shocking event that is so damaging to the reputation of Canada, a country known for the quality of its institutions.

Mr. Paul Mercier (Blainville—Deux-Montagnes): Mr. Speaker, with clause 10 of Bill C-22, the government is in fact inviting the friends of the system—Conservatives and Liberals united as brothers this time and drooling in anticipation—to grab a piece of Pearson, a particularly juicy pie. Not only is the bill conveniently unclear about the way this pie is to be shared, but it does not explain how Pearson Airport is to be managed and what its place will be in the Canadian network. It is this latter

Government Orders

and no doubt less scandalous, but nevertheless important aspect of the bill that I would like to address today.

It may be a good idea to show this airport's importance with regard to air transport, and in particular in relation to Montreal's two airports.

Pearson and Mirabel-Dorval play a major function in air transportation in Canada. Competition between them can be beneficial, provided they compete on equal terms, which is not the case. The Mirabel-Dorval airport complex has a major handicap. If I wanted to make a case against the government based on assumptions and not facts, I would suspect it of, if not keeping an old wound open, at least painstakingly not helping it heal. Its persistent failure to act on this issue is really incomprehensible. I am referring to the lack of a high-speed link between Mirabel and Dorval as well as the totally inappropriate linkage of the airport complex with the road and railway system. First, a few facts.

Dorval is the point of origin of all regular flights within Canada and to the United States, while Mirabel is the boarding point for all other destinations. A passenger travelling from Quebec City to Paris will have to transfer. That is normal, but what is not quite as normal is the fact that this person has to ride, from Dorval to Mirabel, in a shuttle travelling on Highways 15, 640, and 13 and then on Mirabel Blvd. Commuting time: 40 minutes, plus waiting time. It is absolutely absurd.

To remedy the problem, it was suggested that Mirabel be closed down and all flights shifted to Dorval. What a brilliant idea! You eliminate one of the airports, thereby eliminating the need to connect them. Rather than curing the disease, it would be simpler to get rid of the patient!

A simple solution would be to extend Highway 13 another 25 kilometres to the north. It was agreed a long time ago that the costs—that is to say \$78 million in 1988 dollars—were to be shared equally by Ottawa and Quebec, but nothing has been done since. Of course, for a long time, the two governments accused one another of refusing to co-operate, stating that a cheque could be made the following morning if only the other side would stop dragging its feet. I guess that is what you call profitable federalism!

(1645)

Mr. Speaker, the sad thing is that, since then, cost estimates have risen by \$50 million because of the procrastination. This will certainly not help break the impasse. The fact remains that there is a serious need to extend Highway 13 from Boisbriand to Mirabel Airport.

However, what Mirabel needs to become a world class airport is a rail link.

This unacceptable oversight could be corrected while at the same time another problem which is somewhat less frustrating could be solved. As everyone knows, most developed countries already have a high-speed train, an ultramodern means of transportation. In this as in so many other areas, Canada is lagging behind for lack of vision. The Minister of Transport is waiting for another in an endless series of reports on the Quebec City-Windsor HST project before giving consideration to eventually setting up this network. Studies already completed have concluded that an east-west rail link through Quebec and Ontario is feasible, necessary and cost-effective. A total of 120,000 jobs would be created during the construction phase of the project.

All that would need to be done is to add a loop to the main line to connect Montreal's two airports.

Connections between the two airports could thus be made in 18 minutes, instead of the current forty. Furthermore, the two provinces would be linked to Mirabel-Dorval by a high-speed, comfortable rail system, one which would leave foreign passengers with the impression this time of a country in the forefront of new technologies.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the Toronto and Mirabel-Dorval airports can continue to complement one another and to provide services commensurate with the capital invested, steps must be taken to provide Mirabel with the tools mentioned. Failing this, neither Mirabel nor Dorval, for that matter, will be able to ensure appropriate levels of user services. I am talking about extending Highway 13 from Boisbriand to Mirabel and developing a high-speed train in the Quebec City-Windsor corridor, along with a loop to provide service to Mirabel and Dorval.

Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my position on Bill C-22, the Pearson International Airport Agreements Act.

The bill declares in particular that the agreements did not come into force, bars any action for damages against the federal government, and authorizes the Minister of Transport to enter into agreements for the payment of amounts in connection with the coming into force of the legislation.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to the last point. I strongly object to Bill C-22, which authorizes the government to pay the compensation it sees fit to private-sector contractors without shedding light on the circumstances that led to the decision to privatize the airport and to the hasty signature of the contract.

When the government privatizes public property, transparency must be paramount, as the government advocates in the Throne Speech delivered at the beginning of this Parliament. Part of this speech reads as follows: "Integrity and public trust in the institutions of government are essential. My minis-

ters”—it was the Governor General speaking—“will insist upon integrity, honesty and openness on the part of those who exercise power on behalf of Canadians”.

(1650)

The Prime Minister promised to shed light on the circumstances surrounding the negotiations and the agreement to privatize Pearson Airport. Instead, he gives us an internal review behind closed doors. Nevertheless, the study by Robert Nixon, a good Liberal, a former provincial finance minister and a former leader of the Liberal Party of Ontario, underlines the undue influence of lobbyists sympathetic to the current government.

The Nixon report contains a number of comments on the privatization process, its political dimension and the terms of the redevelopment agreements. This same Mr. Nixon says that privatizing terminals 1 and 2 is not in accordance with the government policy that such terminals should be owned and operated by local authorities. He condemns this transaction and talks about the role of patronage and pressure groups.

I would like to make myself clear. We want to shed light on this process of privatization, deals and agreements that are not in the public interest. The review of the Pearson Airport case concludes on page 9 that the role of lobbyists went far beyond the acceptable concept of consulting. “It is clear that the lobbyists played a prominent role in attempting to affect the decisions that were reached”.

This is a series of troubling facts that call into question this government’s openness and the legitimacy of any decision to compensate the companies involved in the case. Why compensate individuals for charges incurred by people who abused their connections? This decision is contrary to government policies on this subject. Bill C-22 deals with a very controversial development agreement which should be elucidated.

I understand that the government thinks that the bill is a way to undo an agreement that it condemns because the agreement was politically motivated and pushed by lobbyists. I understand the government wanting to avoid long and costly lawsuits if an agreement could not be negotiated.

However, despite the controversy and although the government has announced the end of the contract, why does the government still want to keep this contract secret? Would there be something to hide? Not disclosing the full identity of all parties to this agreement and other major provisions of the contract inevitably arouses public mistrust. When the government makes a decision in a case involving the public interest, I think that it has to be open. The public has a right to know all the details of this agreement and the facts surrounding the government’s decision.

Government Orders

[English]

In the events leading up to the signing of the contract permitting the privatization of Pearson International Airport the various lobbyists appear to have played a disproportionate role.

I call on the government to enlighten this affair of public interest as mentioned by the Leader of the Official Opposition in this House calling for the establishment of a royal commission of inquiry before the tabling of Bill C-22.

As long as we do not know the roles played by the various players in this matter, how can we determine for sure whether investors are victims or actors in this affair?

(1655)

Bill C-22 declares that no amount will be payable under this agreement in relation to any loss of profit or any fee paid for the purpose of lobbying a public office holder. Why then will the Minister of Transport with the approval of the Governor in Council make agreements on behalf of the government to provide for the payment of such amounts?

[Translation]

If the government wants to be off the hook, it must authorize an inquiry which will shed light on what might be one of the biggest patronage scandals in the history of Canada.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport himself did not oppose the idea of a public inquiry to find out the details of the circumstances surrounding the Pearson Airport transaction. And the minister even had the support of several of his colleagues regarding such an initiative.

Only after realizing that some of its close friends were involved did the government make an about-face, opting for a simple report prepared behind close doors. The government does not have the right to demand sacrifices from the public to help reduce the deficit, to make cuts in social programs, and to use taxpayers’ money to compensate the key players in these dealings, when its own report states that in this case lobbies have largely exceeded the acceptable limits.

Even if lobbying is legal, the public has a negative perception of this activity, especially in a case like this, where the lobbying took place without the public knowing about it, and where the decisions made went against public interest. Greater transparency will enable Canadians to know who is trying to influence who, how, and on what issue.

For the sake of transparency and honesty, an inquiry must be held on the Pearson Airport transaction.

Government Orders

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the government when it is willing to improve Parliament's credibility. I am quite prepared to support the government when it proposes legislation aimed at ensuring greater transparency regarding its dealings with lobbyists.

In this case, the government has no choice but to shed light on this issue. This is why I support the motion of the Leader of the Official Opposition to set up a royal commission of inquiry and find out the details of that unfortunate saga.

Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity today to speak on Bill C-22.

I would like to point out to my colleagues and all members of Parliament that I had the privilege to sit, for four years, on the Société de promotion des aéroports de Montréal, which is considered, as you know, a local airport authority, according to a 1987 government plan. I want to show you that local airport authorities, or LAA as they are called in the air transport industry, are much less prone to scheming than private companies which take charge of an airport, as was the case at Pearson.

So, I think that we absolutely have to talk about the great openness shown by local airport authorities, and to do so, I want to use Montreal as an example, that is the airport of Montreal and its Société de promotion des aéroports, made up of 21 individuals from the Communauté urbaine de Montréal.

(1700)

What does a SOPRAM or a promotion company do? First of all, it must get a very good representation within the greater metropolitan area as such. In the case of SOPRAM, there are three electoral colleges which form the 21 members of this promotion company. Of course, what the company will promote are these airports and with only one objective in mind, that is to re-invest the money in the community by doing repair work in these airports. That is far better than favouring a bunch of friends who are mostly interested in capitalizing their funds and ensuring that shareholders get more and more dividends in the end.

In the case of a local airport authority, it is the opposite; the money is directed towards the community and re-invested, and people are put to work in the same community.

If I go back to SOPRAM, I was saying earlier that there are three major electoral colleges; there are seven business people who form the executive of the Montreal Airport Administration. They all are business people and their distribution, as you will see, is very well thought out in terms of territorial distribution in the greater Montreal area. We also have seven elected people at the municipal level who are representatives of municipal politicians, and also, people who are responsible for the technology and the administration as such. I was myself part of the technicians and administrators category and I was delegated by

the Société montréalaise de développement and the City of Longueuil.

Also on territorial distribution, it was made sure that the whole of the territory would be very well represented. Among others, we have three representatives from the South area, six representatives from the North area and 12 representatives from the island of Montreal. These people are serving their respective interests within a regional solidarity, and it is worth repeating that all the money is re-invested in the greater Montreal area.

My colleagues raised earlier the relevancy of airport duality in Montreal. That is a debate that was just completed—airport of Montreal—and what was agreed to is that both Montreal airports are extremely important. Even a major international panel confirmed it. The international panel told us that having two airports was an extraordinary advantage for us. Unfortunately, at the time of devolution, the government withdrew from its project to link Dorval and Mirabel by a special shuttle so that, today, the cost of it will have to be borne by ADM.

Let us look at the economic impact. As I said, the goal and objective of the development corporation, as far as Montreal airports are concerned is to make sure that money is reinvested in the area. At the present time these two airports bring in about \$100 million. After expenses, we manage to keep \$30 million which, over the next five years, will be reinvested into the communities through improvements and repairs to the airports. This will create about 1,700 jobs over the next five years. The difference is obvious. Profits are reinvested in the community, they go directly to the workers hired to improve the infrastructures and not to shareholders, as dividends, or to a bunch of friends of the government.

We can also talk of the direct impact. In 1987, it amounted to \$109 million for the community of Montreal and, in 1992, it reached \$273 million. I repeat, the revenues are around \$100 million annually.

According to an HEC study, 42,185 jobs result directly and indirectly from the operation of the two Montreal airports and the reinvestment of profits into the community contributes greatly to job creation. We can see the importance of a local airport authority. This is not the situation at Pearson Airport. Why not?

(1705)

Clearly, the private sector noticed that there was a ripe plum to be picked, something juicy enough to whet the appetite of shareholders. With the help of lobbyists they pressed the government by saying: "Do not give it to a local airport authority, this is a source of trouble". Squabbles occur in all local airport authorities, and Montreal had its share, but in the end, we agreed in order to protect the interest of the community.

In Toronto, the government said that a local airport authority would not work and that the private sector should have the opportunity to dip into the trough. And that is what happened. The present government, which promised during the election campaign that it would cancel the deal, is now finding that the

people feeding at the trough were not all friends of the Conservatives, there were also friends of the Liberals. This is why the minister has included in the bill provisions that would give him discretionary powers to compensate friends of his party.

We can see all the differences and contradictions that exist between the two systems; on the one hand, Montreal proceeds with a people-minded, democratic approach whereas, on the other hand, people in Toronto manage to get a piece of the action, and put the interests of the shareholders, lobbyists, and friends of the government before those of the community.

To conclude, I am indeed in complete agreement with the amendment proposed by the Bloc Québécois because we need a royal commission to review the whole deal. I would even say that, besides a royal commission, the government should allow, without delay, Metropolitan Toronto to take matters into its own hands. I think that there are some very worthwhile people in that city who would be more concerned with the interests of the community than with strictly financial interests. There are people who were there at the time, such as the mayor of Mississauga who was very active and who would probably be willing to carry the torch to make sure that this local airport authority comes into being and that priority is given to the public interest instead of the interests of the government's friends.

To this end, I think that a royal commission is an absolute must. And I repeat that we should take this opportunity to allow Metropolitan Toronto to take matters into its own hands and say to the government's friends: "Sorry, the contract is cancelled and there will be no discretionary compensation". I think that, in this whole matter, we have to look at the government's transparency and set an example so that, from now on, in Canada, there is a clear message that you cannot operate behind the scene and favour your friends at the expense of the public purse. I believe that a royal commission is in order. Let us proceed with a royal commission and discover what is behind all this manoeuvring.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, now that the future of Quebec and of Canada is being debated, we still find ourselves talking about lobbyists. Need we remind members that lobbying is not a new activity? This country, Canada, is the end result of lobbying efforts. Consider the Grand Trunk railroad! The many lobbyists who were involved in the building of the railroad were in fact responsible for building Canada. There more things change, the more they remain the same.

The question is even raised in our history books. I pointed this out to one member, a friend who sits across from me in this House. Lobbyists were the great Canadian promoters and we are

Government Orders

still contending with them today, albeit not the same people. However, the spirit of lobbying continues to burn brightly.

Yet, in its red book, the government promised transparency. On looking at the whole Pearson Airport deal, it becomes clear that the one thing lacking is transparency, at the very least. Let me recall a few facts for you.

(1710)

On December 7, 1992, the federal government decided to go with the bid submitted by Paxport Inc.

Two months later, this company was forced to join forces with its only competitor to form a consortium, T1 T2 Limited Partnership. It is somewhat troubling to realize that the government was planning to award a 57-year contract worth several hundred million dollars to a company in financial difficulty, a company which besides had close ties with the governing party, which at the time, was the Conservative party.

While we could say that T1 T2 was once a Tory enterprise, over time it has become a Grit enterprise. Basically, that is what the red book is all about, Mr. Speaker. It is saying: Count on us, we will put you in the red. And we currently seem to be heading in that direction.

The policy put forward by the Conservative government as early as 1987 regarding airport administration was based first and foremost on local airport authorities of the public type—I am thinking of the Montreal ADM—or else the administration was contracted to certain firms, as was the case in Vancouver, Calgary and Edmonton. Privatizing Pearson Airport ran directly counter Transport Canada's policies.

Take also the bidding period, which was only 90 days long. This time limit seems somewhat unusual, in that we cannot talk about standard tendering. This is a 57-year contract, a long-term and very complex contract.

So, why limit the bidding period that much, if not to favour companies that had already expressed an interest in that area? Companies like Paxport, which had already submitted a privatization plan in 1989 or one which was already managing another airport, like Claridge, responsible of Terminal 3 at Pearson Airport.

Wrongdoing on the part of lobbyists was mentioned in the Nixon Report, but without quoting any specific case. Why then compensate people for their expenses if they misused their connections?

As Robert Nixon points out: "It is clear that the lobbyists played a prominent part in attempting to affect the decisions that were reached, going far beyond the acceptable concept of "consulting". That is on page 9 of the report, Mr. Speaker.

Government Orders

Disturbing conduct is also reported on the part of political staff members who have shown too much interest in the transaction, an interest disproportionate to reality as we know it today. That is also on page 9, Mr. Speaker.

In spite of the controversy, in spite of the fact that it has already announced the cancellation of the contract, the government persists in refusing to release the contract in question.

One can wonder why. Does the government have something to hide? Is this a case of the Ginn Publishing syndrome? Because in that case too, they refuse to show us the contract. Are we dealing, for example, with advertising contracts awarded by the minister responsible for government operations with no real tendering process, no clear criteria, basically at the discretion of the minister?

Contracts which, as we find out, are more often than not granted to friends of the system, the kind of people who carry a membership card in the Laurier Club. It is strange that things are not more open, and that there are even no parameters.

In the Quebec legislature, if contracts were awarded in this way, there would be a general outcry. We are a long way from "Vautrin's pants" in the days of Duplessis. We are not talking about a pair of pants but about an airport, Mr. Speaker.

Why was this 57-year contract, worth hundreds of millions of dollars, awarded without financial pre-qualification? On page 8 of his report, Robert Nixon concludes that such a process is highly unusual. At least we hope so. If it were usual to award 57-year contracts worth hundreds of millions without financial pre-qualification, we would be worried and with good reason.

(1715)

We can however ask, not necessarily for the first time either, why Hibernia project we are now considering was not subjected to a thorough financial review either. We are set to invest another \$1 billion in the biggest contract, private or public, in Canada's history, and no serious study was done. We are now being asked to invest another \$1 billion with our eyes closed. So no prior financial study was made for Pearson Airport.

As you may recall, the Conservative government signed the contract in the last days of an election campaign. This undemocratic gesture was denounced by our friends opposite. Mr. Chrétien jumped on this opportunity to denounce these undemocratic measures flying in the face of Parliament's supremacy because the government, of course, must honour its predecessors' commitments. But there is a way to get out of it to accommodate current realities, as was the case with the helicopters. They acted, but more openly that time. That was in Quebec, and the government may have fewer friends in Quebec, but it is different in Toronto.

Private developers could not help but know that the Liberals were likely to form the next government. That is why the T1 T2 Partnership is friends with the Liberals and with the Conserva-

tives. As everyone knows, the ranks of lobbyists do not only include Conservatives. They also need Liberals in case a new government is elected. They know how to prepare for change. These people are used to power. The party in power may change, but the ideas remain the same.

The lobbyists knew then that the Liberals would take power; they knew that there was a risk in signing such a contract. They decided to take it. That is the law of the market. They are business people, serious people who are always telling us that we have to take the risk of free competition, we must not be afraid, we must know how to take risks, and they are asking the government to compensate them for the risks they took. They made a mistake, poor things! They must be compensated. These are the same people who usually denounce the unemployed and welfare recipients. Pearson is luxury-class welfare, Mr. Speaker.

When the Conservatives awarded the contract, they knew one thing. Ms. Campbell and Mr. Charest did not seriously think that they would keep power. They knew that, but they did not know that they would be left with only two members.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I just want to make sure that we know that we are supposed to refer to one another by the name of our riding when we sit in the House. I just wanted to bring this to the hon. member's attention.

Mr. Duceppe: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the member for Sherbrooke and Ms. Campbell—I must name her because she no longer has a riding—did not suspect that their party would be reduced to two seats.

So these people said to themselves, "Before we leave Parliament and our access to government funds, we will ensure that our friends have not invested for nothing," because the names involved in the Pearson affair did not invest only in Pearson. These people invest at least every four years, even every year, with the Grits and with the Tories, with the Tories and with the Grits. Depending on who will be in power, they invest more in one side than the other. I suppose they invested more in the Liberals, who have 177 seats, than in the Conservatives, although each of the two remaining Tories must have got more than the 177 Liberals, on a per capita basis.

So Mr. Nixon says a little farther in his report, and I will close with that—my ten minutes are almost up—that his examination had led him to only one conclusion: to leave in place an inadequate contract, arrived at through such a flawed process and under the shadow of possible political manipulation, is unacceptable.

That is what we say: it is unacceptable. We must get to the bottom of it and have the resources to do so, have the power to compel people to testify, to present documents and to get a good idea of what people opposite would like to keep in semi-obscurity.

Government Orders

(1720)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I would just add that, as Acting Speaker, I have the duty and the honour and the pleasure to protect the interests and privileges of members of this House.

I do understand that when members are outside the House, they are more vulnerable. However, I know that, whether you are here or not, I must maintain respect for these traditions in the House.

Now to continue the debate, the hon. member for Gaspé.

Mr. Yvan Bernier (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, please excuse my astonishment. I did not expect to rise so soon in the House on this matter.

Never mind, there is so much to say on the subject, that I would be tempted to say: "Let us get on with this, the party is over". That attitude must have prompted the motion from members opposite.

If I understood my colleagues well, and what members opposite did not understand, our main objection to this bill is the fact that in principle it does not allow us to see what the lobbyists involved are doing.

On my opinion, to avoid making the same errors in the future, it is important that we review such measures. Because this is no small matter. We are talking big money here. Moreover, we are dealing with the future of transportation in Canada, which was really the issue here and which they are trying to make us forget. They want us to casually disregard what has happened.

The biggest surprise, and all my colleague agree on that, is that it was only when the election drew near, or during the last week of the campaign, that the new Prime Minister rushed in to announce that an end would be put to that "bargain".

Now, in Parliament, we are told that we must keep silent and that we will not be told what really happened. We call that writing a blank check. I must admit that I find it hard to live with such an arrangement.

What are we to think of all those things which they are trying to hide from us? The things they hide from us tell a lot about the way political parties are financed. We are talking about lobbyists. The Bloc Québécois has very strict rules regarding party financing, and we must thank Mr. René Lévesque for that.

We must specify who gives us money, and the maximum allowable amount is \$5,000. This, Mr. Speaker, is a good example of transparency. You can see who gives us money and whose interests I represent. People may contribute \$5, \$10 or \$100. There are very few in my riding who can make a contribution of \$1,000, and this brings me to another issue: the underdevelopment of regions.

Remote regions like mine do not have the monies or incentives which would allow us to be represented by very articulate lobbyists. They are capable of great things, but we are not on a level playing field in that regard. There is one thing though which the public has understood, and I will get back to this when I discuss the underdevelopment of our regions.

The public has the right to know. During the last election campaign, the Bloc Québécois had limited funds with those \$5 and \$10 contributions to which I referred earlier. Nevertheless, with these small amounts, it succeeded in getting almost two thirds of the seats in Quebec: 54 out of 75 to be precise.

(1725)

Personally, I only spent 60 per cent of the amount allowed to me by the returning officer, and that was enough to defeat two powerful organizations, two old parties. Why is that? It is because I talked to people; I did not try to buy their vote with money. In fact, I could not even afford a single page of advertising in newspapers. But I talked to people and journalists, and the public got my message.

The Liberals now have the opportunity to do exactly what the public expects from them, and that is to tell the people what this is all about. The people have to know what went on with this deal. They have to know why such a thing cannot happen ever again. It is very important.

I also want to talk about the economic underdevelopment of some areas. If the current Liberal government cannot show us how to ensure that, from now on, lobbyists will not be able to continue to influence Canadian development and economic policies in any negative way, how can we benefit from the expertise of these lobbyists? This is a good question, since all the Liberals talked about in the red book and during the election campaign was jobs, jobs, jobs. But when will we be able to work with people who know how to get money from the government to put remote areas residents back to work?

I know that I am digressing, and I will come back to the Pearson issue, but I just want to ask how am I supposed to explain to people in my riding, where unemployment is at 27 per cent and the labour force participation rate stands at 42 per cent, that I gave the government a blank cheque to pass over in silence the millions of dollars that were wasted and the nasty trick we were about to play on the Canadian air transport industry. I will never be able to explain the situation to my voters. However, if the minister or the Cabinet wants to play this little game, maybe they can try to explain the whole situation or send lobbyists to develop the remote areas that are currently underdeveloped. We have the resources, but maybe we are not developing them the right way. But we were never given a chance in the past, since each time we came up with a good idea, as many people from the Gaspé Peninsula have noticed, a funny thing happened and the project was always taken away to the city.

Private Members' Business

This leads us to believe that lobbyists have a lot of clout and that is not acceptable to us. Also it is difficult to understand that only two groups were involved in that deal as there were only two parties—and some criticized us for this. But there is now a third party, which I would call the voice of the Quebec people, that is the Bloc Québécois. And we do not want to put up with that kind of things.

I agree with everything the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean and Leader of the Opposition said the other day in his speech and I would invite every Canadian to reflect on it. We make so many speeches to try to promote awareness among members on the other side. Although they do not belong to our party, our colleagues in the Opposition must also have something to say against this lobby system, which may be responsible for the increase in poverty and a wider development gap between central Canada and the rural or isolated areas like mine.

(1730)

How can I make the government think? As an hon. member, the only means I have is the opportunity to express my views in this House. I do not have millions of dollars but I represent a riding as equal and as influential as the others.

During my election campaign, I used to say: "Local problems call for local solutions". If ever the federal government must give up its direct control over Pearson Airport, I would understand, as the hon. member who spoke before me said, that it could be transferred to a municipal airport authority. Torontonians would know how to use such a development tool, such an important link in the transportation system. However, I repeat that, before any decision is made, the government will have to clarify the role of the lobbyists in this issue. Pearson must become a reference case so that never again is such a situation imposed on the Canadian taxpayers, especially not during an election.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): It being 5.30 p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS*[English]***NATIONAL SPORT ACT**

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops) moved that Bill C-212, an act to recognize hockey as the national sport, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Broadview—Greenwood along with my colleague from Regina—Lumsden and many others who formally seconded this bill. I want to acknowledge my assistant, Bill Syrras, for all of the preparatory work he has done to make this a success today.

I will begin my short speech by quoting Bruce Kidd who said in the book *Welcome Home* by Stuart McLean: "Hockey is the Canadian metaphor. The rink is a symbol of this country's vast stretches of water and wilderness, its extremes of climate, the player a symbol of our struggle to civilize such a land. Unsure as we are about who we are, we know at least this about ourselves: We are hockey players and we are hockey fans".

Those words certainly ring very true these days considering what the national pastime is of Canadians from coast to coast to coast nightly.

I do not suppose there are many of us who do not recall that moment of excitement on a Saturday night when the Montreal Canadiens would take to the ice and that soft maritime chant would fill the room: "Good evening ladies and gentlemen and hockey fans from coast to coast. This is Danny Gagnon at the Forum in Montreal". Then Saturday night would be complete and life would be good.

Probably most of us in this House played hockey and skated even before we could tie our own skates. Many of us will remember those great moments when we first learned how to raise a puck, seeing that puck sailing through the air for the first time. Or maybe it was the first time we were able to complete a good slapshot and heard the sound of that puck bashing into the boards.

It is safe to say that hockey matters to all of us, in Quebec and the rest of Canada. It is part of our culture. It is key to the understanding of Canada. It is the perfect game on the perfect Canadian medium in the perfect Canadian season. We are a northern people and hockey is a northern sport. It is certainly fair to say it is much more than a game in our country.

There are few sportsmen in Canada today who on a wintery Saturday night are not seated waiting for those familiar words: "It's hockey night in Canada". The voice of the late Foster Hewitt was embedded in the minds of many Canadians from the inception of CBC radio and television. That voice united Canada from the Atlantic shores of Newfoundland to Vancouver Island and even northward to the Arctic missions.

It has been estimated that over 650,000 Canadians actually take part in some form of organized hockey.

Private Members' Business

(1735)

To quote the late Foster Hewitt: "In our country while hockey is usually played for sheer enjoyment, its outdoor rinks and enclosed arenas are meeting places for youths of all origins where race, culture and creed are forgotten. Stewarts, Kellys, Smiths, Beliveaus, Delvecchios, Mahovlichs, the Ullmans and Howes combine for the glory of the team and in the process, Canada gains in unity and strength".

In this day, sport has become a means by which a nation attains international status and recognition. I believe that hockey is Canada's national game and is the main sports preoccupation of our young people.

It is ultimately woven in our Canadian self-image and our mythology. Paul Henderson set the tone for this image in 1972 with his dramatic goal over Russia. Indeed, hockey is more than a national game for its popularity has spread to at least 20 different countries.

It is time to recognize hockey for its impact on Canada. It is time to thank the volunteers and all the hockey teams in Canada for their contribution in a number of areas such as charity, education, competition and international co-operation.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure to congratulate Canada's championship women's hockey team for capturing its third consecutive world hockey championship in Lake Placid two weeks ago. It is no wonder that women's hockey is the fastest growing sport in Canada.

When we look at whether or not we should identify a certain sport as our national sport, it is important to look at the origin of the sport, its popularity in the country today, the reputation it has abroad and the value of a number of intangibles.

Many historians have tried to figure out where and when hockey was created in Canada. The cities of Halifax, Kingston and Montreal have all boasted that they are the true birthplace of hockey in Canada. I am sure more theories of hockey's birthplace will arise in the future.

I was interested to hear a comment last month by my hon. Liberal colleague representing the riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants who mentioned that his riding represents the birthplace of hockey.

One theory in support of Kingston mentions that an early historian by the name of Mr. Horsey wrote in his diary of 1847: "Most of the soldier boys were quite at home on skates. Shinny was their first delight where 50 or more players on each side would be in the game".

A committee appointed by the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association to determine the Canadian origin of hockey concluded: "The first hockey was played by the Royal Canadian Rifles, an imperial unit stationed in Halifax and Kingston in 1855. It is quite possible that English troops stationed in Kingston from 1783 to 1855 played hockey, as there was evidence in old papers, letters and legends".

In Montreal authorities emphatically declared their city is the original home of ice hockey. They felt that the first pure hockey game was played in Montreal at Victoria Skating Rink on March 3, 1875.

Perhaps the true cradle of hockey could have been Acropolis Hill in Greece, as there are remnants of a goal, men with hockey sticks in hand, a ball on the ground between curved blades, and an official about to give the starting signal.

Hockey remains the sport of first choice for the majority of Canadian households. It is already looked upon by Canadians as Canada's national sport. This has been proven in the past but most recently by the great outpouring of support and encouragement for Canada's gold medal national junior hockey team, five medals over the last seven years, and the silver medal efforts of our Olympic team in each of the last two Winter Olympic Games. In a recent newspaper article by the Ottawa *Citizen* it was mentioned that Canadian fans vastly outnumbered Americans as a sea of red aided the Canadian women's hockey team to a third consecutive world championship in Lake Placid, New York.

A national sport would promote national interest in times of national competition. Hockey is governed by a national organization and millions of fans follow it. National radio and television spend a great deal of money to broadcast hockey games. There is an organized hockey event in virtually every Canadian community, be it a large city or a humble village.

I received a letter of support for this motion from the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association. Its membership includes an active volunteer force in excess of 100,000 Canadians and upward of 500,000 on-ice participants.

Canada is recognized worldwide as the nation where the great sport originated. It is unquestionably looked upon as the foremost leader playing a vital role in the evolution of hockey worldwide. By the most recent estimates it extends now to not 20 but actually 51 countries that make up the membership of the International Ice Hockey Federation.

(1740)

There is nothing more identifiably Canadian to the rest of the world than our game of hockey. Canadian Amateur Hockey Association teams at all levels of play compete regularly and successfully in international tournaments and championships around the world.

Private Members' Business

In each season the Canadian Hockey Association transfers almost 600 accomplished Canadian players to hockey-playing countries where they assist in the growth of this sport overseas in various emerging federations. All of these players are outstanding ambassadors for our country and our game. They help to sell Canada, its wholesome values and its healthy lifestyles.

In discussing hockey we can never forget the economic impact it has on Canada. A cursory glance indicates that tens of thousands of Canadians are employed directly or indirectly as a result of the game of hockey.

In 1992 Statistics Canada completed a family expenditure survey which concluded that Canadians spent approximately \$400 million annually on hockey. This does not include club dues, ice time, travelling expenses or other numerous expenses relating to participation in hockey competition.

Again I cannot mention enough the appreciation for the millions of hours that volunteers contribute to ensure the success of tournaments and the education of youth in this sport.

Women's hockey is the fastest growing women's sport played in Canada today. In the past few years the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association has estimated the number of women participating in minor hockey at approximately 13,000 and that is being very modest. This has grown from the 6,000 recorded in the 1991-92 season. This upsurge has a lot to do with the success of officially sanctioned world championship events.

Women are actively challenging for positions on professional teams throughout Canada and the United States. The success of Canadian Manon Rhéaume, the first woman to play hockey in the National Hockey League, also has a lot to do with the surge of female participation in hockey.

Brampton, Ontario hosts a women's hockey tournament every year that attracts over 250 teams, including international teams from countries such as Russia and Finland.

I could go on about how hockey supports charity organizations of all sorts throughout our country. I could talk about the impact of the international Hockey Hall of Fame located in the great city of Toronto. I could talk about the impact hockey has on my hometown of Kamloops where we enthusiastically support the Kamloops Blazers. I wish them well in their competition with our friends from Saskatoon. I could go on but I want to step down to allow ample time for a number of members who have indicated an interest in participating in this debate.

I simply want to say the time has come and the timing is perfect. We are right in the middle of hockey enthusiasm and excitement in this country. It would be a great gesture of this Parliament to agree to declare hockey our national sport. I think

Canadians would welcome and applaud that from coast to coast to coast.

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage): Mr. Speaker, during the last election campaign there was much rhetoric about how there should be more co-operation in Parliament and how MPs should actually work together to achieve objectives common to all.

[Translation]

We have the opportunity today to prove that co-operation works.

[English]

In an effort to include a Canadian sporting tradition that predates Confederation, I have asked the member for Kamloops to support the amendment of his private member's bill to recognize both ice hockey and lacrosse as national sports of Canada.

While many Canadians would certainly view the national sports status of ice hockey as a natural expression of the Canadian reality, the concept has been on ice for decades. Canadians have long recognized the significance of another sport which also originated in Canada and which is played all over the world today.

Our proposed amendment would allow for the inclusion of Canada's long tradition in the sport of lacrosse and would resolve an issue that has been left on the bench since Confederation.

In January 1967 Prime Minister Lester Pearson, a devotee of sports and honorary chair of the Canadian Lacrosse Association, said in this House: "I think we should have a national summer game and a national winter game".

(1745)

Twenty-seven years later members of this Parliament had the chance to convert a pass from Pearson and remind ourselves of some unique aspects of Canadian culture.

As Americans remember where they were when Neil Armstrong took a great leap for mankind, Canadians remember what they were doing when Paul Henderson sent Canadians to the moon when he scored the winning goal for Canada in 1972.

[Translation]

Canadians can be proud when hockey is played at the Olympic Games in Norway or when the lacrosse championship is held in the United Kingdom.

[English]

Not only are Canadians a dominant force in both sports but we have been on top for more than a century. Both these sports are just as symbolic of Canada as the maple leaf or the *Bluenose*.

Private Members' Business

[Translation]

Ice hockey as it is played today originated in Canada in 1855, on Christmas Day, when the Royal Canadian Rifles based in Kingston, Ontario decided to remove the snow covering the ice in the harbour. They then attached blades to their boots and started playing with field hockey sticks and a lacrosse ball which they had borrowed.

[English]

In the early 1800s the Algonquin Indian tribe of the St. Lawrence Valley in Canada played a sport that is known as lacrosse, the sport that was an important element in the life and culture of First Nations. Today it is just as important in the lives of Canadians of all backgrounds.

[Translation]

Throughout Canadian history, we have had every reason to be proud of our athletes who participate in all kinds of sports.

[English]

Our nation's athletes have inspired great pride in Canadians by their world class performance in so many different sports: curling, synchronized swimming, canoeing, rugby, diving, track and field, skiing, skating and biathlon, to name a few. Today we salute Canadian achievement in all sports.

[Translation]

Recognizing that sports are an important element of our culture, I think it is essential that we take responsibility for the future of sports in Canada.

[English]

As one of the partners involved in the development of sport, the Government of Canada has a very legitimate and essential role to play in that future. We must focus on building a stronger recognition of sport as an important contributor to the Canadian cultural identity.

Douglas Fisher once said: "Most of our shared experiences and values from Bonavista to Vancouver Island are through politics and sport. We would be a much duller lot without our sporting heritage and sporting present". In short, we must make sure that our athletes are always playing at full strength.

This is one occasion when Parliament should not take one game at a time. Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that there is unanimous consent for this motion. I move:

That Bill C-212 be modified in clause 2 by deleting all the words following "national" and replacing them with the following:

winter sport of Canada and the game commonly known as lacrosse is hereby recognized and declared to be the national summer sport of Canada;

That the title and short title also be amended to include the word "lacrosse"; and

That, at the conclusion of the time provided for Private Members' Business later this day, all questions necessary to dispose of Bill C-212 at all stages be deemed to have been proposed, put and carried, and the bill passed.

(1750)

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is there a point of order? The hon. member for Bellechasse.

Mr. Langlois: Yes, Mr. Speaker, about the relevancy of the amendment. I respectfully suggest that this amendment should be submitted during consideration by the committee of the whole House, if there is to be a committee of the whole House on this bill, and not at the second reading stage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I thank the hon. member for Bellechasse for his remarks. I will consult with the table officers and I will get back to the House at once, on this matter.

The parliamentary secretary is asking for unanimous consent. If the House gives its unanimous consent, it would be acceptable to proceed in this manner at this stage.

[English]

Does the hon. parliamentary secretary have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The motion is adopted.

(Motion agreed to.)

[Translation]

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, since I was prepared to speak to the motion dealing with hockey, I will speak only about hockey, which does not mean that I oppose the amendment.

I would first like to congratulate the hon. member for Kamloops for his determination in wanting to have hockey recognized as the national sport since, according to our research, this is at least his third attempt to do so. Moreover, I learned from my own research that this is at least the tenth time that someone in this House tried to have hockey recognized as the national sport.

Let me say straightaway that we are in favour of recognizing hockey as the national sport, but for another reason than the one raised by the hon. member for Kamloops. The hon. member for Kamloops said that one of the reasons why he presented this bill is that it may contribute to national unity.

Private Members' Business

I do not intend to embark on a partisan debate today, because the reason for a national sport is to foster harmony, but I would like to indicate to the hon. member for Kamloops that our perspective may be different from his. Nothing prevents two countries from sharing the same national sport. Quebecers also love hockey. We will have to wait for a referendum, but Quebec will likely be a sovereign state in a couple of years, and it will want to keep excellent relations with English-speaking Canada. Sports foster good relations. For reasons that have nothing to do with those of the hon. member for Kamloops, we agree that hockey should become a national sport.

If there is a sport that can arouse interest here, that sport is hockey. Playoffs under way in the National Hockey League are on the mind of many people. The first item on the *Téléjournal* on April 20 was the health problems of the Canadiens' goalie Patrick Roy, and not the war in Bosnia or bloodshed in Rwanda.

Many people may condemn that editorial choice, but it shows how important hockey is for Canadians and Quebecers.

(1755)

The method most frequently used by countries to choose a national sport is to find one which was created in that country. This is the case for hockey which is a combination of four other sports, three coming from abroad and one taken from the Indians. People probably do not know it, but hockey is a combination of bandy, originally from England, shinty, originally from Scotland, hurley, originally from Ireland, and, of course, lacrosse, a native Indian sport.

The books written on hockey do not say when and where the first real game was played. As the member for Kamloops and the parliamentary secretary said, many have their own ideas about its history. Many regions still claim, without documented proof, to be the site of the first game. However, we know that the first publicized hockey game was played in 1875 at McGill University in Montreal and that the first rules were published in *The Gazette* on February 27, 1877. All this proves one thing: hockey was truly invented in Canada.

It is also very important to look at the number of people who practice a sport to determine its popularity. Nowadays in Canada more than 650,000 men and women participate in this sport. Even if hockey is played mostly by men, more and more women play as well. Our women's national team has just won its third world championship in a row. This team's goalie is Manon Rhéaume, the first woman ever to play professional hockey.

Who has not played hockey in the street or on a frozen lake? So, when you say 650,000 players, these are players registered with the Canadian Hockey Association. In reality, there are countless players. Just about everybody has played hockey, at one time or another, more often in the street than on an rink with boards around it. The fans who closely monitor the performance of their favourite teams number in the millions. Names such as

Wayne Gretzky, Mario Lemieux, Gordie Howe, Maurice Richard, Bobby Hull, Jean Béliveau, and Bobby Orr are now legendary. They are or will be inducted into the Hockey Hall of Fame, in Toronto, where most of the inductees were born in Canada or in Quebec.

When we think about hockey, we think about the National Hockey League and the Stanley Cup, one of the most prestigious trophies in professional sport. It was created in 1893 by Lord Stanley, a great sports fan who was also the sixth Governor General in Canadian history. The original trophy was only a salad bowl for which Lord Stanley had paid less than \$50. But over the years, several layers have been added to it; the names of the winning team members are engraved on it. In spite of its relative lack of value, the trophy is highly coveted.

Hockey has become the national pride of Canada and Quebec; it reached its pinnacle in 1972 during the series of the century which pitted Canada against the Soviet Union.

In Quebec, there is a hockey team which greatly contributed to enhance French Canadian pride—that is what we were called in those days—the Montreal Canadiens, created in 1909. With 24 Stanley Cups, they are the most important dynasty in professional sport in North America. In the twenties and thirties, this team was one of the first to recruit French-speaking players. Lightning-fast and aggressive, they were nicknamed the Flying Frenchmen. There was Aurèle Joliat, Armand Mondou, and Sylvio Mantha, to name but a few. They played in the Montreal Forum, the legendary building at the corner of Sainte-Catherine and Atwater.

It was during the forties and the fifties that they became truly legendary, especially because of Maurice Richard.

(1800)

He was the first player to score 50 goals in one season in the NHL; he led the Montreal Canadiens to many Stanley Cups, including five in a row between 1956 and 1960. That man was a powerful symbol for Quebecers. The suspension which he got in 1955, depriving the Canadiens from the Stanley Cup, provoked a real riot in the Montreal Forum.

The Canadiens benefitted from an almost monopoly of recruitment in Quebec for many years. That allowed them to acquire players such as Phil Goyette, Bernard Geoffrion and Jacques Plante.

The Canadiens have always had many French-speaking stars on their team over the years. I will name some others: Jean Béliveau, Jacques Laperrière, Henri Richard, Guy Lafleur, Jacques Lemaire, Guy Lapointe, Patrick Roy, Guy Charbonneau and many more. Of course, there were also English players who contributed: Howie Morenz, Ken Dryden, Toe Blake, Doug Harvey, Larry Robinson and many others. Naturally, some French-speaking players also won fame with other teams: Jean

Ratelle with the New York Rangers, Mario Lemieux with Pittsburgh, Marcel Dionne and many others.

This was to demonstrate that Quebecers have been well represented in the sport that is called hockey. It was one of their first successes. Coming from the province of Quebec, I would not forgive myself if I did not mention the Quebec Nordiques who, due to the dramatic increase in salaries, may have to leave Quebec City, as other players from other teams may have to leave cities such as Edmonton, Calgary, Winnipeg and various small towns.

It is fine to adopt today an act recognizing hockey as the national sport. But I believe that one should also consider to take rather quickly some measures which would keep teams such as the ones I just mentioned in Canada and in Quebec. It is very important.

The last point I want to make is that, to preserve this sport, I feel it is important to take measures to fight against violence in hockey, a factor which may very well discredit that sport. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish together with my colleagues to congratulate once again the member from Kamloops for introducing this bill.

[English]

Mr. Riis: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. In the spirit of co-operation and good will that exists and in an effort to acknowledge the days of work that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage has put in to facilitate today, I wonder if I could seek unanimous consent of the House to acknowledge the parliamentary secretary as being one of the formal seconders of Bill C-212.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Members have heard the member for Kamloops. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Dennis J. Mills (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry): Mr. Speaker, I guess today would be one of those days that you wish you were involved in this debate having been a player not only of the Memorial Cup team you played on but a coach and referee in the NHL. We are certainly all aware of your participation in this national sport.

I begin by quoting from *The Game* which Ken Dryden and Roy McGregor put together. I think it summarizes most of the spirit and the theme that the member for Kamloops is putting forward in his bill today:

Private Members' Business

Hockey is part sport and recreation, part entertainment, part business, part community builder, social connector, and fantasy maker. It is played in every province and territory and in every part of every province and territory in this country.

Once a game for little boys, now little girls play hockey as well and so do older men and women, so do the blind and the mentally and physically handicapped, and although its symmetry is far from perfect hockey does far better than most in cutting across social divisions, young and old, rich and poor, urban and rural, French and English, east and west, able and disabled.

It is this breadth, its reach into the past, that makes hockey such a vivid instrument through which to view Canadian life.

I believe that Roy McGregor and Ken Dryden have captured what the member for Kamloops is trying to put forward today in this bill and I stand here in full support. I would like to talk about a couple of experiences that I have had in dealing with hockey as our national sport since I have been a member of Parliament and how I feel that it really pulls us together, not only as a House of Commons but as a country.

(1805)

About the time when we were celebrating the 125th anniversary of our country a group of us from all parties got together. At that time most of us who were working on this idea were in the opposition. We went to the then minister responsible for national unity, the Right Hon. Joe Clark, and asked him to support us in bringing to Toronto 58 hockey teams from villages, towns and cities from all across Canada. From coast to coast, every region of our country, they all came to Toronto in April of that year to play in Maple Leaf Gardens in a 10-day tournament.

There were a few things that inspired me to believe that hockey truly is the sport that pulls us together as a country.

First I have to talk about the evening that the Dartmouth Whalers played in Maple Leaf Gardens against a team that most people thought would dominate the Dartmouth Whalers, a team in a AAA league in Toronto at the peewee level. At the end of the game the Dartmouth Whalers were victorious. They had beaten this Toronto championship team.

The following morning in the hotel I ran into the captain of the Dartmouth Whalers and I said to him: "Boy you had a pretty good game last night. We were all surprised that you did so well". He said: "Well, Mr. Mills, it was a funny experience. We walked into Maple Leaf Gardens. First of all when we looked up and saw those stands we felt the magic in the place. We felt good. But then when we got on the ice our energy quadrupled, our spirit was so great no one could beat us".

Those young peewees from Dartmouth said it all. Hockey provides an energy, a feeling and a spirit of pulling us together that I do not think any other sport in this country has. I am not

Private Members' Business

putting down any other sport, but I do believe it truly is our national sport.

I know you can relate to this, Mr. Speaker, because we both have sons who play in the Ontario Hockey League. Your son is a terrific player with the Kingston Frontenacs and I have had the pleasure of watching my son play this year with the Belleville Bulls. It is an experience going to these local rinks. I am amazed at the way it pulls the community together. It becomes the local event. The radio stations and the local TV stations and the whole community experience happens around hockey. There is a whole family experience that happens around hockey. This same experience is in every rink throughout our nation.

I am happy to stand here today in support of hockey as our national sport. I believe that hockey will be one of the things that ultimately keeps us together as a nation. I just cannot imagine the Montreal Canadiens being changed to the Montreal Blocs. It just does not work.

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I was going to rise in the House today to speak against this, but I guess I have to change that because I have already agreed to the amendment and everything.

Why are we using valuable debate time in this House to debate and vote on a bill which dismisses our national support of lacrosse as though it never was? Perhaps this member does not know his Canadian history. Perhaps this bill is presented to this House out of ignorance.

It occurred to me that if one member of this House is ignorant of our history perhaps other members are not aware of our rich cultural heritage, a cultural heritage given to us by our first peoples. I am therefore going to present some of our history of lacrosse to this House. In 10 minutes I cannot really do the game justice but I will do what I am able.

(1810)

There are some who try to date lacrosse back to Confederation, perhaps because many of the encyclopaedias refer to it as being our national sport at that time.

Lacrosse cannot be dated in this House. Who in this House is going to decide when lacrosse started in what today we call Canada? We have records going back to the Seven Year War, the 1700s, and the story of the English trader Alexander Henry's experience at Fort Mackinac when on the pretence of celebrating King George III's birthday on June 2, 1763 the Ojibway Indians played lacrosse outside the open gate of the fort. When the ball went through the gate the players and the onlookers went after it.

Upon entering the grounds they attacked the garrison and seized the fort. It is told that the native women concealed the weapons beneath their skirts.

Father Brebeuf, the Jesuit priest, speaks of lacrosse in his writings. Many in this House I am sure are aware of the Jesuit priests or the Black Robes who date well back in Canada's 1600s.

I am told that the Creator gave lacrosse to our native people.

I have with me today a list of 27 citations referring to lacrosse as Canada's national sport. They are recognized authorities or researchers, such as sports writers, historians and five encyclopaedias. Some of these resources date from 1877, 1902, 1911 and right up to the present.

Shribners is the earliest source which in volume 14, May to October 1877, states: "The game of lacrosse was adopted as the national game of Canada on July 1, 1859".

In 1911, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edition, states: "Lacrosse, the national game of Canada". I do not have time to quote them all here.

When our children ask us and their teachers for facts on a subject where do we send them? We send them to the encyclopaedia for factual information.

I am not here today to build up lacrosse and tear down hockey. Both are great sports. In fact if we were to ask our national lacrosse and hockey players their opinions I wonder if we would not find many had played both sports during their careers and value the special attributes of both.

Hockey legend Bobby Orr I believe played lacrosse for Oshawa. Other lacrosse celebrities including such names as Wayne Gretzky, Joe Nievendyke, Gary Roberts, Cliff Renning, Newsy Lalonde, Jack Bionda, Adam Oates, Brian Bellows and many more that I cannot name. Each played lacrosse in the summer and hockey in winter. Gretzky used lacrosse to sharpen his hockey skills.

There are some facts about lacrosse I am sure many members here are not aware of. The *Guinness Book of Records* states that the first night game of baseball was played in the 1883. Baseball fans pride themselves on the fact that this was an amazing accomplishment. Would it surprise the House to know that the game of lacrosse was played under the electric light in Montreal in 1880?

Are we all aware that some of hockey's proudest moments began in lacrosse? Each year there is a celebration and a congratulation among hockey people as they hold their all-star game. The concept of holding all-star games began in the 1870s when the lacrosse clubs in Ontario banded together to challenge their rivals from across the border in Quebec.

In the 1870s and 1880s when hockey was becoming popular, in order to increase its appeal to the public, the game borrowed from the most popular sport of the time, lacrosse, the concept of goal posts, centre face off, referees and the position names for its players.

In 1904 Canada sent its first delegation to the Olympic games. Among the team sports which represented Canada at its premier was the lacrosse team. Lacrosse is the only Olympic team sport where Canada has won more medals than the rest of the world combined.

Talk about numbers and attendance at sports games. In 1910, when the Canadian Minto Cup Senior Lacrosse Championships of Canada were played between New Westminster and the Montreal Shamrocks, there were 15,000 spectators. That is not very many you say. It is incredible when we look at the facts. The number of people living in New Westminster at that time was under 8,000. The game literally shut down the majority of B.C. as people travelled to New Westminster to see the game. That is the spirit of nationalism.

(1815)

How many here are aware of the fact that the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson during his office of Prime Minister became the head of only one sport in Canada? Lester Pearson accepted the role and served as honorary chairman of the Canadian Lacrosse Association.

I have always been a sports participant and not much of a spectator, but I did have an opportunity to learn about our national sport lacrosse. Often heard it is the fastest sport on two feet, from a family connection in my early twenties. Lacrosse great Jack Bionda is my brother-in-law, and he played both hockey and lacrosse professionally.

Through Jack I can best describe how these two great sports are a part of one's life. He played hockey for the Boston Bruins and in two Stanley Cup finals; for the Toronto Maple Leafs, among others, and was a defenceman for the Portland Buckaroos for six years.

However, lacrosse was his sport, beginning in Huntsville and carrying Jack to the west where he played in seven Man Cup finals, five of them winners. He played for the Victoria Shamrocks, Nanaimo and the famous New Westminster Salmonbellies. Jack's superb stick handling developed when he was a lad of 10 or 11. He was inseparable from his lacrosse stick and he walked to school practising, hitting the telephone poles with the ball as he walked along. This ability to control the ball until the last minute and score won him the lacrosse all time high scorer in his time.

He has been honoured in the New Westminster Lacrosse Hall of Fame and the Canadian Hall of Fame. Even today in his sixties Jack gives tirelessly to young lacrosse players at clinics and tournaments. His love of the sport extends to the continued use of the wooden native lacrosse stick.

That brings me to Wes Patterson, a Tuscorora native which is part of the Six Nations. Wes Patterson is a North American Indian who knows as much about the cultural heritage of our national sport of lacrosse as any person in Canada. For many years he has been engaged in successfully producing the wooden

lacrosse stick through Can Am Lacrosse Ltd. I wish I had one in the House today to show the skill of this very talented aboriginal.

I have not yet had the honour of meeting Wes Patterson but I have it from good authority that this native can make a complete lacrosse stick in 20 minutes as you watch. He talks of the days as a young boy playing lacrosse and how you were not able to play on the team if you did not select, cut your hickory limb, steam it, bend it, shape it, cut the leather strips and make the net.

What am I trying to say? Is it not long past time for Canadians to realize the cultural contribution of our first people, our truly first people not just in sport but in many things? This is not mythology but true, actual facts.

I do not think Canadians can cheer any harder or enthusiastically for hockey than they have already demonstrated during the Canada–Russia hockey series of the past or than they did during our hockey team's performance at Lillehammer. Both sports are very popular at this time. If members are not aware, ask the countless volunteers who sign up the youth of our nation each season for both these sports.

Today I pay tribute to all volunteers in both associations who over the years have given countless hours promoting these sports. Above all I can never dismiss what the past has given us. We do have a rich cultural heritage.

Come to the Commonwealth Games in Victoria this August 18 to 28 and see lacrosse as the introductory sport. Who will be representing our aboriginal people? Wes Patterson.

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill as amended. It was originally a bill to declare hockey our national sport and now it is a bill to have hockey accepted as our national winter sport and lacrosse as our national summer sport.

I fully support the amendment but I principally want to talk about hockey. I love this game. I love playing it. I love watching it. I love talking about it. Some of my greatest friendships have been formed through hockey.

As many know I come from Montreal, the hockey capital of the world. Montrealers, like no other citizens of any other city, breathe, live and die for hockey.

Last year was the 100th anniversary of the Stanley Cup.

(1820)

In those 100 years, six Montreal teams won the Stanley Cup 41 times, including the first time in 1893. The Canadiens won it 24 times. I am saying that because I want to correct the record. Many newspapers in Canada, in listing last year those that won the Stanley Cup in those 100 years, mentioned that the Canadiens won it 24 times and that the Leafs won it so many times. They forgot that there were five other Montreal teams that won it to make it a total of 41 times for Montreal, way beyond any other city or community in Canada. This not to belittle the other cities

Private Members' Business

but simply to remind Canadians that Montreal is the capital of hockey in Canada.

I have been playing hockey since I was six years old and despite my ancient appearance I am still playing. At this time I want to pay tribute to the many Canadians who are still playing and organizing oldtimer hockey. There are now thousands of leagues in Canada, many tournaments and every weekend a lot of us old guys go here and there to play weekend tournaments.

I think all this goes to show what many people are saying here in this House. It shows that Canadians of all ages and both sexes love this game. We are supporting this bill to make hockey our national winter sport. I hope it would mean more than simply lip service to the game.

What I hope it would mean is that we as Canadians will really support this game at all levels from peewee to international hockey. There have been times in recent years when we have not at the government level and at the private sector level supported it as we should.

By making it part of our legislation, I would hope that our commitment to hockey as our national winter sport will make us more aware of its place in our history and in our tradition and culture.

I have only one concern and I will end with it. My concern is that the cost to young people playing hockey today is escalating to the point at which many young people can no longer play. I am sad to say that in many cases hockey is now becoming a rich man's sport.

That was not the case when I was young in Montreal. We played on outdoor rinks at the peewee level, the bantam level. If you played in a school then you might get on an artificial rink. Our equipment was not that expensive and we did not have many long trips or a long schedule.

I am not arguing with it but simply pointing out my fears. Today players at 11, 12, 13 are playing all their games on indoor artificial rinks which is very expensive. It is very expensive for the parents. They are fully equipped with the best of equipment. They have long schedules and often very expensive travel schedules.

I give credit to the parents who are doing outstanding jobs following their young boys and girls around with these teams. They are paying sometimes up to \$1,000 a year simply to keep their children in minor hockey. If that had been the case we may not have had the Maurice Richards, the Boom Boom Geffrions and the Gordie Howes and many other of these players who came from moderate backgrounds and who went up the ranks and became outstanding hockey players.

I fully support this bill. Canadians fully support this bill but I hope once we pass it, it will not simply be a memory for us but will be what it means; namely a commitment by the Parliament of Canada to really support these two games, hockey and lacrosse, from the very minor level to the international level and the professional level.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to seek unanimous consent to prolong the debate for a maximum of one-half hour or at the collapse of the debate, whichever comes first, in order to permit more members to participate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(1825)

[Translation]

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to spend five minutes of my time on this bill that I support, naturally. I would like to congratulate the hon. member who finally managed to bring his project to fruition. At least it is debated, and I hope it will pass before the end of the sitting. I congratulate also the parliamentary secretary for her amendment that we will gladly support. Since I do not know very much about lacrosse, I am sure this will be an opportunity to learn about it. We will have to find the equipment to learn how to play though. However we are already masters at other sports.

The previous speakers dealt mostly with hockey and I will follow their example. We tried to rewrite history, but the truth is the origin of hockey is largely uncertain. It is very difficult to know for sure where and how it started. Some people go back 2,000 or 3,000 years. Nobody knows. Even in Canada, the time and place of the first game ever played are difficult to find. I choose to remember one place, Montreal, and one date, 1837, 100 years before my birth.

Mr. Robichaud: It was much earlier than that.

Mrs. Tremblay: Perhaps. Let us not argue about it. Anyone can make his own choice.

Making hockey our national sport gives Canada another symbol. We had the beaver, the national anthem, the flag, now we have two national sports: lacrosse in the summer, and hockey in the winter. So these are important elements of our national identity. For now, they are declared national sports of Canada. As mentioned by my colleague, we will see in due time what Quebec will do about it, but I already favour the parliamentary secretary's proposition. The Montreal Blocs could very well play against the Toronto Maple Leafs. That would be a good representation of the two Canadian nations, once sovereign.

Private Members' Business

When the national news on TV begin with the announcement of the Canadian's defeat, I wonder less about the fanaticism of Montreal or Canadian fans than about the choice of the news desk officer. Recognizing hockey as our national sport implies that we must not value it excessively. Recognizing hockey as our national sport is of course recognizing its rights, but also its duties accordingly. I think we must act and clearly define standards so that Canada's national sport is played according to rules that apply even in the national league. Parliament could be called upon to adopt rules that would allow civil or criminal lawsuits against NHL players whose conduct does not improve because a national sport must set an example for a country's young people. Consequently, Canadian hockey officials will have to take on the responsibilities that come with it.

Canada should also make sure that, when it sends a team abroad to compete in our national sport, it can win medals as we are able to do with players of the calibre of our national champions such as Rocket Richard, who made this sport famous, the great Jean Béliveau, Bernard "Boom Boom" Geoffrion, who became the highest scorer, passing Maurice the day Mr. Campbell suspended him—

An hon. member: She really knows her hockey.

Mrs. Tremblay: I was at the Forum the day of the riot. That dates me, I guess.

Several members have mentioned the great ones: Lemieux, Gretzky, Roy, Orr, and Hull. I congratulate the members who took part in this debate and carried it through. I am very happy to have two national sports from now on.

[English]

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am pleased to congratulate the hon. member for Kamloops and am very pleased to support this amended bill. The bill recognizes two sports officially as our national sports, hockey and lacrosse, neither of which has ever been officially recognized in the House before as a national sport. I think that is a very positive initiative.

(1830)

Can there be anyone in the Chamber or anyone in the country who does not know that one sport fascinates and obsesses Canadians from coast to coast to coast? Frankly we know that sport is hockey.

It is our national obsession. It is played by young and old, by male and female, by the able bodied and by the disabled. How well I remember seeing people playing a variation of hockey in a gymnasium, people who had lost the use of their legs. It is our national obsession unlike any other sport, and that is not to denigrate the many other sports Canadians participate in very aggressively, including lacrosse.

Whether it is my young son, Carl, or yours, Mr. Speaker, playing hockey in the backyard or Patrick Roy in the Forum, most Canadians have played hockey at one time or another in their lives, be they citizens in a large city or in one of our hamlets from coast to coast to coast.

Being from southwestern Ontario I can tell the House that the summertime sport of choice there is baseball. It always has been. London, Ontario has the site of the oldest continuous baseball played at Labatt Park. Not to denigrate the sport of lacrosse which I have played a bit, it is not played in some parts of the country. That cannot be said about the sport of ice hockey as we all know. It truly is the national sport of Canadians and I would say the national obsession of Canadians.

We all know that the true world hockey championship is not the Olympics or the yearly world tournament. It is the Canada Cup. That is the true world championship of hockey. Canadian men and women excel at this sport.

It has been said by several members that our women's national team has just won the world championships for the third time in a row. I expect they will add many more times to that championship run.

Hockey is part of our national identity. It helps us to define ourselves. Canadian poet Al Purdy called hockey a combination of ballet and murder. We might not like the second word but it is an aggressive sport. He wrote: "For years a Canadian specific to salve the anguish of inferiority by being good at something the Americans aren't".

The Americans are improving but they have a long way to go to come up to our level. As we all know with the American franchises by far most of their players are Canadians and with the influx of Europeans we are seeing the Americans still have a long way to go to catch us in our national sport.

The impact of the professional sports franchise, the Montreal Canadiens has been mentioned already. It is the most successful of all sports franchises. As several of my colleagues have said—and, my hockey loyalty can be found in this comment—the Canadiens 24 Stanley Cups is a professional sports record. No team in any other sport equals that success level.

I am proud to tell the House that although many early players were French Canadians and the sport was founded in Montreal, it was founded by an Irish Canadian by the name of Ambrose O'Brien. I am proud to note that fact in the debate.

Canadian cities compete to claim these hockey heroes. Being from southwestern Ontario I can say that Stratford likes to claim Howie Morenz as the Stratford Streak, but the people of Mitchell, Ontario, will say that Howie Morenz was born in Mitchell, Ontario.

We have national lessons to learn from the great game of ice hockey. I would like to refer to the most famous goal ever scored. That of course has to be the goal scored by Paul

Private Members' Business

Henderson to give us victory in the 1972 World Championship against the Russians, the first such series.

As a Montreal Canadiens fan my whole life, I am proud to remind the House that the Henderson goal was made possible by a great play by Yvan Cournoyer to keep the puck in the Russian end, an extraordinary effort when they tried to clear the puck, and then by Phil Esposito who refused to be denied his shot on goal, the rebound of which Henderson then pounced on and put into the net. It has hit me many times for years the symbolism of that goal. Let me give you those three names again: Paul Henderson, Yvan Cournoyer and Phil Esposito. That is the kind of co-operation we need in this country: An English Canadian, a French Canadian and an Italian Canadian working together to help us win a hockey series.

(1835)

We are most confident, we are most determined and we are most united on a hockey rink. That is a lesson we ought to bear in mind as we support this bill. I applaud this. This is not frivolous in any way. This is an extremely important bill. It is well worth the time for us to take a few minutes in this House and learn the lessons we should be learning from hockey. The fact that we are at our best as a nation when we set aside background, English, French, ethnic, and we work together as a nation. May it always be so.

Mrs. Sharon Hayes (Port Moody—Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support Bill C-212 and the amendment introduced by the parliamentary secretary.

This discussion encompasses much more than the pros and cons of two Canadian sports. Rather it is an opportunity for us as members of Parliament to raise a rallying point to help us further define ourselves as Canadians. I assert that by naming Canada's national sports, with which we identify parts of our history, our present reality and a future that can bring all Canadians a step closer together.

There are certain questions we can ask ourselves. My colleague has actually presented a case for lacrosse. I wish to briefly propose some questions that will address whether hockey should be made Canada's national sport.

First, is hockey rooted firmly in Canada's history? As we have heard the answer is an unequivocal yes. Hockey in Canada has been in existence for as long as Canada itself. Hockey is a uniquely Canadian sport dating as far back as the early 19th century.

The hockey that is most familiar to Canadians today was first introduced in Montreal by a McGill University student named J.G.A. Creighton. The first world hockey championship was held in Canada in 1883. The first Stanley Cup game was held in 1894 and won by the Montreal triple A team.

In addition to Lord Stanley's contribution, Canada also recognizes excellence in hockey through other historical awards. The Lester Pearson award is given to the most outstanding player in the NHL. The Lady Byng Memorial Trophy is awarded to the player who has exhibited the best type of sportsmanship combined with a high standard of playing ability.

Second, is hockey seen by Canadians as their national sport? Most Canadians would answer yes. Over the last several decades hockey has consistently attracted a number of fans and participants greater than all other sports together. Household words are hockey names like Rocket Richard, Gordie Howe and Wayne Gretzky.

There are over half a million players registered at the amateur level and for each of those at least five other Canadians are behind the scenes. There are 31,000 teams and 2,400 hockey organizations registered with our national registry. These numbers do not include the many tens of thousands of other players. From pre-schoolers to old timers there is an explosion of participation. Like so many other centres in my own riding of Port Moody—Coquitlam the facilities in our area just cannot keep up with the demand.

Third, is hockey an inclusive sport open to all Canadians? For instance, women's hockey is the fastest growing sport played by women in Canada today. Two weeks ago our women's national team gained international recognition as the best team in the world. This was their third straight world title. They have yet to lose to any country at the international level.

Fourth, is hockey accessible to Canadians? Canada boasts the most impressive organizational network for hockey in the entire world. Known as the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association this body links the membership of local associations to all other nationally and internationally organized bodies. First formed in 1914 the CAHA has nurtured amateur hockey in Canada so that millions of Canadians from coast to coast can come together. In addition, police and government organizations, colleges, universities, et cetera, et cetera bring Canadians together through hockey across Canada.

(1840)

Fifth, does hockey serve the interests of Canadians both individually and as a community? Hockey indeed enriches the lives of many Canadians. It encourages leadership among our youth. It teaches sportsmanship, drive and determination. It builds a healthy sense of competitiveness and fosters an atmosphere where lasting friendships as we have already heard can be developed.

Millions of volunteers offer their time to this sport each and every year. Parents, teachers, friends, neighbours, people from all walks of life invest their time in their communities and therefore in Canada as a whole. In addition, an estimated \$400

Private Members' Business

million is pumped into the national economy annually as a direct result of hockey.

Sixth, when other countries look at Canada, what do they see? They see hockey. Teams from across Canada travel all over the world to challenge the best players from other countries. Whether we win or lose on the ice as a nation, Canada wins each and every time one of our teams competes abroad.

Remember well the 1972 Canada–Russia series when Paul Henderson scored. It was one of the great moments in our history, a moment in time that caught and has held the hearts of all Canadians.

Seventh, when Canadians look at Canada what do we see? Canada is hockey. Hockey is played in every region of the country, from west to east, south to north, from Vancouver to St. John's, from Calgary to Montreal, from Edmonton to Toronto, and in every town and village in between.

We look at the present and to the future and see the need to bring Canadians closer together. We need symbols that represent Canada as a whole. We need to build on what we have. Hockey and lacrosse can play a part in furthering pride in our land and our unity.

In the words of one of our hockey greats: “The 1972 Canada–Russia series was not politics, it was not sport. At that time we were not considered easterners or westerners, we were Canadians. We represented Canada and had the best players in the world”.

In conclusion, from what I have heard today, may I suggest that we take part in Winterlude on the ice next year and show Canada that we as parliamentarians can enjoy our national winter sport.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell): Mr. Speaker, here we are at the beginning of the parliamentary season and tonight we are already going into overtime.

The speeches from members across the way could be characterized as very careful stick handling. The House of Commons today will score with all Canadians, I am sure, when we pass this bill. A referee of the NHL is in the Chair as we are having this debate, and I am speaking of you, Mr. Speaker. I think the parliamentary secretary has scored a hat trick with all three readings in one day. This is a shoot out for the member for Kamloops because in the end, he is going to have the winning goal.

We achieved all of this without penalty. Mr. Speaker, I hope you do not think I am offside for making these remarks as we are approaching the termination of the debate.

The net gain in all of this is that Canadians will win and no one will lose. This has to be the only game in town where you have winners and no losers. Indeed, this is a victory for the Canadian hockey team with a very large C.

[Translation]

The Canadian team has just won. And tonight, all of us will be winners when we adopt this bill.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I must tell you in my 10 years with the National Hockey League I would commonly tell the players: “I call 'em as I see 'em” and they would say: “But Bob you don't see enough”. Well, today I wear glasses so I can see all of you.

[Translation]

Mr. Benoît Sauvageau (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, I too am pleased to support this bill which recognizes hockey as the national sport.

Like my predecessors did earlier, all Canadians and Quebecers agree that hockey should be recognized as the most popular, and therefore national, sport. This goes without saying. All we have to do is look at the popularity of the playoff games now under way, or scheduled to start in a few minutes, to recognize the importance of hockey.

(1845)

However, to introduce a somewhat discordant note into the proceedings, the government is trying to use hockey as a component of national unity.

I would remind them that this evening, the Canadiens are playing against Boston, that is a sovereign Canadian country is squaring off against a sovereign American nation. If I am not mistaken, I believe that Toronto is also playing against Chicago. I do not think that Mr. Clinton and Mr. Chrétien call one another up very often or that this creates problems between the two sovereign countries. National unity, perhaps.

Still on the subject of the importance of hockey as a national sport, I want to say, as indicated earlier, that by now there is probably not one soul in Quebec or even in Canada who has not heard about Patrick Roy's appendicitis, and we hope he gets well soon.

However, let me express some reservation about debating hockey in this place, all the while respecting the principles of the parliamentary system.

Yesterday, I was the guest speaker at a luncheon organized by the Chamber of Commerce of Repentigny. By the way, I thank them for their invitation. A hundred or so business people from my riding were gathered and there were discussions about the difficult economic situation, the interest rates, and the insufficient risk capital made available to small business. Other subjects of discussion included the GST and the Quebec sales tax as well as unemployment and, of course, sovereignty.

Private Members' Business

A quick look at yesterday's *Hansard* leads us to ask questions on several problems facing people; yet we are talking about hockey tonight.

The issues debated yesterday in this House include the military college in Saint-Jean; Pearson Airport; the Young Offenders Act; South Africa. We congratulate them on their first democratic election and we hope that everyone will recognize the election results. Also, Bosnia; Canada's credit rating; bilingualism; the fisheries; Hibernia; the economy; AIDS; income tax; and job training.

I said earlier that many young people watch our proceedings. Talking about job training, I would like to quote the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine who said yesterday in this House in answer to my colleague from Lévis: "The federal government does not intend to question provincial jurisdiction over education".

Does this mean that he will not discuss it, that he will take on total jurisdiction in this area? His answer raises questions.

Still on the subject of young people, the hon. member for Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine said on CBC two weeks ago that 30 to 60 per cent of young Quebecers are dropouts because of the plan for sovereignty. Look at this figure: between 30 and 60 per cent. With such precise numbers, he could be finance minister.

Last fall, *Maclean's* showed that although serious, the actual dropout rate of young people in Quebec was about 20 per cent. We agree that we must encourage our young people and our youth, but not at their expense and not with crass petty politicking like he engages in too often.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my presentation, I support the bill to recognize hockey as Canada's national sport, but let us all agree that people in Quebec and Canada and throughout the world face much more urgent problems.

[English]

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to join with my colleagues in the House of Commons this evening to support Bill C-212.

I stand in this House as a certified CAHA hockey coach. I am from Saskatchewan and we do have world curling champions, both men and women. Hockey is played in every community on every dugout in the winter and on every piece of ice that one can find in every community in our province.

That is a tribute to the type of thing we are doing today in the House of Commons, making hockey along with lacrosse our official national sports.

Every Canadian either played hockey or wants to play hockey. It is a dream of almost every young hockey player to play in the NHL.

(1850)

Although Saskatchewan does not have any NHL teams we have exported a number of NHL hockey players to make up a number of teams. For example, we have Mike Modano playing for the Dallas Stars. He played for the Prince Albert Raiders at one point. Ron Grechner who is now with the Sabres is from North Battleford. Theoren Fleury from the Calgary Flames was playing for Moose Jaw at one point. Jeff Shantz is from the Regina Pats. He is playing with the Chicago Black Hawks.

Of course Wendel Clark who is from Kelvington, Saskatchewan is playing with the Toronto Maple Leafs. Doug Wickenheiser, the first draft choice of the Montreal Canadiens, is from the Regina Pats. We have as well Barry Melrose who played hockey in the NHL and coaches the Los Angeles Kings. I believe he is from Kelvington as well, the same place as Wendel Clark. Bill Hicke played many years ago for the champion Montreal Canadiens.

We have from Floral, Saskatchewan Mr. Hockey, Gordie Howe. Hockey is such a popular sport in our province that there is even a statue to Gordie Howe among the many statues in Saskatoon that my colleague from across the floor would acknowledge and certainly support.

As a matter of fact, Gordie Howe is such a major figure in Saskatchewan that he has even got some colleagues of mine in university passing grades. For example, we had a psychology exam one day and one of my friends from Saskatchewan did not know the answers so he wrote a story about Gordie Howe which had nothing to do with psychology. The professor gave him an A for this exam because he was a Gordie Howe fan too. I think that it has interesting implications as we go through the hockey process.

I want to not only support this bill but acknowledge in this House that the Regina Pat Canadians are the 1994 Canadian midget champions. They have played very well throughout the season and ended up winning the entire championship recently.

Not only have I been a coach, I have worked with many individuals in the community. I want to acknowledge this evening the volunteers who have spent hundreds of hours and many years in particular in my district, Regina—Lumsden, working for both the parks and recreation leagues which have in my constituency probably about 2,000 hockey players overall, as well as those in the more competitive city league of Regina which has about 1,600 players for the entire city at a higher level.

I think what they are doing is very important. Individuals like Greg Mario, president of the Regina Northwest Sports Association, and Harald Gohlke, vice-president in charge of hockey,

have made significant contributions to the community by being involved in the sport, in the community by teaching young players not only skills but how to get along in life as they age and become very reliable and admirable citizens of our country.

There are about eight hockey rinks in my constituency. They are always filled from five o'clock in the morning until late at night. We have not only the recreation leagues and the competitive leagues but the senior leagues, the oldtimers, those over 30 as well. Everybody in my community, if they do not play hockey, has played hockey. I think that is an indication of the broad based support for this very important national sport that we are approving this evening.

In summary, I want to say that "he shoots, he scores" is a very well known slogan in hockey. As far as I am concerned everybody in this House this evening has taken a shot today and everybody has scored.

Mr. John Harvard (Winnipeg St. James): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise and speak for just a couple of minutes on this bill. I certainly want to indicate my support for the bill in principle and its amendment. I am more than happy to give my support to it.

I think it is entirely appropriate for a Winnipegger to stand up and enter into this debate because Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba have contributed greatly to this great game of ours called hockey, especially the NHL.

I would like to remind the acting Speaker, who naturally served in the NHL as a referee, that perhaps one of the greatest of referees ever to serve in the NHL and currently serves in the NHL is none other than Andy Van Hellemond and he comes from that great suburb of Winnipeg called St. Boniface.

Andy's name is just one of dozens and dozens from Winnipeg who have contributed to this great game of hockey. For example, does anyone know, and this is just a little piece of trivia, that the NHL player holding the record for the three fastest goals comes from Winnipeg. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you would recognize the name Billy Mosienko. He is probably about six months older than you, or something like that. Sorry about that. Billy Mosienko of course played for many years. He had a sterling, outstanding career with the Chicago Black Hawks and his record of three goals I believe in 21 seconds still stands. I would doubt whether that record will ever be broken.

(1855)

Who can ever forget Bill Juzda, the great defenceman who probably could deliver some of the greatest bone cracking body checks ever delivered on ice in the NHL.

I am sure you cannot forget Don 'Bones' Raleigh who was a great player with the New York Rangers. How about Tom Johnson who played with not only the Boston Bruins but the

Private Members' Business

Montreal Canadiens. I would like to say politicians are given to this kind of thing. The Tom, who shares my ancestry which is Canadian Icelandic, grew up a mere 14 miles from my community. He grew up in a little town called Baldur and I grew up in a little town called Glenboro.

There was another great hockey player from Manitoba. Again, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that given your age and your interest in hockey and participation that you would remember a great player by the name of Black Jack Stewart who grew up in Pilot Mound, Manitoba.

I just wanted to share a little bit of this history because Manitoba has played a great part in hockey and contributed greatly to the game. We are all proud of it. I am happy to support the bill. I think that by adding this amendment that it is in itself a great symbolism of the way we do politics in this country because this is the quintessential Canadian compromise. You start off with a proposition that hockey should be named the national sport then people come in and say: "Now hold it. We have a history, we have a record. Lacrosse also has a lot of merit in this so why do we not reach the Canadian compromise and name lacrosse the summer national sport and hockey the winter hockey sport".

I think that is a great compromise and I am more than happy to support the bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The member for Winnipeg—St. James brought the name of a former colleague in another life with the National Hockey League, Andy Van Hellemond, but let me tell you about one other because I am aging rather rapidly here by all accounts, none other than Red Storey. A few years ago a number of parliamentarians, including the member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce who spoke earlier, came together to form a hockey team to play for a good charitable cause at the civic auditorium here in Ottawa against some National Hockey League oldtimers.

Lo and behold, in the middle of the game, for no apparent reason, Red Storey blew his whistle and stopped the play. Keep in mind that we had about 30 players on our bench. Red came over and said: "Look fellows, whatever you do don't quit your day jobs".

[Translation]

Mr. François Langlois (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate the hon. member for Kamloops whose perseverance will be rewarded in a few moments.

I also want to thank the hon. member for Mission—Coquitlam, who made a brilliant presentation on lacrosse, a sport which those who will read *Hansard* tomorrow will be able to learn more about. If the hon. member has more detailed personal notes on this topic, I would be pleased to read them. In the meantime, I wanted to highlight her contribution to the debate.

Private Members' Business

Later on this evening, most members will watch the hockey game between Montreal and Boston. As for me, I will probably go to Hull to watch the sixth game between the Hull Olympiques and the Chicoutimi Saguenéens of the Quebec junior major league. My interest in hockey stems more from my career as a journalist rather than from the limited skills I displayed on the ice. Indeed, I was better at writing about the game than at playing it. Early in my relatively short career as a journalist, I covered what was then junior A hockey in Canada, since major junior hockey did not yet exist.

I remember all the trips I made for the newspaper I was working for at the time and the playoffs I covered between teams which became famous. I could tell you stories that may have been forgotten in some areas, but are still much talked about in other places.

I covered games between the Quebec Remparts and another great hockey team, the Cornwall Royals, which also played in the Quebec major junior hockey league, and also the east-west finals between the Estevan Bruins and the Niagara Falls Flyers. What was funny about these finals was that both teams had the very same jersey, and I think it was the Niagara Falls Flyers organization which had to lend their visiting-team jerseys to the western team for the Memorial Cup Finals.

I want to point out that the Centennial Cup Series will start on Friday and will be held in Olds, Alberta. I want to wish the best of luck to the team that will be representing Quebec, the Châteauguay Élite, and may the best team win.

If it were not for all these men and women who drive their kids to the arena, or even an ice rink or somewhere else, and stay to entice their children to play their favourite sport, I do not think we would have a national sport. We talked about people playing in the heat and wearing extremely expensive equipment but there are still people playing outside in Siberian cold like the ones we had last winter. We must pay tribute to those people of my generation who started playing hockey with elementary equipment, because that sport was for us the soccer of the North. We would build our nets with ice, use hockey sticks worth 59 cents and quite often make a puck out of frozen horse droppings. Imagine how interesting it would have been in the spring to have a slap shot at the member for Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, if you will allow me a joke, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased, in the name of the Bloc Québécois and of all my colleagues since we share a common interest, whether we are from Quebec or Canada, regarding the two sports we are about to recognize, to support the bill introduced by the member from Kamloops, which we are going to pass unanimously.

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I must confess that I have been very pleased and honoured to have been in the chair throughout debate on this private member's bill. I congratulate the member for Kamloops. I also thank the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage for her diligence and work so that we might bring the bill to conclusion today.

The sports of hockey and lacrosse have played important roles in the development of my home town of Cornwall and the entire area of Stormont—Dundas. In naming names sometimes we forget someone, but let me go to the early 1900s. Two names that come to mind are Joe Lally and Newsie Lalonde, both of whom we will find in the Lacrosse Hall of Fame located in New Westminster, British Columbia. Of course Newsie Lalonde has also been inducted into the National Hockey League Hockey Hall of Fame.

Prior to the early 1960s the Roundpoint Chisholm lacrosse stick factory located on the Akwesasne Reserve manufactured 85 per cent to 90 per cent of the world's hickory lacrosse sticks. I really enjoyed being in the chair throughout the debate.

Pursuant to order made earlier this day, Bill C-212, as amended, is deemed read the second time and referred to committee of the whole, deemed considered in committee of the whole, deemed reported without amendment, deemed concurred in at report stage, deemed read a third time and passed.

(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed.)

It being 7.04 p.m. the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.04 p.m.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesday, April 27, 1994

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Recombinant Bovine Somatotropin

Mr. Patry 3563

National Parole Board

Mr. Thompson 3563

Immigration

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) 3563

South African Elections

Mr. Flis 3563

The Environment

Mrs. Bakopanos 3563

Social Security

Mr. Finlay 3564

Telecommunications

Mr. Pélouquin 3564

Overseas Tax Credit

Mr. Harper (Calgary West) 3564

Rouge River Valley

Mr. Cannis 3564

Official Languages

Mrs. Ringuette—Maltais 3565

Kids Sense Week

Mrs. Gaffney 3565

Sarajevo

Mr. Iftody 3565

Provincial Election

Mr. Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe) 3565

Battle of the Atlantic

Mr. Hart 3565

Community Violence

Mr. Dhaliwal 3566

Tobacco Tax

Ms. McLaughlin 3566

Infrastructure

Mr. Duncan 3566

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**High-Speed Train**

Mr. Bouchard 3566

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 3566

Mr. Bouchard 3566

Mr. Young 3567

Mr. Bouchard 3567

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 3567

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) 3567

Mr. Manley 3567

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) 3567

Mr. Manley 3567

Health Care

Mr. Manning 3567

Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3568
Mr. Manning	3568
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3568
Mr. Manning	3568
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3568

Health

Mrs. Picard	3568
Ms. Marleau	3568
Mrs. Picard	3569
Ms. Marleau	3569

Immigration

Mr. Hanger	3569
Mr. Marchi	3569
Mr. Hanger	3569
Mr. Marchi	3569
Mr. Ménard	3569
Mr. Manley	3569
Mr. Ménard	3569
Mr. Manley	3570

Challenger Jet

Mr. Thompson	3570
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3570
Mr. Thompson	3570
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3570

Social Program Reform

Mr. Crête	3570
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3570
Mr. Crête	3571
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3571

Infrastructure

Mr. Ianno	3571
-----------------	------

Mr. Eggleton	3571
--------------------	------

Tobacco

Mr. Ramsay	3571
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3571
Mr. Ramsay	3571
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3571

Collège militaire royal de Saint–Jean

Mr. Bachand	3572
Mr. Collenette	3572
Mr. Bachand	3572
Mr. Collenette	3572

Canada Pension Plan

Mr. Solberg	3572
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3572
Mr. Solberg	3572
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	3572

Groundfish Licences

Mr. Wells	3573
Mr. Tobin	3573

Reproductive Technologies

Mrs. Venne	3573
Mr. Rock	3573
Mrs. Venne	3573
Mr. Rock	3573

First Nations

Mr. Duncan	3574
Mr. Gray	3574
The Speaker	3574
Mr. Duncan	3574
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	3574

Handguns

Mr. Allmand	3574
Mr. Rock	3574

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Income Tax Act

Bill C-241. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	3574
Mrs. Gaffney	3574

Petitions

Criminal Code

Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa—Vanier)	3575
------------------------------------	------

Port of Churchill

Mr. Harper (Churchill)	3575
------------------------------	------

Ethanol

Mr. Pickard	3575
Mr. O'Brien	3575
Mrs. Ur	3575

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Robichaud	3575
---------------------	------

Motions for Papers

Mr. Robichaud	3575
---------------------	------

Point of Order

Petitions Presented in the House—Speaker's Ruling

The Deputy Speaker	3576
--------------------------	------

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Pearson International Airport Agreements Act

Bill C-22. Consideration resumed of second reading, and of amendment and amendment to the amendment.	3577
--	------

Mr. Paré	3577
Mr. Assad	3578
Mr. Fillion	3579
Mrs. Picard	3580
Mr. Dumas	3581
Mr. Godin	3582
Mr. Sauvageau	3584
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac)	3585
Mr. Rocheleau	3586
Mr. Mercier	3587
Mr. Leroux (Shefford)	3588
Mr. Bachand	3590
Mr. Duceppe	3591
Mr. Bernier (Gaspé)	3593

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Sport Act

Bill C-212. Motion for second reading	3594
Mr. Riis	3594
Ms. Guarnieri	3596
Motion	3597
(Motion agreed to.)	3597
Mr. Dubé	3597
Mr. Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	3599
Mrs. Jennings	3600
Mr. Allmand	3601
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	3602
Mr. O'Brien	3603
Mrs. Hayes	3604
Mr. Boudria	3605
Mr. Sauvageau	3605
Mr. Solomon	3606
Mr. Harvard	3607
Mr. Langlois	3607
The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger)	3608
(Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, concurred in, read the third time and passed.)	3608