



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 216

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Monday, June 12, 1995

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, June 12, 1995

The House met at 11 a.m.

Prayers

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing right to know legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who, in the course of duty, are confronted by fires or disasters involving potentially harmful substances such as toxic chemicals.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to urge the House to support the motion. It has not been deemed votable but nevertheless it could be voted on and passed if there were a will to do so. The House can do this by unanimous consent. The procedure by which resolutions or private members' bills are deemed votable was designed so only a minimum number of motions and bills would be votable. It was not designed in any way to prevent more than the required amount from becoming votable, if the House chose to do so. I urge the House to do that today if there is a will on the government side to allow the motion to go forward. I will explain why I think that should be done.

I thank my seconder in this instance, the member for Kamloops, for helping me today and also the International Association of Firefighters with which I have worked closely over the last little while in developing this motion, along with a couple of others, a notification protocol for infectious diseases and the public safety benefit.

The motion urges the government to improve the safety regime for firefighters and other emergency response personnel. Firefighters as well as other emergency response personnel are often called on to risk their lives to deal with accidents and emergencies involving highly volatile and toxic chemical substances at great personal risk not just in the immediate sense but also in the long term sense. Studies have shown firefighters have

higher vulnerability and a higher incidents of certain diseases associated with exposure to these kinds of toxic chemicals.

They need to have rapid, accurate and complete information about these hazardous materials where lack of information can cost lives. It is the responsibility of the federal government to ensure all reasonable measures are taken to provide that information. That is what this motion is about.

I take the opportunity of this debate to make a specific proposal. If the government is looking for something it could get behind in a concrete and practical way the passage of this motion would create a context in which it might do so.

I will make a specific proposal for this kind of problematic situation involving toxic substances, accidents that occur during the transportation of hazardous materials. In other words, it is not only with respect to transportation that these things happen but in the transport sector we could, as I will go on to suggest, have a pilot project.

Firefighters have been calling on the government to take the first steps in the development of a state of the art system to provide emergency response personnel with the information they need by taking advantage of the latest computer technologies and software.

This is an issue on which there is clearly little occasion for partisan politics. I hope members from all sides of the House will support this motion and that the government will let it come to a vote if someone on the government side near the end of the debate could seek unanimous consent to have this go forward. I am not aware of any members of the House who are opposed to this. It is after all only a motion which asks the government to consider the advisability of it. For the House to pass this motion would afford Transport Canada an excellent occasion to move this important file forward.

Accidents involving hazardous materials pose a number of special challenges to emergency response personnel. On the one hand the consequences of not reacting quickly and in the appropriate manner can result in the death or injury of not only emergency personnel but of large numbers bystanders if accidents occur in densely populated locals.

On the other hand because such accidents occur relatively rarely, giving personnel very little experience in dealing with such emergencies and involve highly complex chemical compounds, it is often difficult for personnel to react quickly in the

Private Members' Business

appropriate manner. Immediate access to information about the contents of containers and the necessary procedures to be followed is the key to improving this safety regime in Canada.

The current system which uses placards on containers to identify the contents is not one that fulfils all the needs of emergency response personnel. Firefighters told us when we met with them recently at their national lobby in Ottawa that the placards do not always provide sufficient information to aid emergency workers and that these placards are often missing or destroyed by virtue of the very accident that has called them to the scene in the first place. We are in urgent need of an upgrade in the reporting system for these emergency response situations.

Fortunately there is an emerging technology which would prove to be very useful in filling the gaps in the current system. Computer software along with communications links between firefighters and police dispatch stations and the transport companies is now being developed which would allow emergency response personnel almost instantaneous access to detailed information to be taken directly from transport companies' data bases.

Not only could such a computer linkup provide firefighters with precise information about the contents of a container, it could also provide detailed guidance about the necessary safety precautions to be taken when dealing with the material in question.

It has also been shown that such a computer linkup could help emergency response personnel in the event of train derailments involving passengers trapped in damaged rail cars. The linkup could provide rescue workers with detailed plans of how these rail cars are constructed with blueprints which could aid them in their search for trapped passengers.

While this network is now a technological possibility it is up to the federal government to take a leadership role in developing the specific computer software and communications networks and putting a system in place.

The International Association of Firefighters has been urging the government to begin the development process by establishing a pilot project in concert with industry, labour and local government stakeholders. It is proposed that such a pilot project take place in a major transportation centre that would permit the stakeholders to experiment with the new software and communications links and to demonstrate the system's effectiveness for later use across Canada.

(1110)

Winnipeg with its thriving rail and truck traffic has been suggested as an ideal choice for such a project not by me but by

those interested in this project; although Winnipeg is not always as thriving as I would like it to be on the rail side.

I hope my fellow colleagues from the Winnipeg area would help make the case to the government for passing this motion and also that if there were a pilot project to follow the government consider very seriously using Winnipeg as a place where this project might proceed.

The primary aim of going forward with such a project in a timely manner is to save lives, the lives of the firefighters who at present work in dangerous situations without all the information they need and the lives of residents in communities where accidents occur.

There is also an important international dimension to this question. The American department of transport has already begun work on developing such communications networks and it is helping fund a pilot project in the Houston, Texas area called operation respond. All indications are that the experiment is proceeding well and that the department of transport will be moving to set up a national system of regulations for the transportation of hazardous materials.

In the context of NAFTA, Canadian export and transport industries will be directly affected by such regulations and there will no doubt be pressure for harmonization. It is therefore imperative that Canada develop its own system which meets particularly Canadian needs so that in the future we will not be obliged to adopt uncritically or simply out of necessity the American regulations by default because we did not have the foresight to apply the available technology to a pressing safety issue in Canada on our own.

I believe all members of the House will want to do whatever is in their power to improve the safety of firefighters and their fellow emergency response workers. Here is a case where the hype about the possibilities of the new information revolution might actually live up to expectations and do something concrete in terms of human health and human safety.

Who would deny firefighters access to state of the art technology in situations in which they are laying their lives on the line? Who would deny them the right and the means to know exactly what they are handling in these very dangerous situations?

Support for this motion would be an excellent means for members of the House to convey to firefighters on behalf of all Canadians we are grateful of the often heroic service they provide, and to convey our support for their efforts to improve safety in their work environment.

I hope the government will allow members of the House to do this by passing this motion; allow members to convey the grateful support of Canadians to firefighters by using its discretion collectively speaking to allow this motion to come to a vote or to be passed by unanimous consent. I cannot imagine that we

would divide on the matter. Either we will pass it by unanimous consent or it will be talked out.

I understand the government believes the wording of this motion is too vague and without specific reference to the transport of hazardous materials to be allowed to come to a vote. I have talked to the Ministry of Transport about this.

I suggest to the contrary this motion simply conveys to the government the House's desire that it take action on improving a firefighter's safety and would give the government a welcome boost in the ongoing discussions between labour, industry and government stakeholders on the appropriate way forward.

By letting this motion go forward the government would supply itself with an excellent spur to move a file forward which members on all sides of the House think should be moved forward. I hope the government has rethought its position over the course of the weekend. This is after all only a motion. If it passes, all the government is obliged to do is consider the advisability of bringing in this system. It would create the context, it would create a little parliamentary momentum.

Last year I had a similar motion on a completely different topic and at the end of my speech I asked for unanimous consent that the motion be put to a vote at the end of the hour. Some may recall it was a motion having to do with the creation of a medal for Dieppe veterans.

The procedure we followed at that time is the one I am suggesting could be done now, that we could decide now that the motion would come to a vote. People could speak to the motion and at the end of the hour we could allow it to pass.

(1115)

With that precedent in mind, knowing this is procedurally possible and that firefighters were here not so long ago reporting that no one disagreed with this suggestion, I seek unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): If I interpret the member correctly, is he asking for unanimous consent at this point in time?

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I believe we could agree now that at the end of the appointed hour the motion be put, if there were unanimous consent to agree to do that. If there is not, then we could seek it at the end of the hour, but we have to seek it at some point if there is a will in the House to allow the motion to pass.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I trust I get not only the intent but the spirit. The unanimous consent being proposed at this time by the member for Winnipeg Transcona would be that this motion become votable at the end of this hour of debate on this motion.

Private Members' Business

Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is not unanimous consent. Resuming debate, the hon. member for St. Boniface.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to speak to this motion. I applaud my colleague's initiative, because he raises an extremely important issue, which must be discussed and eventually resolved.

I myself have a particular interest in this motion because, for a number of years, I participated in conferences on this very issue. My greatest wish is for us to find an equitable solution for all concerned.

As you know, the motion reads as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing "Right to Know" legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who, in the course of duty, are confronted by fires or disasters involving potentially harmful substances such as toxic chemicals.

[*English*]

As was pointed out, this is an all encompassing motion. I assume it includes not only firefighters but also ambulance attendants and police officers. As I proceed to raise questions I do so in the spirit of trying to strengthen the motion, focus it, and come to some sort of resolution.

No doubt it encompasses police officers and ambulance attendants, quite apart from firefighters and perhaps others. It might be useful to try to define those. No doubt it is also intended to cover goods transported by rail and truck, but it is important not to exclude air and marine modes as well.

As to potentially harmful substances, this is very broad and may require further definition. For example, I believe it includes infectious diseases and infectious material. However, that remains to be discovered; perhaps it does not.

When I have discussed this initiative on different occasions a number of questions have arisen. People want to know specifically what is to be accomplished. They want specifics. They want to make sure no one is excluded, that all who might benefit from this or a similar initiative are identified.

The authorities also suggest there are some systems in place, which my colleague has mentioned, that respond at least in part to some of the concerns that have been voiced here. For example, there has been reference to the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act. There has also been a reference to the CANUTEC system, an initial emergency response guide, which is really quite common, popular, and useful. It is available in

Private Members' Business

English and French throughout Canada and the world. I am told it is a useful reference and useful tool as well.

(1120)

The federal authorities also point out that it need not be the federal government by itself but that there are other partners involved, for example, the provincial and territorial governments, local governments, and perhaps even the private sector. Those are questions that need to be resolved before we can in fact proceed with a definitive proposal.

With respect to an initiative on the part of the federal government, I want to tell my colleagues that the government is monitoring the pilot projects. The government is concerned with the scope of the project, what it is attempting to do and what it has in fact accomplished. They are also obviously concerned about cost. In today's world one has to be particularly prudent about taking on additional initiatives and cost is obviously a high priority.

The federal government also wants to make sure there are partners, all of those people involved who could potentially benefit from the initiative. I have mentioned the various levels of government, but I should also mention that the private sector indeed is involved in certain sectors and needs to be involved.

I want to study what is happening in the U.S. and elsewhere. I give my assurance I shall continue to be extremely supportive of such an initiative.

[*Translation*]

In summary, the transport department officials I spoke to felt that the proposal was perhaps a little too broad and not specific enough. I think, however, that my colleague is on the right track. We can provide extra protection to firefighters and others likely to be involved in disasters or difficult situations.

The other extremely important consideration is the need for additional, clear information on pilot projects under way elsewhere. I felt that before moving in that direction, the government wanted to know all the facts, including how much it would cost and who the partners would be. It wanted to ensure that this would lead to something that would help not only firefighters but all those involved.

For my part, I participated in a number of forums over several years. This is something I care about and a most important issue. We must realize that we will eventually have such a system. The basic question for me is not only the issues I raised, but how we could proceed, when, with whom and at what cost. I hope that the questions I just raised will be answered soon.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but one of my colleagues across the way felt the need to shout to someone, and I lost my train of thought. Unfortunately, some people are not as polite as others. I now get back to the motion.

[*English*]

As I said, I am interested in pursuing this proposal and I will do everything in my power to try to find some sort of solution. Clearly not today but hopefully in the near future we can come up with specifics with regard to a pilot project where the partners will be identified, where the costs will in fact have been found as well, and perhaps we can go forward and do something meaningful for our firefighters, our ambulance attendants, our police officers and others involved.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as Bloc members, we are pleased to support this motion made by our colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona.

This is what we could call a forward-looking motion mainly concerned with the interest not only of a trade, namely firefighters, but also of the public in general.

For one thing, the government has a role to play in the area of occupational safety. In fact, it can play several key roles by the influence it has, the example it sets and the legislation it passes.

(1125)

Through its influence, the government can encourage employers to adopt more adequate safety measures. For instance, under existing legislation, since legislation does already exist—we may not find it adequate but it nevertheless exists—the government can check and make sure that safety standards are complied with in many areas, such as construction. The most common areas where risks are still high are the agri-food industry, the environment, transport and, of course, sites where explosives may be handled.

Through the way it deals with its own employees, the government plays a crucial role. Naturally, as I said, the government must set the example, for the entire population is governed by the occupational safety legislation it enacts.

Safety standards for government employees must also be monitored closely and, above all, the government must afford its employees the opportunity to put standards in place so that they are well protected. In addition, by introducing new legislation, the government can strengthen those standards which may seem inadequate or at the very least deficient at this time.

In our view, this is a fundamental role of government, especially since new technologies, such as nuclear energy and all the related areas, have developed rapidly.

Private Members' Business

This fundamental role has become even more essential with the proliferation of chemicals and toxic substances used in various industries to develop new products. Many environmental disasters in recent years have shown how important government action is when it comes to protecting those government employees responsible for managing such disasters.

We need only think back to the explosion—in other countries, but we cannot be spared forever—of the nuclear power plant in Chernobyl or the oil spill off the coast of Alaska. These two examples clearly show the kind of hazards to which government employees are exposed.

Closer to home, the fairly recent devastating fire in Saint-Basile-le-Grand and the lead contamination incident in Saint-Jean are other examples which show that legislation is crucial in this field, whenever chemical and toxic products are used.

The Bloc will therefore support the motion. We were hoping that there would be a vote on it but, unfortunately, the required unanimous consent was not reached. Again, the government must be a leader in the protection against dangerous products. It can, through its attitude toward its public servants and the public, and also by tabling a new bill, make the job of many workers much safer.

Firefighters associations, including the International Association of Firefighters, have been urging the government for years to set up a national computerized information system on dangerous products.

With such a system, as soon as the alarm went off, firefighters would have information on the location of the fire and would be able to react accordingly so as to prevent greater damage or make sure that they did not pointlessly endanger their lives and their health or those of the public.

The presence of dangerous products on the site of a fire can be extremely costly, even fatal, for those involved. Recently, in a small village in Quebec, firefighters answered a call to put out what looked like an ordinary barn fire. However, because they did not have adequate information concerning the premises, the firefighters used normal techniques to put out the fire, without being aware of the danger to which they were exposed themselves.

(1130)

There was a propane tank inside the barn, that no one had any reason to suspect was there. After they set up their equipment and started fighting the fire, the tank exploded. Seven firefighters were killed instantaneously in the blast and several others were injured. This catastrophe could easily have been avoided if the firefighters had known that the barn concealed a deadly bomb.

Seven lives were lost, and the only thing the speaker who preceded me, an hon. member from across the way, was concerned about was the cost. Do other lives have to be lost before they take action?

Another bill is currently before the House, Bill C-68 on firearms. Why is the government in such a hurry to take action? It is in such a hurry because 14 students were murdered at a university in Quebec by a lunatic who was in legal possession of a firearm. Because 14 human lives were lost, the House is debating a bill on firearms, and the cost of implementing and administering it are of no concern to the government. What it is trying to do is protect the lives of Canadians, protect everybody's life.

There are other causes of loss of human life each week in Canada: toxic spills during transport by rail, oil spills on the ocean, the use of chemical fertilizers which pollute or certain toxic substances, such as pesticides or insecticides. Many toxic substances which are widely used, sometimes carelessly, are decidedly very dangerous in the long run.

We are proposing preventative measures, which sometimes, actually not just sometimes but almost always, are less costly than deterrents.

In the opinion of the International Association of Fire Fighters, the computerized system currently in place, CANUTEC, is not well adapted. Towns with firefighting brigades have already put in place their own systems. I know that, before the new year, cities are going to convert to this system which will inform them before they respond to a fire alarm whether dangerous goods could be at the site. Towns are already absorbing the cost of these systems, so, there is no reason for the government to claim that additional costs will be involved. Local organizations will already be assuming the bulk of them.

Therefore, through such legislation, the government not only would increase the safety of workers but also would give peace of mind to all citizens who have to live near or deal on a daily basis with such life threatening products or environments, which would improve their standard of living and protect them.

For these reasons, we support this motion and hope that it will become votable as soon as possible.

[English]

Ms. Margaret Bridgman (Surrey North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Motion 136, proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg Transcona. The motion states:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of "Right to Know" legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who, in the course of duty, are confronted by fires or disasters involving potentially harmful substances such as toxic chemicals.

That is a very broad statement. I am surprised we are talking to such a statement because to my mind it would be a given that

Private Members' Business

kind of information would be available or that there would be processes in place to provide such information.

(1135)

The motion was developed out of a genuine concern for the safety of firefighters. These people seem to be lacking the necessary information so they can do their jobs effectively or as effectively as they would like to do it. I equate it to an emergency department in a hospital. Emergency staff really do not know what they are dealing with until the patient gets there.

I commend the member for Winnipeg Transcona for bringing this problem to our attention. Because of the nature of the firefighters' job it is not often they are actually in the news unless some very unfortunate situation occurs. Several recent incidents highlight the danger of the nature of the firefighters' job.

Recently in Ottawa firefighters had to respond to a fire that turned out to be in a house that was used mainly for drug purposes. When the firefighters arrived at the fire they rushed into the building to put the blaze out. They moved as quickly as possible according to procedures for firefighting. They were not expecting or necessarily looking for exposed needles and other dangerous drug paraphernalia. The irony is that the local police were aware it was a drug house but because of concern at overstepping the bounds of privacy, the information was not shared with another emergency response group. I find it phenomenal that they cannot work in partnership and share information that relates to an incident.

That is a concern we must definitely address, if not through legislation proposed in this motion, then the government should be looking at other ways to get around the letter of the law and use some common sense. Information should be shared among the principal players that are addressing the same concerns, especially when safety is involved. We must be practical and use some common sense on the issue.

Another issue which relates to the whole attitude of how emergency response personnel deal with injured persons would be to keep in mind today's environment in relation to infectious diseases. HIV-AIDS and tuberculosis are two diseases that come to mind that can cause a great deal of concern not only to firefighters but any other emergency response personnel.

In response to these valid concerns, groups such as the International Association of Firefighters have done a lot of work in researching the problem. That research is available to us to pursue. The association has called on the government to take steps to protect firefighters while they are performing their duties. One of the arguments put forward is that firefighters deserve to know what hazardous materials may be present at any incident. That follows logic. If firefighters are called to a potentially hazardous situation, it sounds very logical to be able

to pass on information about what they are facing and what they are dealing with.

That is a principle we can address by looking at a better communication and perhaps addressing the Privacy Act or situations involving that act.

A second principle would be access to reliable information that will save lives by ensuring that firefighters use the most effective response techniques at any incident. The previous speaker talked about a propane tank in a barn. If somebody was aware the tank was there, that information should have been available to the firefighters responding to the fire.

Both arguments put forward by the IAFF are certainly valid. The principles involved in them are certainly worth looking at. They are very timely. There must be numerous options for addressing the proposals by the association that we can look at and it is time we did. This motion presents a couple of suggestions in relation to ways of addressing that.

(1140)

The IAFF supports the establishment of a computerized national emergency response. This is one suggestion on how to address these issues. It would provide accurate information to firefighters at the scene of a hazardous material incident. The system would provide not only information for stationary incidents such as the propane tank in the barn, but also for hazardous materials that are on the move.

A system which deals with materials in stationary structures should certainly be looked at for a couple of identifiable reasons. We are already doing one through the women's program in many institutions such as hospitals, et cetera. The other one would be to prevent firefighters from going into the barn without knowing about the propane tank.

I would like to move on to the computerized system for materials in transit. A system is already in place which requires little placards to be put on vehicles. One of the problems occurring with that is that the placards may not be up to date. Therefore, firefighters can arrive at a derailed train and find the placard is not up to date or they may not even see the placard because of fire. There are situations in the system which really do not address all the problems.

A computerized system seems to be one very good answer. However it will only be as good as the information being put into it. The government is suggesting that this system is not up to par in relation to providing the kind of information that would facilitate the problem that firefighters have.

In the world of technology today, I am suggesting that system, if it is not here now, is not far away. We should be looking at it very seriously as a possible solution. We should be doing some research and investigation of it and figuring out what the cost of it is going to be. If it is plausible it should be implemented on a

Private Members' Business

test basis some place to see whether or not it will address the problem.

The motion deals not only with small aspects of the problem but is all encompassing. It deals with stationary situations, movable situations, health and all other aspects. Therefore, because of the nature and broadness of this motion and the fact that it is a problem that should be solved, we should be looking at it. It is not an isolated type of thing. It is a general thing.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make a few comments on private member's motion M-136 presented by the member for Winnipeg Transcona.

The motion urges the government to consider the advisability of introducing right to know legislation for the protection of firefighters and other public servants who in the course of their duties are confronted by fires or disasters involving harmful substances.

Let me first commend the member for bringing the issue up for discussion through his private member's motion. I personally know the member to be a politician of vision and passion and a vigorous and eloquent defender of worker interests.

Those of us on this side of the House share the concern he brings to occupational safety and health. We too are appalled by the number of accidents and fatalities that annually occur in our workplaces. We also believe that work in Canada ought to be a rewarding and satisfying activity that does not pose undue risk to those who must perform it.

The good news is that because many innovative measures have been taken over the years, considerable progress has been made in the area of occupational safety and health.

(1145)

The intent of the member's motion is something upon which I think we can all agree. However, its fatal flaw is that it does not fall under federal jurisdiction. If I may say so, the member is knocking on the wrong door. Labour related matters including occupational safety and health issues are mainly a provincial and territorial responsibility. Requiring employers to provide information on hazardous substances to emergency response personnel is a matter which provincial and territorial authorities need to address.

As the member may know, occupational safety and health legislation in Canada is based on the internal responsibility system. This arrangement recognizes the employer's right to manage an enterprise in an efficient manner as well as the employer's responsibility to protect the safety and health of the employees. It also recognizes three fundamental rights of work-

ers: the right to participate, the right to refuse dangerous work, and the right to know.

Since 1988 Canada has had in place a nationwide system to provide information on hazardous material being used in the workplace. Known as WHMIS for workplace hazardous materials information system, it established a uniform identification system for dangerous ingredients in the workplace. It came about because in the early 1980s business, labour and government realized that Canadian workplaces were woefully lacking the kind of information necessary to handle safely the kind of materials and equipment which were being introduced in the workplaces of Canada.

The system was comprised of four features: labelling requirements, the provision of material safety data sheets, worker education, and protection for confidential business information. WHMIS ensures that the hazardous materials produced, imported into or used in Canadian workplaces are adequately identified by suppliers using standard criteria. It requires the data sheets on hazardous materials to be transmitted by suppliers to employers and subsequently to employees. It obliges employers to provide their employees with adequate professional training on how to use the materials.

By effective dissemination and information through WHMIS, employers and workers get the data and knowledge required to communicate with one another, making possible the kind of co-operative efforts necessary to enhance safety and health in the workplace. Because employees have firsthand knowledge of the workplace, their involvement is essential. For employees to be able to assume responsibility for workplace safety and health they must be able to recognize what is going on and understand the changes occurring in the workplace. WHMIS ensures that workers have the information they need to make the decisions which they must make. In short, WHMIS is a response to the right of employees to know the hazards of the materials with which they work and the way to safely handle such substances.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that WHMIS is the most advanced information system in the field of occupational safety and health in the world. It is a system which works and, if I may say so, it is a system we can proudly speak of internationally. It should also be mentioned that WHMIS was the result of an extraordinary collaborative effort which brought together not only the governments in Canada but also organized labour and the business community. No one sector, no one government acting alone could deal with this issue in an effective and efficient manner.

WHMIS legislation in each of the jurisdictions throughout Canada is harmonized legislation based on a model regulation which was developed during the consultative process. Regulatory agencies in each jurisdiction ensure compliance within its

Private Members' Business

boundaries. WHMIS has been successfully implemented in all jurisdictions.

I think most officials and informed observers believe that its successful implementation was due to the fact that potential problems were identified by the stakeholders during the design stage when steps could be taken to minimize any possible adverse impacts in the workplace. Although the process was time consuming, its participatory nature made possible a relatively smooth implementation.

(1150)

As I indicated, most emergency response personnel, that is, the employees alluded to in the member's motion, come under provincial jurisdiction. Those who fall under federal jurisdiction, including firefighters, receive their WHMIS information and training as required by part II of the Canada Labour Code, the part that deals with occupational safety and health issues and by the provisions of part X of the Canada occupational safety and health regulations.

The member might be interested to know that presently a committee of labour and business representatives and government officials is reviewing part II of the Canada Labour Code. Among other things it is considering a recommendation that part X of the Canada occupational safety and health regulations be changed to indicate the local health and safety committees which would participate in the development of an inventory of hazardous substances. This inventory would then be made available to health and safety committees, health and safety representatives to the fire department and to the employees' physicians on request.

At the present time only the province of Ontario has a provision in its occupational safety and health act requiring employers to provide a material's safety data sheet to fire departments and local medical officers of health upon request.

Ontario is to be commended for taking the lead in this area. The member might consider approaching the other provinces, perhaps beginning with British Columbia and Saskatchewan to urge them to consider implementing the kind of legislation he has asked this House to implement.

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Thunder Bay—Atikokan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on the hon. member's motion.

I want to express my very deep concern for the welfare of this country's emergency response workers who risk their lives to protect ours. Most Canadians cannot begin to conceive the nightmare these individuals must be living through wondering in doing their jobs to the best of their abilities whether they have put their own health in jeopardy. We cannot imagine the fear and

trepidation all emergency workers must feel when they respond to a call never knowing what danger awaits them.

Canada owes a great deal to the dedicated men and women who put their lives on the line each day for our health and safety. I can reassure the House this government does not take their risks lightly. These risks are taken so seriously that this government along with our provincial counterparts, industry and labour have for some time now been developing programs to protect not only emergency response workers but also those in the transportation sector and those handling hazardous chemicals in the workplace.

Under the transportation of dangerous goods regulations, for example, a United Nations number or product identification number and the shipping name of a commodity must be on the label and the shipping document. Even in the absence of a shipping name or a product identification number or a placard or label the product may be identified by contacting the Canadian Transport Emergency Centre or CANUTEC using any of the following information: the flight number; the call sign if the goods are being transported by ship; reporting marks and car number if it is being transported by rail; carrier and truck or trailer number and carrier and licence plate number if it is being transported by road.

In the event of an emergency, the firefighter can call CANUTEC which has an inventory exceeding 320,000 material safety data sheets. CANUTEC is a national bilingual advisory service provided by Transport Canada to assist emergency response personnel in handling dangerous goods emergencies. CANUTEC has established a scientific data bank on chemicals manufactured, stored and transported in Canada. It is staffed by professional chemists experienced in interpreting technical information and providing advice which can be obtained by calling collect on a 24-hour basis.

CANUTEC is able to immediately provide the relevant information by accessing its database through the use of key words such as the UN number, the product identification number or shipping name required on the transportation of dangerous goods shipping label and shipping documents.

(1155)

Also, part VII of the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act requires that shippers and importers of certain dangerous goods have an emergency response assistance plan, ERAP, approved by Transport Canada. Currently there are approximately 14,000 such plans covering over 4,000 organizations entered into the transportation of dangerous goods directorate's national registry. All of these plans are audited.

Due to the seriousness of safety and health problems of hazardous chemicals used every day in the workplace, the federal, provincial and territorial governments agreed following a consensus proposal developed through extensive consultation with industry and labour representatives to implement a workplace hazardous materials information system. This system is a national program to reduce workers' deaths and injuries by

providing workers and employees with health and safety information about hazardous workplace chemicals. This system is implemented through interlocking federal and provincial legislation under the hazardous products act and in response to the workers' right to know the hazards of the materials with which they work.

Under the hazardous products act, suppliers of hazardous materials must provide precautionary labelling and material safety data sheets to employers. Complementary provincial legislation requires employers to develop appropriate workplace labelling and other forms of warning about hazardous materials produced in their workplace processes and make data sheets available to their employees and provide for worker education on the safe use of hazardous materials.

Furthermore in the province of Ontario, the Ontario Occupational Safety and Health Act requires that employers provide fire departments with data sheets upon request. There is no question we must continue to address the needs and concerns of emergency response personnel, such as firefighters as well as all other workers using hazardous chemicals.

Our goal is where possible to continue improving the systems of hazard communication for the benefit of all workers. We want emergency responders to have access to the most up to date information on prevention methods available. We are encouraging close co-operation between employers and employees to ensure that they have appropriate training and equipment to deal with out of control situations.

It is clear that the protection of Canadians, particularly those whose job it is to protect the general population is tremendously important to this government. In co-operation with the provinces, industry and labour we are doing everything within our jurisdictional power to provide emergency response workers with the necessary vital information to assist them in carrying out the dangerous work in as safe a manner as possible.

The intent of the motion is an honourable one. The government will support any strategy or technique that will provide protection for our citizens involved in such an honourable and extremely dangerous endeavour. The intent of this motion can become a reality with the co-operative efforts of the federal and provincial levels of government plus the others concerned and involved in the private sector.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to participate in what probably is one of the most important private members' debates we have seen in this session of Parliament. We are making an effort to listen to the lobbyists

Private Members' Business

for the firefighters particularly but also the police forces and ambulance services across Canada which have been asking for this initiative for many years.

I want to speak enthusiastically in favour of the initiatives taken by the member for Winnipeg Transcona. If this motion passes by all of the parties in the House of Commons, it will go a long way in saving lives and making the work that the emergency response personnel carry out much safer.

Previous speakers have acknowledged that emergency response personnel, particularly firefighters, are often called upon to deal with volatile and toxic chemical substances. If there has ever been a time for rapid, accurate and complete information about these hazardous materials, the time is now more than ever before.

Accidents involving hazardous materials pose a number of special challenges to emergency response personnel. By not acting quickly the result can be death and injury, to say nothing about bystanders, particularly if the accident takes place in a densely populated locale.

(1200)

It is sufficient to say that we have had the debate. We have heard from all parties in the House of Commons. We have heard enthusiastic support for an initiative that simply calls upon the government to consider appropriate legislation and to take appropriate action.

I seek unanimous consent for the motion to be accepted to allow the initiative to continue forward.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the suggestion of the hon. member for Kamloops. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is no unanimous consent.

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like the record to show that government members said no to this private member's motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): With the greatest respect to the member for Winnipeg Transcona and the important motion he raised before the House today, that is not a point of order.

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96, the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

MOTIONS IN AMENDMENT

*[English]***FIREARMS ACT**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, as reported (with amendment) from the committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There are 267 motions in amendment standing on the Notice Paper for the report stage of Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons.

Group No. 1: Motions Nos. 1, 10, 158, 167, 266 and 267.

Group No. 2: Motions Nos. 2, 3, 5, 19, 20, 39, 40, 55, 58, 59, 107 and 145.

Group No. 3: Motions Nos. 4, 6, 23, 24, 28, 29, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 60, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 85, 87, 88, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108 to 113, 154, 170, 207, 215, 216, 218, 224 and 225.

[Translation]

Group No. 4: Motions Nos. 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 35, 133, 134, 136 to 144, 146, 147, 163, 164, 165, 166, 173 to 206, 208, 210, 212, 213, 214, 220, 221, 222, 223, 228, 230 to 256, 259, 264, and 265.

[English]

Group No. 5: Motions Nos. 13, 14, 38, 209, 211, 217, 219, 258, 260 and 262.

Group No. 6: Motions Nos. 15, 16, 17, 18, 93 and 102.

Group No. 7: Motions Nos. 21, 22, 33, 34, 36, 47, 57, 72, 74, 80, 89, 90, 171, 172, 227 and 261.

(1205)

Group No. 8: Motions Nos. 25, 27, 159, 160, 168, 169 and 226.

Group No. 9: Motions Nos. 26, 37, 44, 46, 86, 94 and 96.

Group No. 10: Motions Nos. 30, 31, 32, 114 to 132, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157, 161, 162 and 263.

[Translation]

Group No. 11: Motions Nos. 48, 53, 61 to 68, 75, 83, 84, 135, 229, and 257.

[English]

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

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-68 be amended by replacing the words "other weapons" in the long title, on page 1, with the words "related matters".

Motion No. 10

That Bill C-68, in Clause 4, be amended by adding after line 38, on page 4, the following:

"(a.1) generally to promote firearm safety and reduce firearm-related crime without jeopardising the reasonable uses for firearms in Canadian society or imposing an undue administrative and financial burden on Canadian taxpayers, including legitimate firearm owners;"

Motion No. 158

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after lines 40, on page 58, with the following new Clause:

"112.1 (1) The Minister shall periodically conduct a review of this Act and the regulations and shall table a report on the review in the House of Commons within twelve months of commencing the review.

(2) The first review must be conducted no later than December 31, 2003, and no more than five years may elapse between the tabling of the report on a review in the House of Commons and the commencement of a subsequent review."

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 167

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 33 on page 65, the following new Clause:

"129.1(1) Sections 3 to 129 expire on December 31, 1999 unless prior to that date, with respect to each section

(a) the Auditor General has prepared and caused to be laid before Parliament a report on whether the section has been or will be a successful and cost-effective use of public funds to achieve an increase in public safety and a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms,

(b) the report of the Auditor General has been referred by the House to such committee as the house may designate for the purpose,

(c) the committee has considered the report of the Auditor General and made a report to the House on the success and cost-effectiveness of the section and on the extent to which

(i) public safety has been or will be increased or decreased,

(ii) the incidence of crime related to the use of firearms has been or will be reduced or increased.

(iii) a cost-effective use of public funds has been or will be made to achieve an increase in public safety or a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms,

(d) the committee has recommended to the House that the section should not expire, and

(e) the House has concurred in the report of the committee.

(2) Where a section is to expire as result of subsection (1), the Governor in Council may, by order, defer its expiry for a period not exceeding one year, if the section contains matters that do not relate to firearms control and the deferral is necessary in order for legislation to be proposed to Parliament to continue the other matters in force after the expiry of the section.

Government Orders

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP) moved:

Motion No. 266

That Bill C-68, be amended by adding after line 28, on page 134, the following new Clause:

“185.1 (1) In 2000, no later than June 1, and every three years thereafter, a comprehensive review of the provisions of this Act shall be undertaken by such Committee of the House of Commons as the House may designate for that purpose.

(2) The Committee shall review the effectiveness of the provisions of this Act and the use of firearms in the community in general and shall report to the House as to whether any provision of this Act or the regulations or any other legislation respecting firearms should be amended, augmented or repealed.”

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 267

That Bill C-68, be amended by adding after line 28, on page 134, the following new Clause:

“185.1 No later than January 1, 2001, the federal Minister shall prepare a report on the effectiveness of this Act in reducing the incidence of indictable offenses involving the use of a firearm and lay the report before the House of Commons.”

Mr. Milliken: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the extraordinary number of amendments and in view of the fact there is a limit on the debate today, I think you would find unanimous consent to deem the motions in each group put to the House when they have been put as you have just said.

If you indicate to the House that we will be debating Motions x, y and z, the motions would then be before the House for debate without your having to read the motions to the House. They are deemed moved and seconded.

Similarly this evening, when it comes to the votes, the same would apply. The Speaker could say the question before the House is on Motion No. 26, for example, and the vote would follow on that motion without having to put the motion. It would save us a lot of time today in view of the very large number of motions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The House has heard the suggestion of the parliamentary secretary. Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Just to be helpful to the House, in group No. 1 Motions Nos. 1, 10 and 158 stand in the name of the member for Algoma; Motion No. 167, the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville; Motion No. 266, the hon. member for Kamloops; and Motion No. 267, the hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka.

I will begin the order of debate by recognizing each of these four members and then we will follow the normal sequence for debate. I will begin with the member for Algoma, followed by the member for Yorkton—Melville, the member for Kamloops and the member for Parry Sound—Muskoka. Then we will follow the normal sequence of government, opposition and so on and so forth, according to the wishes of whoever may be seeking the floor.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, after many months of discussion and debate we have come to an important point in time as far as Bill C-68 is concerned.

My three motions in this group deal with one of the most fundamental issues I have tried to express over past months both in this place and in my constituency. They concern the need to be respectful toward the legitimate gun owning community in Canada. I am speaking particularly of the many hundreds and thousands of legitimate gun owners in my riding of Algoma who feel strongly with pride about their firearms ownership. They believe as I do that they properly own and use firearms.

(1210)

My first motion deals with the title. The current title of the bill states:

An act respecting firearms and other weapons.

It is my proposal in this motion that we simply refer to the act as an act respecting firearms and related matters. The inclusion in the title of the word weapons places a negative nuance on the legitimate gun owning community in Canada. In the hands of legal gun owners firearms are not weapons. They are only in the hands of criminals.

It is important to send the right message. In so doing if we could amend the title by simply saying an act respecting firearms and related matters we would send the right message.

My second amendment in this group relates to the purpose clause. I am proposing an amendment to the purpose clause which I should like to read to the House. It states:

(a.1) generally to promote firearm safety and reduce firearm related crime without jeopardizing the reasonable uses for firearms in Canadian society or imposing an undue administrative and financial burden on Canadian taxpayers, including legitimate firearm owners;

The message that I have consistently tried to convey throughout the months leading up to this point is that we have many situations where firearms are misused or are improperly stored. The message the government wants to give is that those who

Government Orders

commit crime and in so doing use a firearm need to be dealt with swiftly and firmly.

The message must also be that those who legitimately own firearms and use them for recreational or sustenance hunting, for target shooting, for collecting or for use in occupations deserve our respect. They represent Canadians across the country who properly own and use firearms.

I would have preferred a preamble to the bill, but that not being possible I believe this statement in the purpose clause would clearly state to Canadians, to the legitimate firearms community, that the bill is not intended to be a punishment for them because they happen to own firearms. The bill is to deal with crime and criminals. The provisions that deal with the legal firearms community are simply part and parcel of a bigger program to deal with crime and firearms abuse.

The final amendment in the group I am putting forward, seconded by my colleague from Parry Sound—Muskoka, is that there should be a periodic review of the legislation by the minister. This is to acknowledge that no piece of legislation can be perfect. It must be our duty in this place and the duty of the minister to look on a regular basis at how effective and how efficient the legislation is operating, on the one hand as it operates in relation to the legal gun owning community, and at on the other hand how it is operating with respect to the criminal abuse and misuse of firearms.

Periodic review is very important. It cannot start tomorrow because the bill has not yet passed. It cannot start on January 1, 1996 because the first stage of the program will just be starting. However I believe a few years after the program is in place there should be a first review. I suggest the following amendment:

112.1 (1) The minister shall periodically conduct a review of this act and the regulations and shall table a report on the review in the House of Commons within 12 months of commencing the review.

(2) The first review must be conducted no later than December 31, 2003—

And every five years thereafter.

(1215)

I have chosen the year 2003 because it is the end of the first five-year period after the beginning of the registration program.

I am hopeful that this set of amendments, which I encourage my colleagues to support me on, will help to assure the legal firearms community that there will not be reams of red tape involved in what I expect to be a simple and inexpensive system for firearms owners; that it is not a tax grab by government; that it will not be an untoward invasion of privacy; and that it will not lead to the mass confiscation of firearms.

Instead of discouraging young people from entering target shooting sports or recreational hunting, the various provisions in the act will continue to encourage the pursuit of those very legitimate and honourable undertakings.

I encourage the House to look seriously at these amendments and I look forward to the House's support.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents and all the responsible firearms owners who have written me over the last year and a half, it is an honour and a privilege to be one of the few members of Parliament who will have an opportunity to speak during the six hours of limited debate granted to us by the arrogant and dictatorial Liberal government.

While I have the privilege of representing my constituents in the debate against Bill C-68, literally dozens of members of Parliament will be denied that right because of the six-hour time allocation imposed by the tyranny of the Liberal majority.

Voters send their MP to Ottawa to be their voice in Parliament, and what do the Liberals do but take the voters' right to be represented away from them by using anti-democratic measures like time allocation and closure and by making MPs vote according to the wishes of the Prime Minister, not the people of their riding. It makes me sad and it should make every Liberal member who did not oppose this abuse of power sad too.

The Liberals abuse their majority to do anything they want because they know there is nothing voters can do to stop them until the next election. I know there are about seven million gun owners who are just waiting for the next election. Considering what happened to the Liberal Party in Ontario last week, I think there are some Liberal backbenchers who are pretty worried about the direction in which their party is taking them.

Last Thursday the Liberals abused their power by limiting the time for debate on three bills, Bills C-68, C-41, and C-85. In doing so the Liberal government limited debate on three of the most controversial issues ever to be debated in the House, gun control, sexual orientation and MP pensions. By forcing time allocation the Liberals have declared their highest priorities to be gun control, MP pensions, and including sexual orientation in the sentencing legislation.

Personally, I do not believe these controversial issues are priorities for the people of Canada. I am sure that if the people knew how democracy was getting a kick in the teeth here in Ottawa there would be a lot more concern expressed. I wonder if the Liberals are hoping voters will forget this by the time the next election is announced.

Today I am introducing two amendments to Bill C-68 that would automatically repeal any and all gun control measures in five years unless the provisions have proven to be cost effective by the auditor general in improving public safety and reducing violent crime committed with firearms. If any gun control measure is not cost effective in improving public safety and in saving lives, it should be discontinued in favour of more cost effective measures. Is that not common sense?

Government Orders

It will be difficult for the Liberals to argue against my sunset clause amendment because they will have to argue that they support gun control measures even though the auditor general cannot find any evidence to show the measures to be cost effective at reducing violent crime involving firearms. If the Liberals oppose this amendment it will be clear to everyone in Canada that public safety is not their primary purpose in bringing forward this gun control bill.

Will the Liberals really stand up and say they support gun control measures that do not work? Will the Liberals tell Canadians they do not care whether gun control measures are cost effective or not? Will the liberals tell Canadians they cannot afford to implement new criminal justice measures that would save more lives because they are wasting money on ineffective gun controls?

(1220)

There should be a sunset clause in all legislation. We have too many laws. If they are not cost effective, they should be tossed out. We are creating a huge bureaucracy and we need to spend money in this place more carefully. We are the stewards of the public purse, and all legislation should be examined to see if it is cost effective, not just the gun control measures.

The reason we need a sunset clause in this legislation is because gun control in general and most of the measures proposed in Bill C-68 defy all logic. First of all, gun control will not improve public safety. It will do the exact opposite. Gun control and registration of all firearms will mean more crime, more injuries, more expense, more deaths and more victims. I wish I had time to prove each of these, but the debate is very limited.

The justice minister says he has no intention of confiscating guns and then he proceeds to ban over 550,000 handguns and 19,000 rifles. What are the people to believe, the minister's assurances or his actions? The justice minister says he no longer believes that only the police and military should have firearms, and then he proceeds to give himself the power to prohibit all firearms in Canada without bringing any of the prohibition orders before Parliament. The people do not believe the minister's slick lawyer talk because his actions speak louder than his words.

Bill C-68 will give drug dealers more rights than law-abiding responsible firearm owners. This bill will run roughshod over every Canadian's fundamental rights and freedoms, including their right to own, use, and enjoy private property; their right to be secure from unreasonable search and seizure; their right to remain silent; their right to be assumed innocent until proven guilty; their right to legal counsel; their right to freedom of association; their right to be represented in Parliament; their right to be treated equally before the law; and their right to privacy. All of those rights will be run roughshod over by this

bill. Bill C-68 will not withstand a charter challenge on many of these points.

Bill C-68 also intrudes into areas that are the sole constitutional jurisdiction of the provinces, namely administration of justice, regulation of private property, issuing of licences, assessing of licensing fees and user fees, education, and contributing to increases in provincial income taxes and municipal property taxes. Bill C-68 will not withstand a constitutional challenge by the provinces.

The final piece of illogical behaviour is the government's claim that they have broad public support for the measures proposed in Bill C-68. If this is true, then why is the government ramming this through Parliament? If the support is so broad then why not let democracy run its course? If there is broad public support then why not allow free votes? If there is such broad public support, why discipline liberal backbench MPs who are voting their constituents' wishes? If the public support is so great, why impose time allocation during second reading debate and leave at least 30 MPs waiting to speak?

If the public supports this bill, why did the standing committee on justice limit the amount of time for public hearings and deny to hundreds of people who wanted to be heard the opportunity to be heard? If support is so great, why did the standing committee refuse to hear expert testimony from individual independent experts in various areas? For example, we have been in contact with the Canadian Life and Health Insurance Association and the Insurance Bureau of Canada and have learned that insurance companies do not ask their applicants if they own a gun because they are not an identifiable risk group. There are so many people who wanted to come before this committee and were denied the opportunity. We have a problem.

This proves the justice minister and his supporters are wrong when they say gun owners are a risk to themselves or others. If gun ownership represented any risk or liability, insurance companies would charge gun owners a higher premium for life, health, and property insurance. They do not. This is just one of the many areas that have not been fully explored by the justice committee.

(1225)

If the minister is so convinced that the public supports his proposals, then why is he not prepared to do the rigorous evaluation recommended by the auditor general before implementing further gun controls? Let us see if the measures implemented in Bill C-17 are working before spending even more money on measures that are not cost effective in achieving the stated objective of improving public safety. If there is broad public support, why invoke time allocation at report stage?

I am introducing this amendment so that we will always evaluate this gun legislation to see if it is working, if it is effective. Those parts that are not working or not effective

Government Orders

should be repealed. Everything the government does defies common sense.

This sunset clause should be supported by all members of the House. I cannot think of any reason they would oppose it. I hope we will have some common sense when we examine it.

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak on this legislation.

As my colleague, the previous speaker, has indicated, it is unfortunate that many members of Parliament will not have an opportunity to speak at report stage, since the government has introduced closure and will limit the debate at this stage of the legislation. However, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a couple of remarks about the bill itself.

I am certainly not a spokesperson for what people would refer to as the gun lobby. Yes, I have been a fur trapper with my own trapline. Yes, I have been a big game hunter. Yes, I have been a recreational shooter, but that was some years ago.

The fundamental question I asked myself was whether this legislation will curtail the number of people who are killed each year by firearms. That is fundamental.

I looked at the details and noticed, for example, that about 1,400 people die of gunshot wounds each year, which has fallen substantially over the last number of years. How does the 1,400 break out? Eleven hundred people die as a result of a firearm wound through the commission of suicide. In other words, people who have decided to take their own life are using a firearm. If that firearm were registered would the person interested in committing suicide likely not commit suicide? I could only conclude that it would probably have little effect at all, recognizing that suicide is a fairly thoughtful process and that people normally think about it for some time. That takes care of 1,100 people who die of firearm wounds.

About 150 people die each year as a result of domestic violence, when one partner decides to shoot the other partner. Would that be reduced if firearms were registered? Would people not shoot their spouse or their partner? I concluded that probably would not have any effect either. If things have deteriorated in a relationship to that extent, whether the .22 is registered someplace will probably not deter the person from committing the act.

Then I noticed that about 100 people each year die who I will define as gangsters. I suspect that gangsters do not register their sawed off shotguns or pistols, so I concluded that would not have much of an impact.

About 50 people each year die in Canada as a result of shooting accidents. A shooting accident will take place, I presume, whether or not a firearm is registered.

When I looked at the 1,400 people who lose their lives each year as a result of firearms, I could only conclude that no one would not die as a result of the legislation.

Will our streets, neighbourhoods and country be safer because of the legislation? We have to acknowledge we will tie up the work of the RCMP and police forces, which will spend hundreds and thousands of hours doing evaluations and filling out forms. When I talked to many of the RCMP officers in Kamloops, I did not find a single one who actually supported the legislation. With respect to the tens of millions of dollars that will go into the registration system, they said put more members of the force on the street and it will make Canada a safer place, as opposed to a gun registration system that by and large will not be effective. Then I listen with interest to some of the aboriginal members of Parliament when they say the law ought not to apply to First Nations peoples.

(1230)

When there are people in the Senate and in the House of Commons saying this legislation should not apply to First Nations people, what kind of system will this be in the end?

I will give the Minister of Justice credit. I suspect he was honourably motivated when he brought this legislation forward. I believe he thought it would make Canada a safer place as a result of many people urging him to take some kind of action. Will Canada be a safer place? By and large, no. I wonder if it does not get the government members off the hook so they can go across the country saying: "Look at the tremendous action we have taken to combat crime in our streets".

The legislation is by and large a smokescreen. It is a scam, it is a sham, it is an illusion the government is taking action against crime when very little change will occur. I will not say there is nothing good in this legislation, of course there is. Every year I have been here I have supported changes to Canada's firearms' legislation but not this one. This is a phoney piece of legislation that gives the impression of real action when very little is taking place at a tremendous cost both in terms of abusing the lives of legitimate firearms owners and, more important, taking so much time of the RCMP and other police forces.

Is it a priority to tie up hundreds of thousands of person hours in this type of activity? That energy, time and money are misdirected. I assume because of the muscle the government is using in Parliament that the legislation will pass. That motivated me to put forward this amendment. I will read the amendment: "In the year 2000, no later than June 1 and every three years

Government Orders

thereafter, a comprehensive review of the provisions of this act shall be undertaken by such committee of the House of Commons as the House may designate for that purpose”.

I appreciate that the previous speaker indicated the interest in the auditor general's evaluating legislation prior to action. I support that because the auditor general has said on numerous occasions that in his judgment the present legislation has not been evaluated to see whether it is effective.

Even the justice department has stated time and time again the evaluation of the effectiveness of present legislation has simply not been done. Why then is the government so determined to proceed with a whole set of changes on existing legislation that has yet to be evaluated in terms of cost effectiveness?

Basically this is an attempt through one of 267 amendments to say that if the government is to proceed with this anyway as a result of its parliamentary muscle, let us at least include a provision so that this changed legislation is evaluated on a regular basis to see if it is effective, whether the registration system is effective, whether the whole initiative is cost effective and presumably to identify areas that need improvement.

It is meant to improve the legislation. I hope government members take it seriously and give some thought to building in some type of process by which this legislation can be reviewed on a regular basis.

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to talk at debate on Bill C-68 on my amendment which, like a couple of the others presented, calls for a review of this legislation. I have suggested a period of five years.

The purpose of the legislation, the intent of the minister and of the government to attempt to curb violence in Canadian society is a worthwhile objective and the legislation in many respects addresses that.

There are items in the legislation that have beyond a shadow of a doubt proven to have an opportunity to do that; increasing the penalties for the commission of certain violent acts with a firearm, increased penalties for possession of stolen firearms, increased penalties for smuggling, all of which most of us accept. The idea of more policing of the borders is a proven thing which most people would support.

(1235)

On the other hand there is the question of universal registration of all firearms, going beyond what we have now which is for handguns only. There is an open question whether that provision will achieve the purpose of the bill which is to reduce violence in Canadian society.

I and many Canadians believe that with any piece of legislation there has to be a balance. There has to be a relationship between what is being done, the cost and what the result will be.

There are four areas we should take a look at and which I intend to address briefly in this speech. We must look at what registration is likely to do and what is not likely to do, what it will cost and what it may do. There is a difference between what it will do and what it may do.

What is registration attempting to do? It is trying address what we know, that a firearm normally begins its life as a legal firearm and through its lifetime it goes through a process and becomes illegal. Registration is an attempt to arrest that process. It is not an attempt once a firearm becomes illegal to stop somebody from using it in a certain way. That will not happen. It is an attempt to stop the process of going from legal to illegal. It does that a number of ways.

A large number of thefts occur from bulk shipments. Registration will record those items as they reach the border and then can be tracked to their point of destination and hopefully stop theft from those shipments.

It will give police an opportunity better enforce prohibition orders issued by judges. Under this legislation and previous legislation a judge can put a prohibition order on individuals to stop them owning firearms based on their past behaviour, for instance being convicted of a serious criminal offence. Registration will make it easier for a police officer to know exactly what firearms they want to collect and execute the prohibition order.

On safe storage, if somebody has a firearm stolen from his or her dwelling and it is used in a criminal offence there will be the possibility to trace it back exactly from where it came. That might encourage certain people to practise better safe storage.

The licensing part of the registration system will give authorities the opportunity to examine somebody's past behaviour and to determine whether it should preclude them from owning a firearm. Those are some of the things registration is likely to do.

There are some things it will not do and people should be clear on this as well. Once a criminal has a firearm in their possession, whether it is registered is very unlikely to stop them from committing a criminal act. That is not what registration will do. Anybody with that in their mind is probably mistaken.

If somebody is intent on doing harm to themselves and is in possession of a firearm, that the firearm is or is not registered will probably not have a lot to do with the actions of that person. The registration part is to stop the process from becoming illegal. Once the firearm is illegal the legislation will not have a lot of impact.

There are some concerns about what it may do. I am concerned it will increase the cost of hunting. A lot of individuals in my riding hunt. It will preclude them from participating in that sport. On a more broad basis, hunting is an important economic activity in my riding which is pursued by a lot of people. A lot of individuals come into the area and spend their money on lodging

Government Orders

et cetera. The concern is whether it will decrease the number of people who will participate in that.

The fear of many legitimate firearm owners is whether this system of registration in the hands of a future government may be used to prohibit firearms normally used in recreational activities. It is a concern they genuinely hold and one we need to address and take into account when looking at this legislation.

(1240)

We must look at cost. The cost individually to begin with will not be that high, \$10 for up to 10 firearms plus acquiring an FPC. There is the concern that if that is the opening cost what will the cost be in five years, ten years, fifteen years. It is a legitimate concern not just with firearms but with anything that has a fee attached to it.

There is also a concern about the global cost for it. It is set at \$85 million to implement and then there will be a cost to keep it in place. That has to be a concern in a day and age when we have fiscal challenges facing us as a government.

There are a number of considerations we have to take into account. We have to take into account what registration will do. We have to understand what it will not do. We have to understand what it may do or at least have an appreciation of what it may do. We also have to understand what it may cost. We need to evaluate considering all of those components.

Will it stop violence? Will it be reasonable? Will it hurt legitimate firearms owners? Those are the things we need to know. Those are things being debated in the House, things quite frankly that have been debated for the last year. I do not think it will possible at this point to get any clear consensus on that or a clear understanding.

In that respect I have proposed an amendment which will mandate a review after five years so we will have an opportunity as Parliament to understand whether the legislation is achieving its objective to curb violence in society and understand whether we need to modify or change it to make it more effective in order to have an understanding as to whether some of those negative consequences or concerns put forward will take place.

Therefore I urge my colleagues in the House today to help and assist me by voting for this amendment requiring a review of the legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I want to advise the House that we have gone through the first round of debate and I recognized the speakers under whom the motions stood. Now to a more general debate I will look to the government, followed by

the official opposition, the government and the third party. We will see who might be seeking the floor at any time.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to speak on Bill C-68 at report stage.

I listened to the suggested amendments put forward by different members. The member for Yorkton—Melville worked on the committee and spent a good deal of time with other members of the committee working on this bill which I feel is a much better bill as a result of the work of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

I do not agree when members say we tried to shut down debate. We have had a lot of debate on this subject. We will have report stage today and third reading tomorrow. Members may want to speak to the bill at this stage. The important thing is members have spoken to us about their concerns on this bill and their thoughts and ideas have been taken into consideration; not all but a lot. As a result changes are reflected in the revised edition of the bill before the House today at report stage.

I will speak to the amendments that have been brought forward. The first amendment is by the member for Algoma who wants to change the title from other weapons to related matters. I understand what he is trying to do but unfortunately the wording he wants to use is too general. What we want to do here is relate it to weapons.

(1245)

There is not a negative connotation meant in this this bill relating to the use of weapons. A weapon is not something that has a negative connotation in the opinion of the government. If it had not been for weapons we would not have our free society today after the first and second world wars and the Korean conflict. We are not trying to downgrade or malign weapons. This is not something we want to do. For that reason we feel the wording as stated is what we would like to use.

He also mentions in section 4 on page 4 that the wording is ineffective because some of the objectives are not stated. He wants certain objectives stated. The problem is that while some of the objectives are stated by the hon. member in his amendment, other objectives are not. We feel that the section to which he refers adequately states what it is the government is trying to do.

I turn to Motion No. 158 relating to the review: "The minister shall periodically conduct a review of this act and the regulations and shall table a report on the review in the House of Commons within 12 months of commencing the review".

The review is something many members wanted to see in the bill and it was given a good deal of study. The problem is that we will be registering the gun owners from January 1, 1996 until December 31, 2001 and firearms themselves from January 1,

Government Orders

1998 to December 31, 2003. That is when the act will really be in place. Any time after that would be the logical time for a review if one were to be brought forward. If we are looking at a five year review the year 2008 presumably would be the time for a review.

It is not felt at this time that a review should be included in the bill. We want to give the bill a chance to work. We want to have the bill passed, to have Canadians understand what is in the bill and to have an opportunity to look at the regulations.

There certainly will be an election prior to the registration of the firearms commencing on January 1, 1998. This could be a subject of debate during the next federal election. I am sure all members will be prepared to discuss this subject and I welcome that. I think that is the way it should be. We would then have the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of the act and regulations which Canadians will have had an opportunity to review and of which they will be better aware. To leave that out at this time would be the most appropriate course.

The member for Yorkton—Melville has stated in Motion No. 167: "Sections 3 to 129 expire on December 31, 1999 unless prior to that date, with respect to each section the auditor general has prepared and caused to be laid before Parliament a report on whether the section has been or will be a successful in the cost effective use of public funds to achieve an increase in public safety and a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms". Certainly a review in my opinion would be preferable to this.

(1250)

We have stated we want Parliament to have the control over legislation, particularly this legislation. The motion gives the powers over the act to the auditor general. While the auditor general has a very worthwhile and important function in our system of government, he is not an institution to which we want to give control over our legislation and control over whether legislation is going to be successful or not.

The member is placing the responsibility on one man and one man's report as to whether or not legislation is going to continue. This is not a review by Parliament but a review by one person. If this precedent were instituted and followed up in other legislation then Parliament might as well stop functioning. It might as well shut down because the auditor general would declare whether he or she thought bills should continue to be in effect.

Motions Nos. 266 and 267, one by the member for Kamloops and the other by the member for Parry Sound—Muskoka, once again call for reviews of the act and I would say the same thing. This is not an appropriate time to implement a review. If it is felt

there is still a lot of concern with the act later on, it could be the subject of an amendment perhaps after the next federal election.

The act has to be given the opportunity to work. We have to see the regulations. Many members of Parliament will be very pleasantly surprised.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-68 is about public safety. To ensure the safety of the public we need certain measures that will not necessarily please everyone.

When restrictions are set on our freedom of choice or freedom of action, most of us start asking questions and there is bound to be some protest against new measures. Only time will tell whether these measures are effective.

Firearms registration is one such measure that has raised a lot of controversy. Apparently harmless, this measure has caused one of the most emotional debates I have ever seen and in which I have taken part. At the time, even Bill C-17 did not seem to raise arguments that were so emotionally charged.

One that recurs ad nauseam is that the measures adopted in 1991 were entirely adequate and that it is unnecessary to change anything at all in the existing legislation. However, during the debate on C-17, the pro-gun lobby argued that the proposed measures were redundant and would put an additional burden on honest gun owners.

Apparently, the pro-gun lobby has managed to live with the provisions on storage, display and transportation of firearms. If they are satisfied with the existing provisions, it is because they are effective, and only time will tell whether a legislative provision produces the expected results.

Perhaps I may draw another analogy. I well remember the controversy that it raised in Quebec when the government wanted to make wearing seat belts mandatory. A whole range of arguments was raised against this decision. It was an attack on individual freedom, was one argument we often heard. First prove it will save lives, was another one. The government has no right to make me buckle up, people said. I am a responsible driver and never had an accident. Does that sound familiar?

However, according to the statistics, seat belts have saved lives. Especially since a car is not supposed to kill but to carry passengers. I could apply the same analogy to making helmets mandatory for motorcyclists.

(1255)

All these measures were adopted by governments for the well-being of the community, to protect public safety. I agree some measures restrict our individual freedoms, but it is a small price to pay for the benefits down the line. So much for analogies.

Government Orders

Now back to the motions concerning safe storage. The motions I proposed would make it mandatory for the manufacturer, importer and exporter of a firearm to install a secure locking device on the firearm. A secure locking device means a device that cannot be opened or unlocked except with an electronic, magnetic or mechanical key or an alphanumeric combination lock. Once installed, the locking device must prevent the firearm from shooting.

The amendment I proposed, which will probably be discussed later on, is entirely appropriate in a bill on public security. Access to unlocked firearms is far too easy. Guns without a trigger lock and ammunition that is not securely stored are immediately available to the individual who gives in to suicidal or violent impulses. When guns and ammunition are not immediately available, the individual has time to think and calm down.

The statistics on deaths caused by firearms are horrifying. In 1991, suicides represented 77 per cent of 1,445 deaths caused by firearms. Out of 732 homicides recorded in Canada in 1992, 246 were committed with a firearm. Most homicides during the past ten years were committed with shotguns or hunting rifles. In three cases out of four, women killed by their spouses were shot with a shotgun or hunting rifle.

The statistics are there. A trigger lock could have helped reduce the number of suicides and homicides committed with a gun. Just like making the wearing of seat belts mandatory, this measure would help us save lives.

An amendment like the one we proposed would impose few restrictions, considering the benefits that would ensue. Equipping all firearms in circulation, including shoulder arms, with a trigger lock is an indication that firearms are dangerous, that they can kill and that owners should use them responsibly.

Firearms involve too much risk to be ignored. The mere presence of a firearm in a home increases the risk of suicide five times and the risk of homicide three times. The risk of accident is greater in a home where firearms are kept than in a home where there are none.

The improper use of firearms must be reduced by showing that guns mean danger and that firearms must always be used carefully and in accordance with the law and the requirements of safety.

The mandatory trigger lock would permit this. A way must be found to inform users who do not even know there are gun storage regulations. Those primarily concerned, that is the owners, are not even aware that gun storage regulations exist. A survey by Léger & Léger confirms this disturbing discovery. It was done between September 1 and 13, 1994 and involved 515 gun owners living in Quebec. In response to a question on knowledge of the existence of the regulations, only 53 per cent believed there was legislation on storage; 31.8 per cent said the

opposite; and 15.1 per cent were undecided—they did not know there were any regulations on the safe storage of firearms.

(1300)

At the very least, a trigger lock and targeted advertising are required and just as essential as a national registration system.

Bill C-68 is not intended to stigmatize firearms owners, but, rather, to promote a form of social accountability. This is why we must oblige manufacturers, importers and exporters to equip firearms with a secure locking device.

These are my comments on the amendments before us at the moment, since, unfortunately, I believe some members will try to use the time and prevent us from discussing other motions. This is why I chose to discuss mine now.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Further to the comments by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert, it is not up to me to plan strategy for anyone in this House. So long as no one questions the relevance—we know how complex it can be to resolve—we will continue the debate.

[English]

Mr. Bob Speller (Haldimand—Norfolk, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a very important issue for many people in the rural areas of the country.

I have considered this question over the last several years. In my previous life as an opposition member we had a debate on this issue. In fact we have debated the matter a number of times. I was here when Bill C-17 was debated, which was brought in by the former Conservative government.

That bill was supported by the hon. member for Kamloops who stood in the House today to say that he was upset with the fact that time allocation had been imposed. During the previous debate that member was the House leader of the New Democratic Party and he supported the government, in fact all the parties, in limiting debate and supported not having a vote at second reading. I find it somewhat surprising today that the hon. member for Kamloops would stand in his place and criticize the government for imposing time allocation.

We have debated this bill for the last year. I am sure all hon. members in the House have had or should have had the opportunity to express the views of their constituents, not only on the floor of the House but across the country. Certainly in the last year there have been opportunities for constituents to express their views of the issue. I have travelled across my riding. I have been to gun rallies. I have met with different groups.

This past weekend as I debated how I will vote on the issue I had the opportunity to speak with many of my constituents, especially a number of the mayors and regional councillors. In my constituency a number of motions were put forward by regional councils and a number of municipalities outlining their concerns with the legislation. I have also had an opportunity to speak to a lot of my gun guys. I call them the gun guys because they are the ones who have formed different shooting clubs.

Government Orders

They are members of anglers and hunters groups and they have come together to fight the bill. I say gun guys because the membership is made up of guys. I have been out west and I have discussed this issue with people in various ridings.

I took issue with the hon. member for Yorkton—Melville when he talked about the view of Ontarians on the issue. He seemed to suggest that somehow the Mike Harris sweep meant that people were against gun control in Ontario. That is simply not true. Take the example of northern Ontario for instance where there is the strongest disagreement with this bill. It went Liberal and NDP. In two of the three ridings of the members of this party that voted against the government on second reading, those ridings went Liberal.

(1305)

Therefore, I find it hard to believe that the Reform Party, as it does in my riding, tries to take credit somehow for the Mike Harris victory in this past election. As members know, that is simply not true.

I have had difficulties on this issue in my own riding simply because I have had the opportunity of getting around and talking to a number of people. If one talks to people generally on the street, what they will say is that a lot of people are against this legislation.

The Reform Party in my riding likes to build this up. The Reform Party comes forward. Its past candidate writes letters to an editor at a newspaper saying they will use this and fight the member on it.

Most people in my riding know my views on this issue. They know that I fought hard to make changes. What they do not know is how the Reform Party says it is speaking out on behalf of its constituents but when you look at the numbers and the polls, it shows that many of these members are being two faced about the issue. They are claiming to represent their constituents and they are not.

There are only a few brave members of the Reform Party who are standing up for what their constituents want. I find that to be in contrast with what the Reform Party promised in the last election. I have always in the House taken very strongly the views of my constituents and tried to put them forward.

What the Reform Party never tells you when its members talk about free votes—we have not seen very many free votes from these people—is what you do in the House when—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I remind members on both sides that all interventions must be made through the Chair, and not directly to one other. In that way we might continue to have a very parliamentary debate on a very serious matter before the House.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, what the Reform Party never tells its constituents when it talks about free votes is what to do in a situation where your views on an issue are different from your constituents.

If one looks at the polling across the country, one poll may be different, two polls may, but when all polls across the country show support for this legislation it is difficult.

A poll taken in my own riding by the Simcoe Reformer asked a number of questions. It said: “Are you strongly in favour, somewhat in favour, or opposed to the registration of all guns?” Those who strongly support were 33 per cent. Those who strongly opposed were 23 per cent. For somewhat support, there were 26 per cent and somewhat opposed, 19 per cent.

The question I have to look at is: “How do you think your member of Parliament should vote on this issue: For or against the proposal on gun control legislation?”

Of those who had an opinion, 60 per cent said that their member of Parliament should vote for the legislation and 40 per cent said that he should vote against the legislation. That poll was taken in my riding.

It has been difficult to get a good grasp on what the majority of constituents think on this issue. What I did was call around. In fact, I talked to some of the gun control opponents in my riding. They said that they had been taking polls too. It showed 70:30. The numbers were not only true but they were stronger.

It makes it difficult for all hon. members. I know tonight as we vote on this Reform Party members will too be looking at how their constituents think about this issue. On this issue we are talking about a five-year review, which I totally support and which I have put forward. The minister is here today and he has indicated in the past that this might be a proper thing to do, to review the legislation to make sure it is working.

(1310)

The *Toronto Globe and Mail* had an editorial which essentially said the same thing. Let us see whether or not the registration of guns will do what the government says it will do. That is why I support the motions. I would put the year for review at 2008 as the hon. parliament secretary has done. That would be a good way to do it.

Since the parliamentary secretary said he supported the idea and the minister is here and since the Reform Party agrees with this, I wonder if we could get unanimous consent to put forward a motion that would use the year 2008, five years after the implementation. If there is unanimous consent, the motion would say:

Government Orders

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 134 the following:

That no later than January 1, 2008, that the federal minister shall prepare a report on the effectiveness of this act in reducing the incidents of indictable offences involving the use of a firearm, and lay the report before the House of Commons.

I wonder if we could get unanimous consent of the House for this motion?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the unanimous consent for the motion?

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by touching on the inconsistencies that I see and the reasoning behind this bill.

Inconsistencies always bother me because fact should support fact and truth should support truth. An inconsistency indicates that fact is not supporting fact. I am concerned about that.

The two inconsistencies are these. If the justice minister and the government truly believe that the registration of rifles and shotguns will reduce the criminal use of those firearms and save lives, why are we waiting until the year 2003 to make it mandatory? Why are we waiting that long to begin to save lives and create a safer society?

The other inconsistency is that 58 per cent of the handguns that have been legally acquired and legally held are to be banned. Why? Because they pose a danger to society. Yet those handguns are not to be taken from society, they are to be left in society. They are to be grandfathered.

Why would the government, if it honestly believes that 58 per cent of handguns held today in society are a danger to society, then why would it allow them to remain in society?

I will have more to say at third reading about the bill. I will begin my address to Bill C-68 at report stage by taking cognizance of those two very glaring inconsistencies behind the rationale of the bill as presented by the government.

I am opposed to a system of registration of rifles and shotguns as outlined in Bill C-68. I am also opposed to the draconian inspection powers and the absurd penalties provided for anyone who fails to register a rifle or a shotgun.

Canada has some of the most stringent gun regulations in the world now. Some 60 pages in the Criminal Code deal with the acquisition, ownership and use of firearms, and we want to add a whole bundle more.

(1315)

We do not need further controls on law-abiding gun owners. We need the enforcement of the present laws and to get tough with the criminal use of firearms. Canadians have been demanding changes to the justice system in this country for years. All they have received are weak-kneed, bleeding heart policies that further erode the objective of justice, which is to reduce crime.

The present and past governments have used gun control to make Canadians believe they are doing something about crime in Canada when they are not.

Bill C-68 is not a gun control bill. It is not going to control guns; it is going to register them. There is a huge difference between the two.

Bill C-68 is nothing more than a pretence that the government is making our homes and streets safer and getting tough on criminals.

I recall Lynda Haverstock, the leader of the Saskatchewan Liberal Party, when she appeared before the standing committee stated in effect that the federal government was spreading misinformation by claiming Bill C-68 would reduce suicide and domestic violence that involved firearms. I agree with this observation.

The bill creates false hopes in the minds of Canadians about what it will do in terms of making our homes and streets safer, hope that will never be realized through this bill because it does not address the cause of suicide or the cause of domestic violence.

As the auditor general concluded in his 1993 report: "Our review of the new regulations indicated that important data needed to assess the potential benefits and future effectiveness of the regulations were not available at the time the regulations were drafted. The government proceeded with new regulations for reasons of public policy".

The government is doing exactly the same thing. There is not a statistical justification for bringing in a universal registration system, and yet we see that as the central pillar in Bill C-68.

The voters have awakened. They cannot be placated by pretentious pieces of legislation. Canadians want concrete measures effectively aimed at reducing crime. The Ontario and Manitoba elections demonstrate quite clearly that the citizens of these provinces reject the Liberal form of justice. They reject the Liberal tendencies to make offenders' rights supersede the rights of victims.

Government Orders

Canadians must be able to see that the measures introduced by the government will meet the objective of reducing crime before legislation is passed, not after. Through common sense appraisal of the law they must be able to see that it will be of benefit to them, their families and their communities.

The justice minister has not provided any statistical information to justify the implementation of these draconian measures in this bill, although he has repeatedly been asked to do so. He has not effectively demonstrated the link between registering firearms and a reduction in crime. That is what the attorneys general from the three western prairie provinces addressed when they appeared before the standing committee. There was no linkage they could see between the registration of rifles and shotguns and the reduction in the criminal use of these firearms.

Not one witness who appeared before the standing committee could provide any substantive evidence that registration would reduce the criminal use of these firearms. No one could demonstrate how registration, the banning of .25 and .32 calibre handguns, the new licensing regime or the intrusive inspection powers will diminish the number of firearm crimes in this country.

What they did inadvertently illustrate was an unrealistic fear of firearms and an idealistic notion that by restricting ownership of firearms, criminals, those people who thrive on obtaining a valuable object to sell on the black market, would somehow be thwarted by such regulatory acts aimed at honest citizens, people who have owned and used firearms for years in a safe and legal manner.

To date it seems the only impetus for Bill C-68 is to fulfil the justice minister's original and unrealistic thought to have only the police and military possess firearms in this country.

Time today does not permit me to address and debate each of the Reform's amendments. The time allocation imposed by the Liberal government with the co-operation of the separatist Bloc party for both the report stage and the third reading of this bill denies me and my colleagues the opportunity to present evidence to substantiate our amendments or to represent the concerns of our constituents.

(1320)

I object to the shameful and undemocratic methods employed by the government to ram this bill through Parliament. It is no secret that the government is having trouble keeping its caucus together on this issue. The threat of being kicked off a committee is hanging over every Liberal's head if they dare to represent their constituents by voting against the government and in accordance with the will of the majority of the people they represent.

I think the government is terrified to allow its MPs the opportunity to go home for the summer to consult constituents on Bill C-68, Bill C-41, or the government's pension bill. It knows that the more Canadians learn about Bill C-68, as was the case for the Charlottetown accord, the stronger the opposition will grow.

So much for the competence of the government. So much for the rhetoric that it has the support of Canadians. If it had the majority of Canadians on its side it would not be moving so quickly to have this bill passed, especially given the fact it will not be implemented until the year 2003.

Reform is opposed to Bill C-68 in many of its forms. Therefore, we will be voting against the vast majority of this bill at third reading. Our amendments tabled before the House are an attempt to make this draconian legislation more palatable for those firearm owners who will be burdened by red tape, costly controls of privately owned property, and intrusion into their lives.

Reforms' amendments in no way concede to the principle of more gun regulations in this country. We still maintain and are adamant that there is no need for the registration of rifles and shotguns.

I will have more time at third reading to address the concerns of our party with regard to this bill, which are reflected by the people all across the country.

I was in Stratford this weekend, and last weekend I was in Bridgewater, Nova Scotia. I have spoken to approximately 35,000 to 38,000 Canadians across the country who have all expressed the very same views and concerns. They are prepared to do whatever is reasonable and underlaid with common sense to bring about a safer use of firearms. However, they do not believe this bill will do that. They believe that it will do quite the opposite and simply encumber law-abiding citizens when it ought to be directing its efforts at those who would use firearms in a criminal manner.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to this bill and particularly to the amendment put forward by the Bloc Québécois. But first I must say that I am somewhat surprised by the debate surrounding this bill, which, at first sight, should bring us together in support of the goal that was set.

Without accusing anyone—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I have a little bit of a problem. I simply want to clarify something with the hon. member and all my colleagues. We are currently debating the first group of motions on Bill C-68. Otherwise, if we broaden the debate—if I can use that expression—, if this is what the

Government Orders

House wants, the Chair will certainly acquiesce to its request. However, at this time, I am seeking some guidance from my colleagues.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, tell me if I am mistaken, but I understood that, given the limited time available to discuss each group of motions and the number of members scheduled to address the first group—as you can see, there is no Bloc amendment in this group—, we would be allowed, while speaking to the first group, to argue on any amendment moved by any other member. I am one of the movers of an amendment that will come up only in the fourth group and, if I am not mistaken, I think that this group will not pass.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker. It is up to you, but I understood the House agreed to broaden—as you say—the debate on this group of motions. It is up to you, of course.

(1325)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): As you know, the Chair is not involved in those discussions.

[*English*]

If there has been some agreement reached by the parties as to how this debate might proceed, you would be in full knowledge that the Chair is not a participant in those deliberations and is consequently unaware of any such agreement, which is not to say there is not one.

All I am attempting to do is facilitate the debate in the traditional fashion for colleagues on both sides of the House. I seek your guidance. If there is something the Chair is not aware of, please make us aware.

Mr. MacLellan: Mr. Speaker, there is no agreement on the content or to change the format.

The hon. member for Saint-Hubert talked generally about trigger locks and things that were not related to group one. The hon. member for Crowfoot did likewise. I can understand why they would do it, because we do not know how far we will get in this debate.

However, with both parties having had an opportunity to put points of view on the record, I would hope that not all members are going to talk generally. I would like to adhere to the groupings so we will be able to discuss the merits of the amendments. I am not saying we have to adhere completely to that, without deviation, because we do have a time limit and all members have a right to be heard on the subject matter at report stage. I hope we adhere to the groupings as best we can so we give an airing to the motions that have been put forward. If not, then why have these motions at all?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I appreciate the intervention from the hon. parliamentary secretary. Certainly we are all cognizant that a great deal of work goes into formulating these groupings to facilitate the debate and to bring a certain focus to amendments within a certain grouping.

I will join the parliamentary secretary and everyone else in the House in appealing to everyone to keep their remarks and participation as much as possible within the context of the groupings. Otherwise, I will react to whatever the mood of the House is at any time during this debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bellehumeur: Mr. Speaker, in this case, I will simply pass my turn and wait for my amendment to come up before taking the floor. I will also wait for third reading to denounce the government.

In that sense, I think that, given all the amendments and the time limit on debate, the government could have shown good faith and allowed the opposition to present arguments, as was done before I rose. I was not the first member to speak to this bill in a general way. I will give up my turn, given the government's way of proceeding.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I very much appreciate the understanding shown by the hon. member for Berthier—Montcalm. True, he was not the first member to discuss the bill in a more general way, but I did react to a previous speech.

[*English*]

Certainly I will attempt to the best of my ability to conduct the debate in the fashion that will be most acceptable to at least the vast majority of colleagues in the House.

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, I think you might find unanimous consent to consider that all the questions have been put, a division demanded and deferred.

I think you would be able to follow this procedure throughout the day if we reach the end of a group, simply to save time in the House. In other words, we will have a vote on them at the end of the day. There is no need to call the yeas and nays at this point and then defer the vote.

The Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion of the hon. parliamentary secretary.

[*Translation*]

Does the House agree that the Chair should defer the questions instead of putting the motions in group No. 1 to a vote?

Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(1330)

[*English*]

We will move to group No. 2. I want to apprise the House the only motions standing in group No. 2 will be Motion No. 5 and Motion No. 145. All other motions in group No. 2 have been withdrawn.

Government Orders

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could we have a clarification on the withdrawal of those other motions? I am unaware of any withdrawal.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): The mover or movers of those other motions within group No. 2 have decided to withdraw their motions. That is the only explanation I can offer the House at this time.

Mr. Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I understand some of those are my motions and I have not withdrawn any. I am not aware of anyone withdrawing them on my behalf either.

I was looking at a past Order Paper, not today's. I am in error and I withdraw my intervention.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I thank the hon. member from Crowfoot for his co-operation. Certainly we were looking for whether we had given less than accurate information. I would not want to do that on any debate, certainly not on this one.

Now we will go to group No. 2, with only Motion No. 5 and Motion No. 145 standing. As I understand, by previous agreement I do not have to read the motions.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-68 be amended, in Clause 2, by adding after line 11 on page 4, the following:

"(3) For greater certainty, nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982."

Motion No. 145

That clause 107.1 of Bill C-68 be amended

(a) by striking out, in the English version, line 23 on page 52 and substituting the following:

"may lawfully use it;

(b) by striking out line 28 on page 52 and substituting the following:

"obtains a registration certificate for it; or

(c) a person who possesses a firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(i) has borrowed the firearm,

(ii) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it, and

(iii) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain himself or herself or his or her family."

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will speak on both of these motions proposed by the Minister of Justice. Motion No. 5 relates to clause 2 and adds a new subsection (3):

For greater certainty, nothing in this act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada under section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982.

(1335)

We have heard from many aboriginal groups about the importance of firearms in exercising their traditional hunting rights. With this in mind the government is in the midst of consultation with aboriginal groups so the main tenets of the bill can be applied in a manner which is sensitive to the aboriginal communities. This motion would simply confirm the government's commitment to work in concert with aboriginal communities so that the firearms legislation can operate in their communities in a way which recognizes and is respectful of constitutional aboriginal treaty rights.

What we want to do is rationalise the constitutional and treaty rights which the aboriginal people already have with Bill C-68. That is not to create due rights, but then again it is not to derogate the rights aboriginal people already have. We want this legislation to work in conjunction with the treaty and constitutional rights of the aboriginal people. That is very important for the operation of this bill and for the respect of the rights of aboriginal people under the Constitution and the treaties.

Reform members are calling this a two tier justice system. We have stated and we state again there is to be the same rights applied to all Canadians and that the bill is to apply equally in all parts of Canada except where we have stated certain conditions would apply to those who hunt for sustenance. We are acknowledging that there are treaty and constitutional rights for aboriginal people. We want to mesh the application of this bill into that.

Motion No. 145 strikes out certain lines in the English version of the bill. We are proposing an amendment consequential to the new lending conditions to be provided in the legislation. Motion No. 145 would provide an exception to the summary offence provision of possessing a firearm without a registration certificate if the person were a sustenance hunter who had borrowed the firearm.

This is in relation to section 107(1) of the Firearms Act which will come into being with Bill C-68. It says someone who has borrowed a firearm for hunting for sustenance would not be charged because they were hunting with or using an unregistered firearm. We think that is applicable and is in keeping with those who must hunt for sustenance to feed their families in the more remote parts of the country.

I put forward on behalf of the government those two motions which we feel will add to the bill, particularly to those residents of the more rural parts of the country. We are mindful of the concerns of those in the rural and regional parts of the country and we want this bill to be respected, obeyed and applicable in a meaningful way to these regions.

Government Orders

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was a bit unclear as to what the parliamentary secretary was saying. Is he saying this would not apply to anywhere south of the Northwest Territories, to any aboriginals in Ontario, Quebec and the west?

(1340)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): With respect, that is not a point of order.

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

[English]

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak to the amendment put forward by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice. This clause was recommended by most of the aboriginal groups that came to the justice committee during its hearings on Bill C-68. Some specific recommendations were made by the Inuit Tapirisat of Canada and the Grand Council of the Crees of Quebec to include a non-derogation clause in the bill.

While the government's position is that the bill does not abrogate or derogate from aboriginal and treaty rights, aboriginal people want greater assurance and comfort.

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

[English]

Aboriginal groups are happy the government and the minister have responded. I thank the aboriginal witnesses for this suggestion. I express my deep appreciation to the minister for listening and responding to these concerns.

I am sure we will have the support of the Reform Party. I will quote the hon. member for Crowfoot who quite clearly said during one of the hearings that the support is there from the Reform Party: "I find it unacceptable that the government will make agreements with our aboriginal people and then violate those agreements. This is unacceptable. What is the purpose of the agreement and where is the honour of the agreement if it is simply to be violated? No wonder the aboriginal people come forward. I admire your patience. I cannot get over your patience in the face of this kind of treatment".

It is quite clear that when the aboriginal people of Canada want a non-derogation clause in the gun control bill the Reform Party will be with us all the way on this issue. It would not want the Government of Canada to break its treaties with the aboriginal people who have negotiated land claims and treaties over the past number of years.

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

(1345)

[English]

I am glad this amendment has been put forward. I am sure members of this House will find that this amendment is acceptable to all, that it will address the needs and that it recognizes and acknowledges the special place aboriginal people have in this country.

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is the same agreement applicable that the votes will be deferred?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Pursuant to Standing Order 76(8), a recorded division on Group No. 2 stands deferred. We will now proceed to Group No. 3.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 11, on page 4, the following new Clause:

"2.1 This Act does not apply in respect of

(a) any firearm that is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm; or

(b) any ammunition that is not prohibited ammunition."

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-68, in Clause 4, be amended

(a) by replacing line 17, on page 4, with the following:

"4(1) The purpose of this Act is"; and

(b) by adding after line 18, on page 5, the following:

"(2) Nothing in this Act is to be interpreted as prohibiting a person who is licensed to own a firearm from using a firearm, other than a restricted or prohibited weapon, that has been registered by the person pursuant to this Act, from

(a) using the firearm for recreational or sustenance hunting, target shooting, trapping or other lawful activity, or

(b) keeping the firearm in a collection of firearms."

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 23

That the French version of Clause 10 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 36 to 41 on page 10 and line 1 on page 11 and substituting the following:

"10. Les articles 5, 6 et 9 s'appliquent aux transporteurs se livrant à des activités, notamment, de transport d'armes à feu, d'armes prohibées, d'armes à autorisation restreinte, de dispositifs prohibés ou de munitions prohibées reliant une province et une ou plusieurs autres provinces, ou débordant les limites d'une province, et, à cette fin, la mention du".

Government Orders

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-68, in Clause 10, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 3, on page 11, with the following:

“province.”

Motion No. 28

That Bill C-68, in Clause 13, be amended by replacing line 24, on page 14, with the following:

“registration certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm unless the”.

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-68, in Clause 14, be amended by replacing lines 27 to 32, on page 14, with the following:

“14. A registration certificate may be issued only for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm

(a) that bears a serial number sufficient to distinguish it from other prohibited firearms or restricted firearms; or

(b) that is described by one or more of the following characteristics:

(i) its make,

(ii) its model,

(iii) the name of its manufacturer,

(iv) the length of its barrel,

(v) its calibre, or

(vi) its assembly number.”

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 25.

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-68, in Clause 25, be amended by replacing lines 20 and 21, on page 18, with the following:

“or to a police force if the person informs a chief firearms officer of the transfer and complies with the”.

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-68, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 32 and 33, on page 18, with the following:

“proposed transfer of a prohibited firearm, restricted firearm, prohibited weapon, prohibited device, ammunition or”.

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-68, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 21, on page 19 with the following:

“(c) decide whether to approve the transfer or importation; and”.

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 21, with the following:

“transfer of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, the Registrar may”.

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 21, with the following:

“transfer of a firearm, a chief firearms officer may”.

Motion No. 51

That Bill C-68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 23, on page 21, with the following:

“prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm to Her Majesty in right of Canada or”.

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-68, in Clause 30, be amended by replacing line 24, on page 21, with the following:

“province or to a police force, a chief firearms officer”.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 54

That Clause 32 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 4 to 8 on page 22 and substituting the following:

“(i) has reasonable grounds to believe that the borrower holds a licence authorizing the borrower to possess that kind of firearm, and

(ii) lends the borrower the registration certificate for the firearm, except in the case of a borrower who uses the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain himself or herself or his or her family; or”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-68, in Clause 32, be amended by replacing line 7, on page 22 with the following:

“(ii) in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, lends the borrower the registration”.

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-68, in Clause 33, be amended by replacing line 18, on page 22, with the following:

“(a) in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, the transferor”.

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-68, in Clause 40, be amended in the English version, by replacing lines 38 and 39, on page 26, with the following:

“same effect as a registration for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm for the period for which the confirmation”.

Motion No. 70

That Bill C-68, in Clause 41, be amended by replacing lines 41 and 42, on page 26, with the following:

“41. A customs officer shall inform a chief firearms officer without delay of the exportation or”.

Government Orders

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-68, in Clause 43, be amended by replacing lines 13 and 14, on page 27, with the following:

“(a) in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, holds the registration certificate for the prohibited firearm or the restricted firearm;”.

Motion No. 73

That Bill C-68, in Clause 43, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 33, on page 27, with the following:

“(e) provides a chief firearms officer with the prescribed information and any other information required by that officer.”

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-68, in Clause 45, be amended by replacing lines 16 and 17, on page 28, with the following:

“(c) in the case of a restricted firearm or a restricted weapon.”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-68, in Clause 45, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 30, on page 28, with the following:

“(f) provides a chief firearms officer with the prescribed information and other information required by that officer.”

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 78

That clause 45 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 28 to 30 on page 28 and substituting the following:

“(f) provides the Registrar with the prescribed information and any other information reasonably required by the Registrar.”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-68, in Clause 47, be amended in the English version, by replacing line 4, on page 29, with the following:

“certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm for the period for”.

Motion No. 81

That Bill C-68, in Clause 49, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 29, with the following:

“49. A customs officer shall inform a chief firearms officer without delay of the exportation or”.

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-68, in Clause 50, be amended by replacing line 15, on page 29, with the following:

“50. A chief firearms officer shall inform the member”.

Motion No. 85

That Bill C-68, in Clause 52, be amended by replacing lines 8 to 13, on page 30, with the following:

“a chief firearms officer.”

Motion No. 87

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 53.

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-68, in Clause 53, be amended by replacing lines 132 and 33, on page 30, with the following:

“53. (1) A chief firearms officer may require an applicant for a”.

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-68, in Clause 58, be amended by replacing lines 6 to 10, on page 32, with the following:

“58. A chief firearm officer is responsible for issuing registration certificates for prohibited firearms or restricted firearms and assigning firearms identification numbers to them and for issuing authorizations to export and authorizations to import.”

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-68, in Clause 59, be amended by replacing lines 26 to 28, on page 32, with the following:

“firearms, restricted firearms, cross-bows, prohibited weapons.”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-68, in Clause 64, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 34, with the following:

“64. A registration certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm”.

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-68, in Clause 65, be amended by replacing lines 28 to 31, on page 35, with the following:

“shall give notice of that decision in the prescribed form to the individual.”

Motion No. 98

That Bill C-68, in Clause 67, be amended by replacing line 12, on page 32, with the following:

“67. A chief firearms officer may refuse to issue a”.

Motion No. 99

That Bill C-68, in Clause 68, be amended by replacing line 39, on page 36, with the following:

“(2) A chief firearms officer may revoke an authoriza-”.

Motion No. 100

That Bill C-68, in Clause 69, be amended

(a) by replacing line 42, on page 36, with the following:

“69. (1) A chief firearms officer”

(b) by replacing lines 2 to 5, on page 37, with the following:

“a prohibited firearm or restricted firearm held by an individual where the chief firearms officer decides under section 65 that the firearm is not being used for”.

Government Orders

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-68, in Clause 70, be amended by replacing lines 21 to 25, on page 37, with the following:

“or authorization to transport, a registration certificate, authorization to export or authorization to import, the chief firearms officer shall give notice”.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 103

That the French version of clause 71 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 25 on page 38 and substituting the following:

“autres provinces, ou débordant les limites d’une province, et, à cette fin, la mention du”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 104

That Bill C-68, in Clause 71, be amended by replacing lines 26 to 28, on page 38, with the following:

“province.”

Motion No. 105

That Bill C-68, in Clause 72, be amended

(a) by replacing line 30, on page 38, with the following:

“(a) a chief firearms officer”

(b) by replacing line 20, on page 39, with the following:

“officer or provincial minister under”.

Motion No. 106

That Bill C-68, in Clause 73, be amended

(a) by replacing line 29, on page 39, with the following:

“chief firearms officer or provincial”

(b) by replacing line 37, on page 39, with the following:

“firearms officer or provincial min-”.

Motion No. 108

That Bill C-68, in Clause 74, be amended

(a) by replacing line 11, on page 40, with the following:

“firearms officer, or provincial”;

(b) by replacing lines 13 and 14, on page 40, with the following:

“(b) direct the chief firearms officer to issue a licence, registration”.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 109

That clause 75 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 31 to 42 on page 40 and substituting the following:

“(a) the Attorney General of Canada may appeal to the superior court against the order, if the order is directed to a chief firearms officer who was designated by the federal Minister, to the Registrar or to the federal Minister; or

(b) the attorney general of the province may appeal to the superior court against the order, in the case of any other order made under paragraph 74(b) or (c).”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 110

That Bill C-68, in Clause 75, be amended by replacing lines 33 and 34, on page 40, with the following:

“order, if the order is directed to a chief firearms officer who was”.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 111

That clause 76 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 19 to 23 on page 41 and substituting the following:

“(a) the Attorney General of Canada, in the case of an appeal of an order made under paragraph 74(a) confirming a decision of a chief firearms officer who was designated by the federal Minister, of the Registrar or of the federal Minister;”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 112

That Bill C-68, in Clause 76, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 41, with the following:

“a chief firearms officer who”.

Motion No. 113

That Bill C-68, in Clause 77, be amended by replacing lines 40 and 41, on page 41, with the following:

“(i) direct the chief firearms officer to issue a licence, registration”.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 154

That Bill C-68, be amended by adding after line 26, on page 57, the following New Clause:

“110.1 Notwithstanding section 2.1, the Governor in Council may make regulations that are applicable in respect of firearms that are not prohibited firearms or restricted firearms for the purpose of

(a) establishing minimum age and safety criteria for purchasers of firearms;

(b) establishing safe storage and handling standards for firearms; and

(c) regulating the exportation and importation of firearms.”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 170

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 29 to 31, on page 70.

Motion No. 207

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 42, on page 87, with the following:

“a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm the serial number on which has been.”

Motion No. 215

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 37, on page 98, with the following:

Government Orders

“ly possess the firearm and, where the firearm is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, a registration”.

Motion No. 216

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 21, on page 99, with the following:

“(b) in the case of a firearm, which is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, a registration”.

Motion No. 218

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended in the English version by replacing line 37, on page 100, with the following:

“thing and, in the case of a seized firearm, which is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, a”.

Motion No. 224

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 44 and 45, on page 106, with the following:

“cate is, if certified as a true copy by a chief firearms officer, admissi-”.

Motion No. 225

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 46, on page 107 and lines 1 to 27, on page 108.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Following the process we adopted in the first grouping, I have before me a list of the movers of the various motions in this grouping. I will begin with the hon. member for Annapolis Valley—Hants.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to debate the third group of amendments regarding Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons. I also want to thank my hon. friend from Carleton—Charlotte for seconding the amendments I have put forth. Within this block I have moved four motions for debate today, Motions Nos. 4, 76, 92 and 154.

Judging by the level of debate in this House, in the media and among Canadians generally, this legislation undoubtedly is one of the most important bills presently before the House. I am honoured therefore to rise today to speak on this motion on behalf of my constituents of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

Over the past year I have consulted widely with people in my constituency. Whether at public rallies, through regular correspondence or during many conversations with concerned individuals, I have maintained a regular contact with over 1,500 people on the firearms issue alone. The series of amendments I have brought forward represents the culmination of this consultation process. The amendments represent the views I have heard from many of my constituents. I feel that if adopted they will make the bill stronger and more acceptable to a large majority of firearms owners.

Before outlining the details of these amendments, I want to clearly state that I intend at the end of the day to support Bill C-68. I believe the majority of the provisions in this bill will achieve our government's stated goal in improving public safety on the streets and in our homes. Certainly I am not alone in this regard. The vast majority of Canadians have expressed support for the crime control elements of Bill C-68. Initiatives includ-

ing stiffer penalties for illegal importation and trafficking of firearms as well as cracking down heavily on those who use firearms in the commission of crime will indeed improve security on our streets.

In discussions I have had with my constituents, a common theme has consistently emerged. Many individuals have serious concerns with the mandatory registration of all long guns. The motions I have introduced reflect this concern. They are also a reflection of my absolute commitment to represent the views of the people of Annapolis Valley—Hants. I have promised from day one to work to address their problems with this bill and to bring forward realistic solutions in order to mitigate these concerns.

(1350)

The overall objectives of this series of motions is quite simple. As I proposed in my written submission to the justice committee, I support amending the legislation in order to exempt owners of non-prohibited, non-restricted long guns historically used in Canada for hunting or sport shooting from licensing and registration provisions of Bill C-68. Any new purchases or transfers of existing firearms would be subject to the requirements outlined in the legislation.

This proposal offers a reasonable balance between the rights of legitimate owners and users of firearms and our government's commitment to strong, effective firearms legislation. We have an opportunity to send a positive message to Canadians that we understand historical, cultural and economic attachments that have governed the use of firearms to this point in time. However, we will also be sending an important message that times are changing. In keeping with legitimate public concerns, new generations of firearms owners will be subject to new rules.

Within this series of motions I would like to highlight two which are of particular importance. Motion No. 4 would add new clause 2(1) to the bill. This clause reads:

This act does not apply in respect of

- (a) any firearm that is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm; or
- (b) any ammunition that is not prohibited ammunition.

This motion would allow for an exemption from the licensing and registration components of the bill for current owners of long guns.

By supporting the inclusion of this clause, all members of the House will have a chance to acknowledge the legitimate rights of owners of long guns. It will ensure that these individuals will not be subject to undue burden or costs without weakening the crime control elements of the legislation. It will allow us to gain greater support or at the very least, tacit acceptance of Canada's gun owners. After all, without their acceptance or their willingness to comply with the new laws we may face problems enforcing this legislation.

The second motion I would like to briefly discuss is Motion No. 154. This motion would entail the adding of new clause 110.1 to the legislation. This clause reads:

Notwithstanding section 2.1, the governor in council may make regulations that are applicable in respect of firearms that are not prohibited or restricted firearms for the purpose of

- (a) establishing minimum age and safety criteria for purchasers of firearms;
- (b) establishing safe storage and handling standards for firearms; and
- (c) regulating the exportation and importation of firearms.

This additional clause responds to concerns over the ability to determine whether or not a long gun is owned and operated in a safe and legal manner. It has been included to ensure that officials have the ability to establish and enforce certain standards that must be strictly adhered to in order to legally own a long gun. This is not unlike the present system that uses the FAC.

Through this amendment, the government will have the opportunity to implement through the regulations a means to ensure the safe and legal ownership of long guns. Any regulations would of course have to remain consistent with clause 2.1 which provides for the exemption of long guns from the licensing and registration components of the bill.

I am pleased by the changes made to the bill during the committee hearings. These changes do reflect many concerns which have been brought forward by legitimate gun owners. I would also like to applaud my hon. colleagues who have worked so diligently on this legislation.

(1355)

I would now ask my colleagues, as well as the Minister of Justice, to support the measures I have brought forward for debate today. While we have certainly come a long way in our deliberations, I believe we must go further still.

These motions represent a modified course of action, a course that will in my opinion help gain the support of many firearms owners. By adopting this series of motions, I believe we will still achieve the overall intent of the legislation without adding to the overall bureaucracy or cost. Above all, we will develop a bill that addresses the concerns of all people on all sides of this issue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Just to give members the information as best I can, we are following the order of the movers of the motions in Group No. 3. I will now go to the hon. member for Parry Sound—Muskoka who of course we anticipate will complete his remarks after question period.

S. O. 31

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am cognizant this will be a two part process.

The amendments in this third group deal with what I believe to be one of the most significant concerns which was expressed by my constituents and was expressed generally in much of the testimony given in front of the justice committee. They reflect to a great extent much of the correspondence most of us in this House have received from the Canadian public. Quite frankly, they mention the concern that the legislation is not necessarily going to do what it is intended to do which is to control violence in Canadian society, or it will achieve that to some extent but in doing so will affect legitimate firearms owners.

There are many activities that firearms owners undertake in Canada which are legitimate, longstanding and traditional. In my riding of Parry Sound—Muskoka hunting has been an important sport for many years. It is an important economic generator. It brings large numbers of people to our area every year.

I can see that we are approaching the time for question period. I will finish later.

The Speaker: It being 2 p.m., we will now go to Statements by Members.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDS OF EXCELLENCE

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to recognize National Public Service Week.

Canada's public servants have developed an enviable reputation worldwide. Their professionalism and dedication is second to none. I am particularly pleased to recognize Master Corporal Steven Vézina of Greenwood in my riding of Annapolis Valley—Hants.

Mr. Vézina is one of 100 hundred public service employees receiving this year's awards of excellence. Mr. Vézina, along with Master Corporal Daniel Coté of Bagotville, Quebec are being honoured for proposing modifications to the cathode ray tube assembly in the CF-18 aircraft. Their suggestion has saved Canadian taxpayers \$400,000 a year.

The award of excellence is the highest honour accorded to federal government employees. I am proud to acknowledge the work of Mr. Vézina and all of the recipients for their service and dedication to Canada.

S. O. 31

[Translation]

CANADIAN OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY WEEK

Mr. Jean Landry (Lotbinière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this House today on this first day of the Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week, the theme of which this year is "Reach Out and Communicate".

It is extremely important to celebrate this week in order to make all stakeholders in the work force aware of the importance of a safe and healthy work environment.

Some fatal or serious accidents could have been avoided. Every day, two workers are killed and, every 38 seconds, an accident happens which could require compensation to be paid. The time has come to tackle vigorously what must not be regarded as inevitable.

Quebec has adopted very strict measures to limit occupational hazards, and the Bloc Québécois applauds such determination. It is now up to the work force in Canada to clearly give priority to this fundamental aspect of work.

* * *

[English]

ROBERT PAUL THOMPSON

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the government has a unique opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to judicial reform in Canada.

Robert Paul Thompson has applied for early release and tomorrow the parole board will hear his application. I will be in attendance at this hearing in Renous, New Brunswick, along with his victim's mother, Helen Leadley.

Let the government and the parole board never forget that Brenda Fitzgerald was an abused and battered woman who ultimately lost her life in her battle against Thompson.

Thompson's violent rages are almost incomprehensible. In his anger and jealousy he alone was able to overcome three others, and with only a knife as his weapon.

I will be in attendance at tomorrow's hearing to confirm my commitment to Helen Leadley and to her family. I made a commitment to victims of crime to ensure violent offenders such as Thompson are not released.

Will the government also make use of the opportunity tomorrow and keep a convicted killer in jail?

ROBERT SHERREN

Mr. Gary Pillitteri (Niagara Falls, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recognize and congratulate Robert Sherren of Niagara Falls who on June 8 was awarded the emergency medical services exemplary service medal.

The ceremony was presided by Governor General Romeo LeBlanc at Rideau Hall. The award recognizes employees in emergency services who have been working with Canadian ambulance services and performing their duties in an exemplary manner for at least 20 years. Of these 20 years at least 10 have to be served in the performance of duties involving potential risk.

It is with pride that I extend congratulations to Mr. Sherren for the outstanding service he provided to the community.

* * *

GEORGE P. MORRISON

Mr. Derek Wells (South Shore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago today Brigadier General George P. Morrison was born in Quebec City. For almost 40 years now this gentleman has resided in the village of Chester in my riding of South Shore.

George Morrison who joined the army in 1915 bears the distinct honour of being the oldest living graduate of the Royal Military College in Kingston, Ontario.

In the wake of the recent celebrations marking the 50th anniversary of the end of the war in Europe, I feel it is important to recognize and honour Brigadier General Morrison, as he served Canada during both the first and second world wars and served with a Canadian artillery battery during the Russian revolution.

The freedom that Canada and many countries throughout the world enjoy today comes as a result of the selfless contributions made by people like Brigadier General Morrison. I would therefore ask those assembled in the House today to join me in wishing Brigadier General George Morrison a happy 100th birthday.

* * *

SCOTT EDWARD GOODRIDGE

Mrs. Jean Payne (St. John's West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the heroic actions of a 20-year old constituent of mine, Scott Edward Goodridge.

Last October 17, a 12-year old boy was swept into the harbour at Renew's by a large wave. The boy's friend ran to Scott Goodridge's nearby residence for help. Without hesitation Scott raced to the rocky shore, grabbed two lifejackets and dove into the extremely cold and rough waters. Scott swam approximately

S. O. 31

65 metres to reach the young boy and placed a lifejacket over his head.

During these tense minutes another man assisting in the rescue was also swept into the waters. While towing the first boy to safety Scott swam to the second man, kept him afloat until all three were taken aboard a small boat.

Last fall I brought Scott's heroic efforts to the attention of the Governor General of Canada. I am very pleased to tell the House that on June 23, Scott will be awarded the Governor General's Medal of Bravery.

I invite all members of the House to join me in paying tribute to the actions of Scott Edward Goodridge who braved rough seas and a rocky shore to save two lives, those of a young boy and of another man.

* * *

[Translation]

STATUS OF WOMEN

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today is the National Action Committee on the Status of Women's annual lobbying day. This is a great opportunity for all the women's groups represented in this committee to get to know where the political parties stand on various women's issues.

Women are seriously concerned about preserving their vested rights. They know from experience how easy it is to cite financial difficulties as an excuse to ignore their needs and expectations. Yet, these are legitimate needs and expectations which, in many cases, are urgent.

Women grappling with problems of violence, poverty or unemployment must be able to rely on parliamentarians to adopt policies and legislation addressing their problems. They cannot afford to wait. And neither can their children.

(1405)

As the recent march held by Quebec women and gatherings such as those today show, women are making their demands with an increasing sense of urgency. The government must listen and take appropriate action.

* * *

[English]

FLOODS

Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, floods ravaged southern Alberta last week affecting High River, Pincher Creek, Fort Macleod, Lethbridge, and the community of Medicine Hat.

Friday night the South Saskatchewan River peaked at almost 10 metres above normal, forcing the evacuation of 5,000 people from Medicine Hat. Hundreds of homes were affected and acres of real estate were submerged. It was the worst flooding in over

100 years. Now with the receding of the floodwaters comes the back breaking and dirty job of cleaning up.

While it is too soon to tally the damage, by all accounts it will be in the tens of millions of dollars. In the wake of a calamity like this it is hard to see the good but there is good. The concern, the kind words and the sweat on the brows of hundreds of volunteers are eloquent testimony to a community that would not stand idly by while its neighbours struggled.

I know I speak on behalf of the members for Macleod and Lethbridge when I say it is a great privilege to serve the people of southern Alberta who have shown great character in the face of adversity.

* * *

TRANSPORT CANADA

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg Transcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to draw to the attention of all members of the House the Transportation Safety Board's report on the crash of an Air Manitoba flight at Sandy Lake on November 10, 1993.

The report finds that previous to the crash Transport Canada's audit and surveillance of Air Manitoba "did not uncover serious maintenance discrepancies that were present". In general it finds serious "shortcomings" in Transport Canada's "regulatory overview process of air carriers". It makes a number of recommendations to improve the audit.

Families of the victims of the crash are also concerned that when safety infractions are found by Transport Canada they are not then made public, depriving crew and the travelling public of information they need to make decisions.

This incident has raised serious questions about the effectiveness of Transport Canada's monitoring of safety regulations in the airline industry and thereby of the safety of airline crews and the travelling public.

I call on the Minister of Transport to address these problems with the greatest of urgency.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to the Environmental Centre for New Canadians which in partnership with Environment Canada and the Environmental Partners Fund established a very worthy environmental educational project. The creation of a multilingual resource centre which provides materials on the impact of pollutants on the environment will increase the diversity, experience and numbers of people involved in improving the state of our environment.

The centre's goal is to overcome the barriers new Canadians face in their attempts to seek information on a range of environmental issues. Their voices strengthen the efforts to improve our

S. O. 31

environment, facilitating a better relationship with all levels of government, schools, corporations and environmental groups.

Our government along with several community partners in the metro Toronto area support the need for culturally and linguistically sensitive and relevant environmental information to diverse ethnic groups. Sustainable development can after all only be achieved through preventive environmental care by all Canadians.

* * *

THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. Rey D. Pagtakhan (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians of Filipino heritage join the Filipino people in their celebration today of the 97th anniversary of Philippine independence.

Anniversaries like this give us an occasion to recall the immortal writings of her national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal, and the bloody struggle that led to the triumph, and to renew the commitment to defend it at any cost. That proclamation of independence has since been a source of pride.

The Filipino people have also shown that democracy, a tool to secure freedom and dignity for the citizenry, can be restored without a drop of blood; witness the peaceful Aquino revolution of 1986.

Freedom is not an end in itself. It is a challenge to a higher calling: freedom to do good and thereby ensure human dignity for all.

Filipino Canadians who are proud of their new home and who pledge their undivided loyalty to Canada are equally proud to share this noble heritage.

I urge all colleagues to join Filipino Canadians nationwide on this very glorious occasion in the history of the Filipino people.

* * *

NATIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

Mr. John English (Kitchener, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, June 11 to June 17, is National Public Service Week.

A prominent politician once remarked:

Public servants serve you right; indeed, often, they serve you better than your apathy and indifference deserve.

(1410)

During this week Canadians should note the valued role that public servants play through the services they deliver.

The government recognizes and supports an efficient and strong public service. At a time when we are re-examining the role of government, public servants in my riding of Kitchener and throughout Canada are rising to the challenge to assist in

tailoring a system that more effectively meets the needs of today's Canadians.

The excellence of the public service of Canada is recognized worldwide. I wish to extend my gratitude to all public servants who have offered services to Canadians in a manner second to none. I remain confident and look forward to a public service with a more defined role that is more satisfying, fulfilling and challenging for the 21st century.

* * *

[Translation]

QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today we wish to draw the attention of the House to the historic agreement endorsed by the Action démocratique du Québec, the Government of Quebec and the official opposition in Ottawa, the Bloc Québécois. In response to the expectations of Quebecers, the team for change will put before Quebecers this fall a proposal for sovereignty for Quebec and an offer of economic and political partnership with Canada.

Faced with the atmosphere of resignation and inertia engulfing the "no" camp, the forces for change united to offer a plan for the future and invite Quebecers to say yes to themselves, to stand tall and to speak as equals to the other nations of this world.

We are all confident that this plan for partnership reflects the genuine and profound aspirations of the people of Quebec.

* * *

[English]

LIBERAL PARTY OF CANADA

Mr. Elwin Hermanson (Kindersley—Lloydminster, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, along with millions of Canadians I am angry at the Liberal government for its frequent use of undemocratic tactics regarding firearms, employment equity, sentencing for hate crimes, and MP pension bills.

The Liberals are proving that they are no different from Mulroney's Tories who used procedural trickery to ram through the GST. Liberals have equaled Brian Mulroney when it comes to lack of fairness, honesty and integrity in the House.

What is worse, Liberals have got into bed with the separatists to expedite the hijacking of Parliament. They struck a deal with the Bloc so sovereignty could start by St. Jean Baptiste weekend.

Now it seems that the PQ-BQ alliance treats its members as ruthlessly as the Liberal government. Mr. Parizeau punished one of his members for voting against the PQ budget, just as the member from Notre-Dame-de-Grâce was punished for voting against the Liberal budget and three other Liberals were punished for voting against gun control.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

It is clear the Liberals and the Bloc-PQ parties are old style political parties cut from the same cloth. They have no sense of fairness or democracy and are arrogant in the extreme.

* * *

GUN CONTROL

Ms. Judy Bethel (Edmonton East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to challenge the leader of the Reform Party to explain to the Canadian people why he is blatantly disregarding their expressed wishes by voting against Bill C-68, the firearms control legislation.

He is sanctimoniously paying lip service to his stated principle of casting his vote with the majority. Can he not hear the voices of the 71 per cent of Canadians, of the 58 per cent of Albertans and of the 79 per cent of women who believe that registering firearms will bring greater safety to our streets and in our homes, or is he just refusing to listen?

The leader of the Reform Party has offered no proof that he has consulted with his constituents in Calgary Southwest on gun control. Will he follow the example of his own MPs, the hon. members for Calgary West and Edmonton Southwest by seeking the collective wisdom of their constituents and supporting the legislation, or will he ignore the two-thirds of Calgarians who support registration of firearms? Canadians deserve an explanation.

* * *

NIGERIA

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today marks the second anniversary of Nigeria's 1993 presidential election which led to Moshood Abiola being chosen as the first democratically elected leader of Nigeria.

Regretfully President Abiola has been prevented from assuming office by the military regime backed by General Sani Abacha. General Abacha has disbanded all elected bodies, jailed the president elect, closed newspapers, repressed labour unions and carried out public executions.

Nigerians have already demonstrated their readiness and enthusiasm for democracy. On behalf of the Government of Canada I call on General Abacha to respect human rights and the democratic process.

(1415)

Nigeria must be free to choose its own leader and its own future.

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, at a time when the economy is in low gear, with almost zero growth during the first quarter, the statistics tell us that for the sixth month in a row, there has been no net job creation in Quebec.

Meanwhile, the federal cabinet is looking at a new plan for reducing unemployment insurance benefits. Clearly, Ottawa has decided to reduce its deficit at the expense of the unemployed.

Will the Prime Minister confirm that the federal cabinet is putting the finishing touches on a plan to reduce unemployment insurance benefits that would cut \$1.6 billion from the plan?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government made a commitment to reform social programs. There will obviously be transfers from one program to another. At this point, all I can say is that this fall, we will have a bill on the subject. The minister is consulting with his cabinet colleagues and his provincial counterparts. Hon. members will know what the bill is about as soon as it is ready this fall.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, considering what was indicated in the last federal budget and what was leaked to the newspapers last weekend, the Prime Minister should give us some assurances or confirmation.

Now that for the past six months there has been no net job creation in this country, would the Prime Minister confirm that the plan now before cabinet would oblige young people entering the labour market to work for 26 weeks full time—six full months—before they were protected under the unemployment insurance plan? Is that what he has to offer the people of Shawinigan, which depends even more than other cities in this country on government programs?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that in the past 19 months since we came to power, the unemployment rate went down from 11.5 per cent to 9.5 per cent. We think we can do better. We must keep working on creating jobs. With changes like those we want to make in existing social programs in this country, we wish to provide an incentive for people to work instead of receiving social benefits. Social program reform is based on a desire to create jobs and help people to find work instead of staying home, to give them back the dignity of being able to work, which is something I am sure they all want.

Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister can make pretty speeches and juggle the figures, but the fact remains that the number of workers who are no

Oral Questions

longer entitled to unemployment insurance because of the government's cutbacks and are now on welfare is absolutely shocking.

That being said, how can he justify the fact that the unemployment insurance reform his cabinet, his government, is considering will, according to his own analysis, affect people with incomes of less than \$25,000 annually, in other words, workers whose employment status is precarious, who are at the bottom of the wage scale, the neediest in our society, and that these people may be permanently disqualified from receiving unemployment insurance benefits as a result of his cutbacks?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since this Parliament has been in session, we have been used to hearing the official opposition make similar predictions that have never come true.

I would simply ask the hon. member to wait until the bill is introduced in the House of Commons. Our objective is to help people on low incomes find jobs and to give them a chance to get back into the labour market. That will be the objective of the reforms proposed by the Minister of Human Resources Development.

(1420)

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The major proposed cuts to the UI program will primarily affect women and will do so in a very significant way. Indeed, women, who often hold the most precarious jobs, will be particularly affected by the proposed cuts.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, by increasing the number of hours of work required to be eligible for UI from the current level of 180 to 300 hours to somewhere between 450 and 700 hours, he is directly targeting women, who hold the vast majority of part time jobs in Canada, and that many of them will no longer be eligible for UI benefits?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister said, no decision has been made regarding the UI program. A bill will be tabled this fall but, again, there has been no decision yet.

I consulted Canadians, including Quebecers, and 60 per cent of them are asking for a UI reform that will promote work and a more equitable distribution of income. This is the purpose of the UI reform.

Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Quebec, BQ): Mr. Speaker, are we to understand that the minister is ruling out any cuts to the UI program? Or are we to understand that the federal government's answer to the women's march, which ended in Quebec City last week, is a program of UI cuts which will force women trying to

re-enter the labour force to hold a full time job for six months to be eligible for UI benefits?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. member that in the last several months, for example, by the previous changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act the government has provided additional benefits for close to 300,000 Canadians drawing unemployment insurance, of whom about 80 per cent were women. They gained an extra \$1,000 per year income benefit. That was one of the direct results of our changes.

In the province of Quebec alone we have provided direct assistance to over 50,000 women for training and career development programs. We are introducing a special program for women to go on to graduate school in universities. We have established under the self-employment program special initiatives for women to set up their own businesses.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Rimouski—Témiscouata attended a meeting at the women's human resource centre in her riding, to help women find work.

[English]

We are very committed but we have to make changes in the programs so we can move from passive assistance to active support with new tools to help people get back to work.

* * *

CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, in the House on Friday the Deputy Prime Minister admitted that Howard Wilson, the government's much touted ethics watchdog, has no teeth and has been relegated to a very minor role on ethical questions.

She said: "If there are questions about the ethics of the government, the ultimate arbiter of those questions is not a bureaucrat, it is the Prime Minister". Canadians will take little comfort in that revelation, given the government's mishandling of the Canadian heritage minister's unethical behaviour.

Since section 23 of the federal conflict of interest code has been violated by the heritage minister without reprimand or penalty, and since the Prime Minister is now the de facto ethics commissioner, will the Prime Minister tell us what parts of the code he is prepared to uphold and how he intends to enforce it?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister was absolutely right when she said it is the responsibility of the Prime Minister of the country to make decisions about the ethics of his ministers. I am

Oral Questions

the one who named them, and I am the one who has the responsibility to dismiss them if ever I decide to do so.

In the case of the minister of heritage, I said very clearly last week that all he did was have a fundraising activity that was according to the laws of Canada. The names of the people involved are public. Everyone has admitted they have given money to the Liberal Party, just like money is given to the Reform Party and to all other parties. Everything is public.

(1425)

I discussed that with the ethics commissioner, who is there to advise the Prime Minister. The final responsibility is the Prime Minister's. I always take it. I never run away from my responsibilities.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, we are asking the Prime Minister to accept responsibility. We are not talking about fundraising.

The Prime Minister has code of conduct guidelines, which he waved around with great flourish at the beginning of the session. One section of it says that a public office holder shall take care to avoid the appearance of being placed under any obligation to any person that might profit from special consideration on the part of the office holder. The heritage minister broke this guideline. He did not avoid the appearance of conflict of interest.

If the Prime Minister assumes ultimate responsibility for the application of these guidelines, will he hold the heritage minister accountable for violating not some general thing about fundraising but this specific guideline in his own code of conduct guidelines?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when we go to any fundraising activities we meet people who do business. I do that regularly, ministers have to do that regularly, and members of Parliament do that regularly. We meet with the Canadian people and some contribute to the good functioning of the democratic institutions of Canada. Everything is public.

The Reform Party is proposing at this time to make it even more open than it is today. It would like third party groups to finance while they are not running for office, to favour one cause or the other.

We say if people want to be elected to Parliament and have influence, they should run for a political party and raise the money according to the laws of Canada. That is exactly what this party is doing, the Bloc Québécois is doing, the Reform Party is doing and the Conservative Party is doing. They go to the people of Canada and ask for contributions. The contributions are made public; everybody has access to these lists, and anyone can

check at any time of the year. The list for last year will be published in the next few days. The Reform Party will check the list of people who gave to us and we will check the list of those who gave to the Reform Party.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I say to the Prime Minister that every day he pretends not to understand what the issue is he strengthens the public's suspicion that the government has something to hide.

The heritage minister clearly violated the Prime Minister's conflict of interest guidelines with his dollars for contracts dinner, and the Prime Minister has gone to great lengths to pretend that this indiscretion was merely some part of routine fundraising, which it was not and is not.

Will the Prime Minister stop this charade, admit that it is now his office that is managing the disclosure or cover up of ethics code violations and provide the House with a full and frank disclosure of the heritage minister affair—who was invited, who contributed what and who got what?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, to a very long question there is a very simple answer.

There is no cover up of any kind. The leader of the Reform Party, the third party, which is about to become the fourth party in Canada, knows the names of everyone who was invited and contributed. It is all well known. It is all public information. We have nothing to hide. We gave the list of the people who were present at this party. There is no cover up. They have the names of the people and the amount of money that was contributed. That is the way we have raised money for political parties in Canada for many, many years. That is the way the Reform Party does it all the time.

The leader of the Reform Party has a lot of those kinds of dinners all the time with a lot of people who contribute to his own party.

* * *

(1430)

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The federal government has shown yet again that it is proposing cuts mainly targeting Canada's jobless, who, for the second time, will be the targets of a reform proposal of this government.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, altogether, last year's unemployment insurance cuts of \$5.5 billion and the \$1.6 billion in cuts recently announced amount to a 25 per cent total cut in assistance to the most needy of our society, those who have to claim unemployment insurance benefits to survive?

Oral Questions

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote a report published by the Quebec Department of Fisheries, which is based on consultations made by the minister, Mr. Beaudry. It said that unemployment insurance is not well adapted to the realities of Quebec's fisheries and that it currently hinders progress and development in this sector to a great extent by halting private initiatives and stifling people's dynamic energy.

I hope that the Bloc members of this House will agree with the report published by the Government of Quebec, which calls for reforms to the unemployment insurance system.

Mr. André Caron (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, will the minister confirm that the federal government is not planning to reform the unemployment insurance system by cutting forestry workers' benefits by 22 per cent and fishery workers' benefits by 33 per cent? Does he not feel that this would hit regional workers very hard and that, in fact, the two tier system that he said he did away with because it was discriminatory is again rearing its ugly head in his new proposal?

[English]

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the last budget we indicated that we were aiming at obtaining a 10 per cent saving in order to provide for reinvestment in employment programs and to provide for general stimulus to the economy. The ways and measures in which we will undertake that will be tabled in the House next fall when we have finished the kinds of discussions and examinations of the very extensive consultation that went on last October.

For the hon. member to be citing all kinds of facts and figures concerning what may happen or what could happen simply is not relevant as we have not yet made any decisions concerning the nature of the reform. We are busy and involved in undertaking a serious review of the consultations, talking to provincial groups and others. When we are ready to put forward the legislation the hon. member then will be in a position to react to reality, not simply to speculation.

* * *

MINISTER OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Regarding the contracts for dollars dinner held for the Minister of Canadian Heritage, the Prime Minister stated that all the information is public. The Deputy Prime Minister stated that the Minister of Canadian Heritage would be happy to make public all the information.

Clients of the department were specifically targeted and invited to contribute. We are discovering, one name at a time, who contributed and what rewards the minister gave. The Liberal whip said the names of contributors have been tabled in the House and yet they have not.

Who is on the contributors' list that the Prime Minister is hiding from us? Who else has been rewarded with contracts, grants or appointments for contributing to the minister's debt retirement fund?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again that is a completely false accusation. Every contribution to the Liberal Party, the Reform Party, the Bloc Québécois or the Conservative Party, which is above \$100, requires a receipt to be given to that person. This list is made public every year. Every contribution which is above \$100 is published.

When I was in the House the other day the minister gave the list to her. She has not read it yet. If she needs more information we have a procedure. She can table her request in the House of Commons and if it is within the responsibility of the minister, the request will be met as soon as possible. We have nothing to hide because every contribution to the Liberal Party is known by anyone who wants to know.

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it seems that everyone in the country knows that the heritage minister should resign except the cabinet. Liberal backbenchers are saying that the contracts for dollars dinner was unethical and so are newspapers and Canadians across the country. The Friends of Canadian Broadcasting is asking for the minister's resignation. The *Montreal Gazette*, *Le Droit*, the *Citizen*, the *Sun*, *La Presse* and *Le Journal de Montréal* are all expressing similar sentiments.

(1435)

[Translation]

With Canadians calling for the resignation of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, how can the Prime Minister keep on a minister who is awarding contracts to companies organizing fundraising dinners for him?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have answered the question. All the documents on this matter are public. Those who made contributions have been issued receipts, and their names will appear on the lists published. In any case, the names have already been given to the press and to journalists. Everyone knows who was at the dinner. There is nothing hidden, and so I have nothing to add.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

Oral Questions

We have learned on the eve of the G-7 Summit that Russian President Boris Yeltsin will be taking part in both political and economic discussions with the seven major industrialized nations—an indication that Russia is one step closer to membership in this exclusive group.

Given the many human rights violations in Chechnya and the attitude of the Russian President during the Prime Minister's visit to Russia last spring, what position does the Prime Minister intend to take on Russia's increased inclusion in the group of seven?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Yeltsin will not attend the G-7 meeting. He will participate in the political meeting of the G-8 on the second day. The two meetings are different. The first is the meeting of the western world's seven most industrialized nations; the second, on the following day, will be a political meeting of the group of eight. Mr. Yeltsin will participate in this meeting.

Economic discussions will be over. Mr. Yeltsin may choose to raise economic issues affecting Russia or other countries at the second meeting. I cannot stop him from raising the issues he wants. However, the G-7 economic summit will be over when we meet with Mr. Yeltsin.

Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is as follows.

Since there will be a political meeting with Boris Yeltsin in attendance and in the light of the discussions there will be in this regard, does the Prime Minister intend to propose a joint statement by the heads of state to encourage Russia to respect human rights in Chechnya? In other words, does the Prime Minister intend to assume a leadership role among his colleagues with respect to human rights in Chechnya?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when I met President Yeltsin in Moscow a few weeks ago, I raised the concerns of the government and people of Canada about his behaviour in Chechnya. I also intend, as the chairman of the meeting of the group of eight, to raise the matter again. I am sure many of the other leaders will raise the same problem, but I will take the initiative.

* * *

[English]

PENSIONS

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Prime Minister.

The cost to taxpayers for individual MPs' expense allowances, travel expenses and salaries are available for voters' scrutiny in the Public Accounts of Canada, volume II, part II.

However, the cost of individual MP pensions is not there. The information commissioner is being forced to take recourse to the courts just to obtain a list of MP pension beneficiaries.

Why is the government trying to hide how costly the MP pensions really are?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is not trying to hide anything. It is trying to reduce the cost of MP pensions. Even though we have had suggestions to increase the size of the payroll of MPs coming from the very party that now asks the question, nevertheless we are proceeding on course to reduce by one-third the cost to taxpayers of MP pensions.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The House will notice that minister did not offer to reveal the real cost of MP pensions. We know that some Liberal members must opt out of the pension scheme in order to fulfil campaign promises made in the last election.

(1440)

If the government will not commit to publishing the benefits of the MP pension plan, will the minister at least agree to publish a list of those members who opt in and those who opt out or is he trying to hide that information too?

Hon. Arthur C. Eggleton (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it will be up to each member of Parliament. Once the bill has been proclaimed, members will have 60 days in which to make a determination whether they want to be part of the plan.

If the member wants further information he has only to look at the public accounts to determine what goes into MP pensions. What is in MP pensions, what is contributed by the taxpayer, the government wants to reduce and that is part of its reform.

* * *

[Translation]

JOB CREATION

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

We are now witnessing a disturbing slowdown of the economy. The GDP has been falling for the last two months. On Friday, we learned that employment growth remains stalled. In fact, there has been no net job creation in the last six months.

Since some 23 per cent of the Quebec workforce is now unemployed, does the Minister of Human Resources Development not agree that the Liberal job creation policy is a dismal failure and a glaring example of inaction?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is saying it is a disaster but if he looks at the figures that his colleague who is asking questions about the G-7 tabled, we have the highest level of economic growth of any of the countries of the G-7.

The result over the past year has been over 430,000 new jobs in Canada. To call that a disaster seems to be turning logic on its head topsy-turvy. We are working hard to put in place an economic framework that will stimulate private jobs.

Eighty thousand jobs have been created in the private sector over the past month. That shows that the stimulus is in the right place and that is the course we are following.

In the meantime we will help those without jobs to get the kind of support and training they need to fit the new kind of economy we are moving into.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Mr. Speaker, despite the answer I just received, does the minister not realize that, as a result of this government's first 18 months in power, the unemployment rate in Quebec still hovers around 11 per cent, the employment level has not moved in six months, 50,000 more people are on welfare, and thousands of unemployed workers do not qualify for UI benefits?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it must be said that the figures quoted by the hon. member and his colleagues are wrong and that, since October, the Canadian economy has created over 219,000 jobs in the private sector, 30,000 in the month of May alone.

True, there have been job losses in the public sector because governments want to save money so they can spend it on programs. It must be said that, while job creation over a six month period starting in October reached that level, more than 50,000 new jobs have been created in Quebec in the last 12 months, 111,000 since the election.

* * *

*[English]***INCOME TAX**

Mr. Alex Shepherd (Durham, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue.

At this time of the year many single parents, mostly women, find themselves in debt to the government because they have to pay taxes on the receipt of support payments that have not been taxed during the year.

Would it not be appropriate for Revenue Canada to require tax deductions administered through the courts so that payments into custodial homes are received net of tax like forms of employment income? Would the minister not agree that this would go a long way to alleviating the April blues suffered by these families?

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question and the concern he has for this important area of public policy which goes well beyond the tax area.

(1445)

The hon. Minister of Justice has made it clear we are shortly to bring forward provisions with respect to maintenance and support and in relation to the Thibaudeau decision. These will soon be brought forward and I know that he among other members will be very interested in seeing them.

As for the department and the responsibility we have for collection for those who may have been concerned about the impact of the Thibaudeau decision, I assure him we will continue our normal practice of making sure the collections take place with sensitivity and with full understanding of the position individuals may find themselves in.

It is certainly not our intention to hassle single parents or to go after their last dime.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, when interest rates are high economic slowdown and recession are inevitable.

Statistics now show the inevitable has occurred. Economic growth in this quarter at an annual rate is essentially stagnating; there is no economic growth. The tragedy is these problems could have been avoided if the deficit was smaller and had produced lower interest rates.

Does the Minister of Finance admit Canada's economy and employment situation would be better today if spending cuts in the last two budgets had been greater and the elimination of the deficit had been put on a definite time frame?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member being an eminent economist in his own right knows full well the Canadian recovery was largely based on exports primarily to the United States.

The member knows as well the United States economy is going through a substantial slowdown and that as a result quite clearly our exports have been affected which is reflected in the Canadian economy.

He also knows we have made substantial deficit reduction cuts. We have taken substantial action in the last two budgets.

He also knows the problem is the deficit we inherited. I know deep down he is very proud of the actions of the Canadians government in cleaning up the nation's finances.

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, national income this year has been stagnant because exports are down. It is disturbing that housing starts are also down, car sales are down, manufacturing is down, retail sales are down and service industry output is down. The only things that are up are interest rates and taxes.

Will the Minister of Finance let the people know how he plans to get them out of the quagmire he created by his inadequate spending cuts in the past?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I may have to take back my words about eminent economist.

The hon. member knows if we take a look at the last three to four months our interest rates are down substantially. He knows our job creation has increased substantially in the private sector. He knows as well our job creation record given the last couple of months has been substantially better than in the United States which has suffered from a major loss.

On the other hand I do not want to criticize my colleague too much. I am delighted to finally see somebody from the Reform Party asking a question about the economy.

* * *

[Translation]

BOVINE SOMATOTROPIN

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Last Friday, in response to questions from the official opposition, neither the Minister of Agriculture nor the Minister of Health were able to confirm whether there had been an investigation into the illegal use of somatotropin in Canada.

Will the minister undertake to table the investigation report prepared by her department to confirm that this hormone is not being used illegally in Canada?

(1450)

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have said time and time again that, despite the rumours, no one was able to bring any concrete example to our attention. Again, if you can give us the names of any individuals selling somatotropin, please let us know, because what they are doing is illegal. It is illegal to sell this product and to import it into Canada, and it will remain illegal as long as it has not been approved by Health Canada, if indeed it is approved.

Oral Questions

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us whether or not her department is taking any measures to enforce the Food and Drugs Act under which, as she told this House, the use of somatotropin is prohibited in Canada, and if so, what measures have been taken?

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is illegal to import this product into Canada or to sell it in Canada. We have worked together with Customs on this and found nothing. What can I say? We will arrest as many people as need be, but there is a limit.

* * *

[English]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the finance minister stated in his budget that UI would be cut by a minimum of 10 per cent. The surplus created would be used as a buffer to prevent the need for UI rate increases during tough economic times.

Now the human resources minister has leaked a document directing half of that surplus to increased spending on training programs. Clearly the government has two ministers trying to pull the country in two different directions.

Has the human resources minister consulted with the finance minister about this abrupt change in policy?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have to consult with the Minister of Finance every day concerning these matters.

Let me correct the hon. member's statement. It is unfortunate that she tries to slip in these certain amounts of illusions and suspicions. I did not leak a document to anybody at any time. I assure the House of that.

We know very clearly Canadians want a reform which will simplify the system and provide for a real end to the disincentives in the system. It will also be a program which helps people to get back to work. Unfortunately that one crucial element of getting people back to work is not part of the Reform Party's vocabulary.

Mrs. Diane Ablonczy (Calgary North, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are paying substantial UI premiums to help ensure against lost income during periods of unemployment. However, the minister acts like these premiums are his money to use to tinker with the system.

Why does he not return the UI program to true insurance principles rather than continuing to invest our money in his failed training programs like TAGS?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Human Resources Development and Minister of Western Economic Diversification, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Friday I visited the North Sydney learning centre where I had an occasion to talk to a number of former fishermen and plant workers under the TAGS

Oral Questions

program. They were starting classes at eight in the morning and sometimes going through until midnight. Many of these same workers who left school at grade eight or nine are now in a position after four months of the TAGS program to take their equivalency exam to get their grade 12.

This shows that if we give people a certain hand up they will take full advantage of it. They are now ready to become high school graduates because of the kind of initiatives and resources we have been able to provide.

I wish the Reform Party had more trust in the real motivation and commitment of Canadians given the chance to work.

* * *

[Translation]

FISHERIES

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The recent agreement reached between Canada and the European Union to conserve and protect Atlantic fish stocks was the object of a meeting held in Toronto last week by the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization. Can the minister, who was largely instrumental in developing Canada's position, inform this House of the outcome of those meetings and of the support expressed by NAFO regarding the crucial Canadian objectives?

(1455)

Hon. Brian Tobin (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Following the NAFO meeting, the scope of the Canada-European Union agreement was expanded in two major ways. The conservation agreement on Greenland halibut, or turbot, now includes all Northwest Atlantic groundfish catches. As well, the Canada-European Union agreement now extends to the 15 NAFO members.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I think I should have a talk with Quebec fishermen sometime.

[English]

The meeting in Toronto last week in conclusion changed two important things. First, the NAFO enforcement rules now cover all vessels, not just EU vessels. Second, the new rules cover all species of fish, not just Greenland halibut or turbot.

* * *

[Translation]

BOSNIA

Mr. Jean-Marc Jacob (Charlesbourg, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

On June 9, the UN secretary general officially recommended that the security council approve the deployment of a rapid reaction force in Bosnia. While the UN is about to give the green light to such an operation, the Canadian government is still hesitant about Canada's participation in that force.

Will the Prime Minister tell us clearly whether a decision has finally been made regarding Canada's participation in a rapid reaction force in Bosnia?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government is still looking at the issue. We are waiting for the outcome of the discussions taking place between those countries which have already decided to participate, and for the UN position. As I said last week, I am personally not very enthusiastic about Canadian participation. However, if it is necessary, we will participate. However, there is no urgency, and a decision does not have to be made immediately.

* * *

[English]

INDONESIA

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Over the last three years our country has spent over \$51 million funding post-secondary education in Indonesia. Why are we doing this when we have just stripped \$6 billion out of post-secondary education in Canada? Why are we funding this when the Government of Indonesia said it would ask us to pay for its students to come over here?

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the hon. member is trying to compare apples and oranges. The responsibilities that Canada has taken on regarding education are not only acknowledged but actually sought by a considerable number of stakeholders. The programs which for the most part are run in collaboration with Canadian universities and colleges have considerable spin-offs in the countries where these programs are in operation as well as in Canada itself.

* * *

[English]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the parliamentary secretary for the minister of Indian affairs who will be well aware of the six-week old blockade checkpoint now on Adams Lake in British Columbia.

Tensions are escalating. Will he or the minister of Indian affairs please travel to the site to attempt to resolve this issue, primarily over land claims, before serious problems begin?

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[*Editor's Note: Members spoke in Inuktitut.*]

[*English*]

If the parties agree to ask the minister of Indian and northern affairs or me to come and help resolve the issue, we are prepared to do so.

* * *

(1500)

LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

As he knows, the law of the sea convention protects the world's fisheries and prevents ocean pollution. It came into force in 1994. Canada is among the nations who have yet to ratify it.

Having celebrated international oceans day last week, I would like to ask the minister whether he can say when Canada will ratify the international law of the sea.

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the hon. member that this fall we will table a bill which I hope will allow us to ratify the treaty.

[*English*]

The Speaker: My colleagues, that would bring to a conclusion the question period.

* * *

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Dr. Wole Soyinka, Nobel prize winner in literature and a leader of the democracy movement in Nigeria.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

The Speaker: I also wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in our gallery of His Excellency, Émile-Derlin Zinsou, chairman of the permanent council of the Francophonie.

Routine Proceedings

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. Richard Bélisle (La Prairie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table today the twelfth report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. The topic of this report is the Department of National Defence, which has the largest budget of all federal departments.

It covers four chapters of the auditor general's 1994 report. First, Chapter 24, Defence Management Systems; Chapter 25, Information Technology; Chapter 26, Infrastructure Reductions and lastly, Chapter 27, Infrastructure Management.

The Standing Committee on Public Accounts concludes at the end of its report that the auditor general should review on a regular basis the Department of National Defence's initiatives to improve its management structure and methods regarding management information systems, information technology, rationalization and infrastructure management and that he should report his findings at an appropriate time.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, the committee is asking the government to table a global response to this report.

* * *

(1505)

[*English*]

PETITIONS

PAROLE

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise in the House today to present petitions containing the names of 1,086 constituents who wish to halt the early release from prison of Robert Paul Thompson.

The petitioners are concerned about making our streets safer for our citizens. They are opposed to the current practice of early release of violent offenders prior to serving the full extent of their sentences.

I will be attending Robert Paul Thompson's National Parole Board hearing in Renous, New Brunswick, tomorrow, June 13, and I pray that the decision arising from that hearing will support the actions of these petitioners.

PAROLE

Mrs. Jan Brown (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise before the House again today on what has become a crusade to obtain justice for the victims of violent offenders. Every day

Routine Proceedings

since February 6 a petition has been tabled. Today's petition contains 1,257 names of constituents, all of whom wish to halt the early release from prison of Robert Paul Thompson.

The petitioners I represent are concerned about making our streets safer for our citizens. They are opposed to the current practice of early release of violent offenders prior to serving the full extent of their sentences.

I, along with my colleague, will attend Robert Paul Thompson's National Parole Board hearing tomorrow in Renous, New Brunswick. I pray that the decision arising from that hearing will support the actions of these petitioners.

CENSUS

Mr. Jim Silye (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of Mr. Clifford Joynt, who along with 144 other constituents calls upon the Parliament of Canada to recognize that the word Canadian be listed as an answer to the ethnic origin question in all future censuses.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise pursuant to Standing Order 36. It is my privilege to present 17 petitions containing well over 15,000 signatures of Canadians who are opposed to Bill C-68.

The petitioners are requesting that Parliament not attack the recreational firearms community and that it support legislation that severely punishes one who uses a weapon, including a weapon other than a firearm, protects the rights and freedoms of the law-abiding recreational firearms community to own and use firearms responsibly, passes careful scrutiny to see that it will improve public safety in a cost effective manner, and repeals present firearms control legislation, which features tortuous language and has been characterized by the courts as one of the most horrifying examples of bad draftsmanship.

As we draw to the close of the debate on Bill C-68 this week because of time allocation invoked by the government, let these petitions serve as a reminder that the minister does not have the support of these nor millions of other Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I simply want to remind the House that in tabling petitions we do not enter into debate.

LANDED IMMIGRANTS

Hon. Charles Caccia (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition that is humbly submitted by over 250 petitioners who are residents of Burlington, Mississauga, Toronto, and further points.

The petitioners are asking for an extension of the stay outside Canada for landed immigrants from the present 183 days to two years, the reason being that the care of property back home

requires attention for a period that is longer than what is presently permitted under the law.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have four petitions on different subjects, some of which are contradictory, and I would like to table the petitions pursuant to Standing Order 36.

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present two petitions from constituents in my riding as well as ridings throughout central Nova Scotia.

The petitioners call on the government to enact changes to the Canadian Human Rights Act to protect individuals from discrimination based on sexual orientation, in keeping with the campaign pledges that were made by the governing party during the election campaign.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my pleasure to present two petitions from persons from the riding of Miramichi.

The two petitions 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 changes in the law that would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or any activity designed to terminate human life.

(1510)

GUN CONTROL

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I have four petitions to table before this House. Two are concerning Bill C-68, calling on Parliament not to enact any new firearm registry, registration fees, costs, or any further restrictions on the ownership, sale, use, transportation, or storage of firearms.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, another petition is praying that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by born human beings to unborn human beings.

CRIMINAL CODE

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the fourth petition is requesting that Parliament delete entirely proposed section 718.2 from Bill C-41.

PAROLE

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to present a petition on behalf of JC-55 super country

Routine Proceedings

radio station in Kamloops, who circulated a petition and have now collected nearly 75,000 signatures.

They point out in the petition that Canadians are becoming increasingly fearful to walk on our streets and in our neighbourhoods. They believe that many violent offenders and sex offenders are being paroled prematurely or being released without proper treatment or rehabilitation. They believe that those convicted of dangerous offences or sexual offences should be incarcerated until they have successfully undergone treatment and can demonstrate unequivocally that they have been completely rehabilitated.

Therefore, they are simply asking the House of Commons and the Minister of Justice to take whatever steps are necessary to accomplish these aims.

DETENTION ORDERS

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to present a petition on behalf of residents of the town of Elkford in my community.

Your petitioners call on Parliament to enact legislation against serious personal injury crimes being committed by high risk offenders by permitting the use of post-sentence detention orders and specifically passing Bill C-240.

I am particularly pleased to present this petition because of a serious situation they were in. They asked me what to do. I suggested that they do exactly this, that they petition the government.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 185 could be made an order for return, the return would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[Text]

Question No. 185—**Mr. Caccia:**

What is the total amount of federal public money, in 1995 dollars, that has been given to Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (AECL) since its inception?

Return tabled.

[English]

Mr. Milliken: I would ask that all other questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to ask the government House leader when I can expect to receive an answer to Question No. 137, which has been on the Order Paper since February 6, 1995. I requested an answer from the government within 45 days, and now, as of today, 126 days have passed.

Last Thursday the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader said once again that I can expect an answer to my question soon. I know the government is not interested in a free and open debate on the issue of gun control because they have invoked time allocation, but I find it hard to believe the government does not have the information on the cost of gun control readily at hand. My dictionary defines "soon" as "before long, promptly, quickly". If the government isn't forthcoming with the information on the cost of gun control, maybe the parliamentary secretary should find a better word to describe this.

Will I have an answer before the six hours of limited Liberal debate in third reading of Bill C-68? Will I have the information so we can properly debate this question?

Mr. Milliken: Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the hon. member suggested, timetabling and organizing House business is an important aspect of government. In the case of these bills, the official opposition and the government agreed that six hours was quite a reasonable time to debate the gun control bill at the two stages, and that is what we have agreed to do.

The government has not opposed this unilaterally, and I know the hon. member knows that and would not want to think that the government was acting unilaterally in cutting off debate, but we are trying to organize the time between now and the end of the session. Part of the duty of organizing that time involves getting answers to questions.

I can tell the hon. member that a draft answer to this question has been seen. It was inaccurate. It is being corrected and will be available soon for the hon. member.

(1515)

Mr. Abbott: Soon again.

Mr. Milliken: The hon. member says "soon again" and that is absolutely true.

Whether I will have the answer before the six hours of debate on third reading ends tomorrow I will have to wait until tomorrow to see. I hope so but I am not optimistic. Normally movement of the document around the various places it has to go to be corrected takes more than 24 hours. However I assure the hon. member I am doing my utmost to ensure he is provided with full and accurate answers to his questions.

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***FIREARMS ACT**

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, as reported (with amendments) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 4, 6, 23, 24, 28, 29, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 60, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 85, 87, 88, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 154, 170, 207, 215, 216, 218, 224 and 225.

Mr. Andy Mitchell (Parry Sound—Muskoka, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to finish my comments.

As I was saying before question period, one of the concerns that has been brought forward to many members in the House has been the issue of the legitimate use of firearms. There is a concern that some of the provisions contained in Bill C-68 could be used to curtail what in essence is legitimate activity by legitimate firearms owners.

There are a number of activities undertaken that are historical in nature, that actually represent a way of life and a lifestyle we have come to know and enjoy in rural Canada, in my case in rural Ontario.

Hunting for sustenance has a long history. Hunting for sport has been done in my riding for generations and generations. It is important to the psyche where one generation passes its firearms and the whole tradition of hunting to the next generation.

Hunting is important in terms of economics as I mentioned when I spoke earlier. A large number of individuals travel to my riding and make use of the great facilities we have there. Of course trapping is important as an economic generator. Other recreational activities like target shooting are also important and for many people the collecting of firearms.

It is important we ensure the provisions contained in Bill C-68 do not curtail such activities. For the most part they are designed to do what I fully support and what I know other government members support: control violence in Canadian society. That is the legitimate objective of the legislation, one that I support.

If regulations are put forward that achieve public safety in their implementation and that help to reduce violence in society, most Canadians and legal firearm owners would be quite willing to support that. For the most part many of the regulations in this legislation do that. However some legitimate concerns have been expressed that need to be addressed and of which we need to be cognizant.

There is the issue of cost. Many people who participate in hunting are not wealthy individuals. They either hunt for sustenance or they hunt for sport. We have to be very careful not to create a regulatory regime or a costing structure that will some day make it impossible for these individuals to pursue hunting.

Although the government has done a good job in setting out a fee schedule that is modest, I have concerns that it stay that way and that firearm owners are not going to be faced with high costs down the road.

I have a concern which I know is shared by many of my rural colleagues and by many legal owners of firearms: that provisions in this legislation could be used at some point in the future. The government has stated unequivocally that it is not its intention to do that but there is concern that people can use the provisions in the legislation to at some time prohibit firearms that are normally used for recreational purposes.

(1520)

This is a genuine concern. It is something that has been expressed by a lot of people. We need to put something in the legislation that makes it absolutely crystal clear that it is not the intent of Bill C-68 to restrict the legitimate use of firearms for legitimate purposes like hunting, target shooting and collecting. It is absolutely essential that we make sure that it is not done.

Although most individuals will accept the regulations contained in the bill that are designed to increase public safety, although most individuals will accept those provisions that will ensure they attempt to curtail violence, it is important that we place within the body of the bill a safeguard, a provision that explicitly states that nothing in the legislation is intended to curtail the legitimate use of firearms.

I will read the amendment:

That nothing in this act is to be interpreted as prohibiting a person who is licensed to own a firearm from using a firearm, other than a restricted or prohibited weapon, that has been registered by the person pursuant to this act, from

- (a) using the firearm for recreational or sustenance hunting, target shooting, trapping or other lawful activity, or
- (b) keeping the firearm in a collection of firearms.

It is absolutely essential that we make it clear that nothing in Bill C-68 is to be used to curtail the legitimate use of firearms. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the motions that I am presenting and speaking to on behalf of the government are:

Motion No. 23 which is a correction of the French text.

Motion No. 54 would amend the conditions which attach to lending a firearm to better reflect the actual practice. If a firearm's owner lends a gun to someone he or she knows very well, it may not be necessary for that owner to verify the

Government Orders

borrower's licence each time. If someone is lending a firearm to a brother, his wife, or a wife to her husband, that firearm owner has every reason to believe that the person has a licence.

Consequently this motion would change one of the lending conditions in the bill at the present time. What the government would require with the amendment now is: "having reasonable grounds to believe that the borrower holds a licence".

This depends on the actual circumstances and may require a lender to request proof of the borrower's licence. For instance, if it is a stranger, someone the lender has never met before, then the lender would not have reasonable grounds to believe that the borrower holds a licence whereas if it was a member of a family, the borrower would.

Therefore it is a significant change which will make the actual practice of using a borrowed firearm much more in line with reality.

Motion No. 72 would clarify that a non-Canadian business wishing to ship firearms in transit through Canada must obtain an authorization to export, but need not have a business licence in Canada.

As has been said before, even if the firearms are in transit through Canada, the firearms must be registered. There cannot be a shipment in transit, or otherwise, of firearms in Canada if those firearms are prohibited weapons.

(1525)

A motion was adopted at committee stage which provided that in an application to the registrar for an authorization to export, the registrar could only request from the applicant such other information as is reasonably required. For consistency sake, Motion No. 78 would also add the word "reasonably" to authorization to import. Therefore, the word "reasonably" would be required not only for export but for import as well. We have to look to the business practices of manufacturers. There is no reason that they should be giving any information requested of them, particularly if it does not have any relation to what is required and gives confidential competitive data that would only serve to hurt their competitive position.

As I mentioned, a very similar motion was introduced and adopted at committee stage. However, customs in particular is asking for a slight modification in the wording referring to the in transit shipments to avoid any future confusion.

Motion No. 109 relates to changes introduced at committee allowing an appeal of the minister's decision in respect of shooting club approval. In it we referred to provincial ministers. This change is to make a reference to federal ministers as well as

provincial ministers. The federal and provincial ministers will be able to give approval to shooting clubs.

Motion No. 111 is essentially the same as 109. It relates to changes introduced in committee allowing the appeal of a minister's decision in respect of shooting club approval. The minister may be provincial or federal. As I have said, this motion is intended to clarify the appropriate minister in the appropriate circumstances.

Essentially, most of the amendments in group three relate to the registry system. A number of motions delete the role of and references to the registry right through to the registrar and is related to the Reform Party's proposal to eliminate the registry.

The second largest area where motions are put forward refer to the rationale for a registration system and whether they should apply to long guns. The concern is that the registry system is put into effect for various reasons for long guns as well as for handguns. The idea is so that we will have a record of all firearms in Canada. If a firearm is stolen, we want to know where that firearm is. We want to have, if not the serial number, then certainly pertinent data that would allow us to track that firearm.

We also want to be able to register firearms immediately on their entering the country. We found that when certain firearms are brought into Canada initially and not registered, as was practice in the past, between customs and the wholesaler-distributor, some of those firearms disappear.

As I mentioned earlier, we also want to register firearms even when they are in transit through the country. If that is to be an inconvenience then so be it, but frankly we do not really want to encourage the in transit shipment of firearms through Canada.

We also want to be able to impress on people that firearms are important and that the owner's care is very important as well.

We feel the registration system will be of benefit and will reduce death through firearms. We feel there will be a greater appreciation of firearms. The minister has stated time and again that the costs are going to be minimal for the registration of a firearm beginning in January 1, 1998. It may not be anything but very shortly it will go to \$10 for up to 10 firearms and maybe up to \$18 for 10 firearms before the end of the five year period.

(1530)

The minister has been very frank on that. He has stated there will not be any cost initially for getting a possession licence but for the renewal of an FAC or eventual renewal of a possession licence it will be \$60 for a five year period. Once a firearm has been registered there will not be any need to register it again. With respect to the possession licence there does not have to be

Government Orders

any course taken if the possession licence is for firearms presently possessed and not for the purchase of new firearms.

The registration system has been put into effect with the lawful gun owner in mind. Supposedly there will be the inconvenience of having to register long guns. That is in the eye of the beholder. A lot of people who have long guns do not mind registering them. It is not, as some people have stated, an idea of keeping track of all the long guns with the eventual intention of confiscation. That is not the intent at all. If that were the case, we would not be spending up to \$85 million on the registration system.

The member for Yorkton–Melville has requested costing. The minister provided the costing in committee when he initially appeared. He stated why in his and the government's opinion it would be \$85 million.

The idea is to put the possession licence in effect on January 1, 1996 and the registration certificates for firearms beginning in January 1, 1998 to give the system a chance to work gradually. Also it is hoped that Canadians will see that the registration of firearms and the possession licences are not an attempt to act against the lawful gun owner.

To know what firearms are illegal first we must know which firearms are legal. That makes sense. We cannot just say that a particular firearm is illegal unless we have a common denominator to say which ones are legal. That is a basic axiom and we want to create that basic axiom in the registration of firearms.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my amendments deal with the registration system.

During the appearance of witnesses before the standing committee, I recall asking a criminologist how the registration of rifles and shotguns would reduce the criminal use of those firearms. I was surprised at his answer. He said that we would probably see no effect in this area for 15 years. That was the closest we could get to seeing any impact on the whole area of deaths by gunshot wounds during the four weeks of testimony before the committee.

When we look at the registration of firearms, before the system can register one single firearm we have to licence all the owners under the provisions of clause 5 of the bill. Clause 5 requires the chief firearms officer to take cognizance of the criminal record of the individual, the mental health record of the individual and a neighbourhood check as to the record of the individual to determine whether there is any violence in that individual's history. Before getting to the registering of firearms the owner of the firearm must first satisfy the chief firearms officer that he or she is eligible to own a firearm in accordance with the criteria set out.

(1535)

When we look at the cost of this it is not unlike the procedure followed to obtain an FAC today. If we look again at the cost of the FAC the Toronto metro police board did an analysis of the cost for an FAC during 1994 and it came to \$185. If that is the cost to register or license an individual and it is going to have to go through a similar process and cost a similar amount, then we are looking at three million gun owners multiplied by \$185 which comes to \$550 million before a single firearm is registered. The cost of this whole thing will be far greater than the \$85 million suggested by the justice department.

Then we have to look at the possibility that a gun owner may not meet the criteria. If the gun owner does not meet the criteria what happens to his firearms? It means he cannot get a licence to own them, therefore he cannot own them. What happens to those firearms? We never got a clear response, at least I did not, from the witnesses including justice officials on that question. Some said they might be allowed to sell them or export them.

If a person is not eligible to hold a licence to own a firearm it means it would be dangerous to allow them to continue to own a firearm. It seems very clear to me that it would be the responsibility and duty of the police to remove those firearms from the possession of that individual if that individual does not meet the criteria to hold a licence. That issue has not been clarified well enough.

There is the issue of cost before a single firearm is registered. If the individual does meet the criteria and receives a licence then there is the added cost of registering the firearm. To suggest it is going to cost \$10 to register a firearm is utter nonsense. What can we register for \$10 today?

Although it may only cost the firearms owner \$10 it is going to cost the taxpayer a lot more for the police or whoever is transferring the information and identifying features from the firearm into the system itself and then issuing a registration certificate. No one has assured the committee or assured me that it is going to cost less than \$10. I will have more to say on this during the final debate at third reading.

We must seriously look at the whole registration system. No evidence, not even a smidgen has been produced that we could consider from a common sense point of view that the registration of a rifle or a shotgun is going to reduce the criminal use of that firearm. If all of the firearms in the country were registered now, what would stop the suicides? As our hon. colleague from Kamloops indicated, what would stop those individuals who lose their sense of responsibility through drug abuse, alcohol abuse or simple anger and despair? What would cause them to be less likely to use a firearm simply because it is registered? It does not make sense.

Government Orders

I ask all hon. members to consider these amendments that deal with that aspect of Bill C-68. We say it is not going to work so why go forward with it?

(1540)

We asked the government to bring forward those portions of the bill that get tougher on the criminal use of firearms. There is not anyone in this House or anyone in Canada who would not immediately support that aspect of the bill. The government has failed to do so. That saddens me and many of my colleagues on this side of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): We have recognized and heard from each of the movers of the motions in Group No. 3. Now we will open debate to the remainder of the House.

Mr. Jack Iyerak Anawak (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.):

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

[English]

My comments will be on Motion No. 54, the lending provisions.

I would like to thank Atima Hadlari for lending me his shotgun yesterday to go out hunting in Cambridge Bay for geese and ducks. He was very nice about it. I know him very well. He offered me the use of his .12 gauge shotgun and I obliged.

Both aboriginal and non-aboriginal groups who appeared before the justice committee expressed concerns about the lending provisions of Bill C-68. They talked about the impracticality of lending a registration certificate along with a firearm when someone is out on the land hunting for food, which we were doing just a little over 24 hours ago in Cambridge Bay.

This is an issue of concern in my riding of Nunatsiaq. The Inuit Tapirisat of Canada, the Grand Council of the Crees of Quebec, the Council for Yukon Indians and representatives of the Government of the Northwest Territories all expressed similar concerns. Again, the minister and the government have responded to the concern. I express my thanks to the minister for listening.

Motion No. 54 is a practical one. It would remove the requirement to transfer the registration certificate along with the firearm when the firearm is being loaned to someone who will be hunting for sustenance purposes.

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

[English]

All of the Inuit in my riding hunt for food. They may supplement it with food from the Bay, the co-op and other stores. We do not have grocery stores as such; we have depart-

ment stores. They may supplement the food they get from hunting with food from the stores, but they all hunt.

I was in my hometown of Repulse Bay two weeks ago. I went caribou hunting and got a caribou. I was in Baker Lake a week after that. People there depend on caribou. Everyone depends on the caribou they hunt. As I said, a little over 24 hours ago I was in Cambridge Bay. There because they hunt for food, they are always concerned about their neighbours, their friends or whoever else may lack hunting equipment, whether it is a snowmobile, a rifle, or gas. They lend hunting equipment to their neighbours, their relatives, their sons, their daughters or whomever. Lending firearms is a common occurrence. In the north it is as common as lending a lawnmower or a cup of sugar to a next door neighbour.

(1545)

In doing this the government is acknowledging that we have a way of life which includes lending whatever we have to our neighbours, sons, daughters or whomever; our firearms in this case.

It is with deep appreciation to the minister that I support Motion No. 54, knowing that he has listened to my ongoing concern about that portion of the bill and knowing that he has understood that it is a special case.

[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]

[Translation]

Mrs. Venne: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for you. The hon. member is speaking to us in a language that I neither recognize nor understand. I would like to know if we must continue to listen. As far as I know, the hon. member is not using one of the official languages.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): In response to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert, there is nothing in the standing orders that would allow the Chair to force a member from either side of the House to speak in one language or another.

Allow me to raise a personal point. In these circumstances, I still appreciate the hon. member for Nunatsiaq's using his mother tongue and, I take it, translating his words into English from time to time. Resuming debate.

Mrs. Venne: Does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members of Ukrainian or German descent—our members come from all kinds of backgrounds—can now make their speeches in their mother tongues?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I can only answer the hon. member's question pursuant to the standing orders of the House of Commons, which hon. members must comply with. At this time, there is nothing in the standing orders preventing anyone from using, as you say, a language that is not one of Canada's two official languages. In the present circumstances, the hon. member for Nunatsiaq may speak in his mother tongue.

*Government Orders***Mr. Anawak:***[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]**[English]*

It is an insult to the people of Canada that some people would not agree with our speaking our own language when the Inuktitut language in Canada is 4,000 years old and the English and French languages are mere hundreds of years old.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

(1550)

Mr. Anawak: A lot of my constituents are out camping now because school is over for the summer. They will not wait around for someone to come along and say: "Here is my registration certificate. There is a polar bear coming so you better come and get your rifle or lend me your rifle". There has to be an understanding on the issue of lending. This applies to all sustenance hunters whether aboriginal or non-aboriginal.

The motion will benefit all hunters and trappers because it recognizes that there is a different way of doing things in the rural areas. I strongly support the motion and urge the House to support it.

*[Editor's Note: Member spoke in Inuktitut.]**[English]*

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, after this morning I was a little confused about when I was supposed to speak and on what, but I think I have it all straightened out now. However I am sure you will straighten me out if I do not.

I will be speaking to clause 110 and would like to respond to the motion made with regard to it. I agree with the member across the way who moved the amendment that something needs to be done about the clause. I personally believe it needs to be totally scrapped.

I disagree with the parliamentary secretary who feels there is no concern about prohibiting certain firearms, confiscation, et cetera, because of the powers in the clause.

I have given out several hundred copies of the bill even though it cost quite a bit from my budget. I have had responses back from a number of people, including legal minds and people who support the idea, who say it is a terrible piece of legislation, that it is just plain bad and written very poorly. Many of these people came to Canada from places like Czechoslovakia and Hungary and lived in the days when those kinds of thing happened. They know what they are talking about.

We all know how much the Liberal government desires power. Bill C-68 is a further example of how power hungry the Liberal government can be. clause 110 of Bill C-68 gives absolute

power through order in council to dictate every condition chosen to end firearm ownership for reasonable law-abiding people.

No matter how many times the minister and the power hungry members of his government state that their intention is not to remove ownership of firearms from Canadians, the wording and the language in the bill read otherwise.

We on this side know why the minister and his government are invoking closure on the bill. It is just another example of their thirst for abusive power. Their attempt at ramming the legislation through before the House closes for the summer is their own means of protecting their backbench members.

As the Ontario election has shown, the people of Canada are tired of top heavy government that passes legislation to look good rather than to do what the people want. The clock is ticking on Liberal style government. As each second passes more and more people have read Bill C-68 and discovered that it is a bad bill and it is not about public safety.

The people of Canada have discovered that Bill C-68 is all about giving absolute power in clause 110 to a chosen few social engineers and ivory tower intellectuals who believe they know what is best for Canada. As the Ontario election proves, the people of Canada are tired of dictatorial government of any stripe and want a government that mirrors the will of the people, not the mandate of closet dreamers.

(1555)

The clock is ticking and each tick places more and more pressure on the minister to push Bill C-68 through the House. Each tick of the clock gives more and more Canadians time to understand the powers given in clause 110 to the governor in council and to make absolute demands upon the people of Canada. Each tick of the clock is making the Liberal government and the minister weaker among the citizens of Canada. That is why they are in such a hurry to get this dictatorial mandate through the House.

The Liberal government finally understands that the people have had enough of false prophecies from a government opposed to the wishes of Canadians. Canadians did not agree to firearm controls to hamper and incriminate law-abiding friends and neighbours who own and use properly stored firearms. Canadians want the government to use legislation to deter and punish those who believe a firearm can be a useful tool in robbery, assault and murder.

Canadians want their government to get tough with criminals, to make criminals understand that using a firearm will result in swift, sure justice with dire consequences for unlawful behaviour.

As more and more Canadians read and understand Bill C-68 they find that the legislation does not protect them from criminals and law breakers who improperly use illegally smuggled firearms. They have found legislation that criminalizes their

Government Orders

friends and neighbours at each and every whim of a select few and orders in council.

Canadians did not elect members to the House so that a chosen few among them could dictate their favoured beliefs. Canadians elected members to the House because they believed members when elected would stand up for constituent wishes over the elite who want control over every aspect of Canadian life.

During the last election each party promised Canadians that they would vote according to constituent wishes, that if elected constituents would come first over party politics and the whim of a few chosen to rule.

The order in council in Bill C-68 shows Canadians that the Liberals have broken the most sacred of their promises and that the government is without integrity and cannot be trusted to maintain its promises beyond the ink drying in the red book.

There is no representation by constituents in the bill. Constituents asked for input in their governments. The bill removes all authority from people and gives total control of the people to the chosen few.

The clock is ticking and the Liberal government knows it. At each tick the government knows its old style government of distortion and outright misrepresentation is doomed to failure, but the government has cashed too many cheques from its special interests and vested groups to back down.

As the heritage minister holds special meetings where contributions can buy political favours, the justice minister has special meetings where utopian idealists convince the government they know what is best: "Give yourself absolute power. Use that power to make firearm owning Canadians semi-criminals at the least and outright criminals at the most. Threaten Canadians with absolute punishment for daring to own politically incorrect private property, legally owned firearms, and then Canadians will be safe".

Canadians have read Bill C-68 and know that it has little to do with public safety. It has little to do with making career criminals and first time criminals fearful of our courts. Canadians have read Bill C-68 and discovered the government wants dictatorial powers. That is why more and more Canadians are pushing their Liberal backbench members to vote against the bill. The government knows when its backbenchers return to its constituencies there will be questions asked. The government knows constituents will ask how ill advised spending of tax dollars for registering lawful private property will increase public safety when study after study states registration will not reduce use of firearms by criminals.

The government knows constituents will ask their Liberal members why they supported a bill the constituents did not want, but most of all the government knows constituents will

ask why backbench members agreed to give the chosen few absolute power to dictate to Canadians.

(1600)

The clock is ticking. As Ontario voters proved, the Liberal ideal of government by the elite chosen few is over. Canadians have chosen to take back their right to govern and the government knows it. As I said, too much political capital has been granted by the minister and his government to abandon this ill advised bill. While the clock is ticking on their style of dictatorial government through order in council they are stuck with it and they shall be stuck with it during the next federal election. They will have to explain to constituents why they did not do as promised, why individual MPs in the Liberal Party were not listened to, why there were few free votes and why the government chose the old style Liberal way of government by the few which it stated it would not do.

The clock is ticking not only in Ontario but in British Columbia and all across Canada where Canadians believe government is elected to follow the wishes of the people, not to follow the wishes of a selected few chosen to mandate by order in council.

Bill C-68 is a documented futile attempt at social engineering, not criminal justice. This bill affects law-abiding citizens more than criminals, demands more from citizens than criminals and wastes tax dollars on a non-existent claim of public safety.

Canadians know this and that is why more and more Canadians understand what Bill C-68 means to the democratic principles they thought they voted for. More and more Canadians will abandon the Liberal government. As the clock ticks the Liberal government loses credibility on each count. The government that promised integrity but gave Canadians the old style of patronage will find its bases thinning.

The bill will not reduce the flow of illegal firearms or reduce the use of illegal firearms. It is estimated the bill will increase the flow and value of illegal firearms while it punishes law-abiding citizens.

A vote for this bill is a vote against democratic principles. It is a vote for absolute power and the worst part of it is those who vote for the bill are supporting a minor defeat for democracy in this land.

Bill C-68 is not about public safety or good governance, it is about the manner in which Canadians will be governed. I support government by and for the people, not dictatorial misadventure, and I believe that most Canadians agree with me.

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I take the opportunity to address these motions. At report stage there are some 267 motions to amend the legislation.

Government Orders

I will address the time element because as members begin to talk we lose sight of the fact that there has been a great deal of discussion about Bill C-68. It has been happening now for well over a year. Members have had discussion papers and briefing documents. It has taken a great deal of time and now is the time to move forward.

If the House had to debate each amendment with the appropriate time allocation we would be here until next Christmas. The government has to move forward. We have had a great deal of time to discuss this. The allegation of some members that somehow this is ramming something through is quite to the contrary.

The hon. member for Wild Rose said the government's position on Bill C-68 is simply the whim of a few. Yet, as we well know, more than two-thirds of Canadians actively support this piece of legislation.

I want to address the issue of registration. That is certainly one of the areas where members have brought forward their concerns. In my riding people have asked questions concerning registration. I think it is fair to ask the question and to explain how registration and crime reduction go hand in hand and cannot be split, as hon. members might suggest.

Many members have asked why we are going after law-abiding citizens and not criminals. Law-abiding citizens are law-abiding citizens until they are convicted. There are no shades of grey in between.

(1605)

The Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police recently came out with a report. I thought it was very useful. Today the law requires all handguns to be registered, and law-abiding citizens have them registered.

One of the interesting facts was that 40 per cent of the crimes committed with these guns were registered. That is very significant. Members in the Reform Party continue to say law-abiding citizens, those who register their firearms, do not commit crime. Yet 40 per cent of the crimes committed with handguns presently required to be registered were committed by registered firearms.

This legislation will ask that all firearms now be registered including long arms, shotguns and rifles. I found out another interesting statistic from this report, that 47 per cent of all firearms crimes committed in Canada involved long arms. That is the reason long arms should also be registered.

I do not think Canadians have to look too far for the facts that encourage them to tell their members of Parliament that we do value safety. Canadians hear statistics all the time about the realities of gun crime; 200 children are shot by guns every year. This is appalling to Canadians. There is a problem to be dealt with.

There were some 1,400 firearms deaths last year, some 77 per cent of which were suicides. Only 3 per cent of those firearms deaths had anything to do with self-defence. These are facts which indicate clearly there are problems we can address to ensure our communities remain safe.

Unlike the platitudes and rhetoric I have been hearing from the Reform I will give more facts. The Prime Minister was recently in the United States. He was asked why people in the UN thought Canada was the best country in the world. He said the global economy is making us more and more alike. He said there were two things that really made Canada distinctive. The first is our medicare system. I do not have to explain to hon. members how important that is to Canadians. The second is that we can walk in our parks safely, unlike in the United States.

In the United States there are more gun shops than there are gas stations. There are private security officers in the United States than there are real police. For every one crime with a firearm in Canada there are 100 in the United States. When we take into account the 10 to 1 population differential that means the situation is 10 times worse in the United States than in Canada.

With such a vast majority of our population being so close to the U.S. border why has the gun problem not moved more fully into Canada? There are a couple of reasons. One has to do with the American constitution which has effectively the right to bear arms, whereas in Canada we do not have that right enshrined in our constitution. Ownership of a gun in Canada is a privilege subject to certain rules. Those are some of the reasons we have such a low relative crime rate with guns.

The real question has to do with crime. The members repeat the question about what the bill will do about crime. It is an excellent question. The importance of the question is how we approach it. Do we wait until after we have a problem and then start to deal with it or do we do things in advance anticipating forces in our society which may result in a greater level of crime?

We spend 75 per cent of what we do on remedial health care and only 25 per cent on prevention. To make sure our health care remains affordable and accessible, we have to deal more on the preventative side. This bill has an awful lot to do with preventing crime. It is not reducing crime; it is preventing crime and it results in the same effect.

(1610)

Since the mid-seventies about 64,000 firearms were reported lost, missing or stolen in Canada. We wonder how many guns were actually lost, missing or stolen but not reported. This fact alone indicates that members who would suggest criminals get their firearms only through smuggling really failed to understand the facts. So-called law-abiding gun owners are major suppliers of firearms to the criminal element. Some 1,400 firearms last year were reported lost, missing or stolen.

The cost issue has come up in my riding and in the House. The parliamentary secretary has done an excellent job to make sure Canadians know despite the rhetoric we have heard from others that cost is not a major item here. Registration will begin on January 1, 1998 and does not have to be fully implemented until the year 2003. In the initial phases it will cost something like \$10 for up to 10 guns for a five year period. Clearly in the first period as we go through this process of transitioning to registration of our firearms cost should not be a major problem for Canadians.

With regard to the issue of what gun control will do about crime, the most important element is public education. Now that we have discussed the issue of crime and firearms for well over a year now, more and more Canadians know what a serious responsibility it is to own a firearm. They know now they have to have a licence, that they have to register, that there are restrictions on storage and mandatory criteria for ammunition, transportation, et cetera. It is a very serious responsibility.

One of the things I am finding from talking to a number of serious gun owners and club shooters is they are finding there are an awful lot of guns now for sale to collectors and to clubs and other owners. A large number of people in Canada who have acquired firearms either through an inheritance or on a whim really are not very serious. Recent statistics show 60 per cent of firearms owners have not shot their guns in the last year and some 40 per cent have not shot their guns in the last five years.

A lot of people with firearms in their homes probably were not totally familiar with the rules and regulations. Now through this education process, now that more and more Canadians understand the important responsibility of owning a firearm, they are getting rid of those guns. That is good in terms of reducing the probability of firearms being dumped into the criminal markets.

The Minister of Justice has listened to Canadians. The amendments are constructive and address the concerns of many Canadians.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Pursuant to the agreement made this morning the divisions on the motions are deemed deferred.

(1615)

[*Translation*]

We will now proceed to group No. 4.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Government Orders

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-68, in Clause 4, be amended

(a) by replacing line 24, on page 4, with the following:

“under subsection 101.1(1) of this Act or subsection 92(1), 93(1) or”; and

(b) by replacing lines 31 and 32, on page 4, with the following

“constitute an offence under subsection 101.1(2) of this Act or subsection 92(2) or 93(1) of the Criminal”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 24 and 25, on page 4, with the following:

“under section 106 of this Act and subsection 95(1) of the Criminal Code,”.

Motion No. 9

That Bill C-68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 31 to 33, on page 4, with the following:

“constitute an offence under section 106.1;”.

Motion No. 11

That Bill C-68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 37 and 38, on page 5, with the following:

“offence under section 106.2 or 106.3 of this Act or subsection 99(1) or 100(1) of the Criminal Code; and”.

Motion No. 12

That Bill C-68, in Clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 17 to 18, on page 5, with the following:

“wise constitute an offence under section 106.4 or 106.5 of this Act or subsection 103(1) of the Criminal Code.”

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-68, in Clause 18, be amended by replacing lines 5 and 6, on page 16, with the following:

“sal in accordance with this Act.”.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 133

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 41, on page 50, the following new Clauses:

“101.1 (1) Subject to subsection (4) and section 98 of the Criminal Code, every person commits an offence who possesses a firearm, unless the person is the holder of

(a) a licence under which the person may possess the firearm; and

(b) a registration certificate for the firearm.

(2) Subject to subsection (4) and section 98 of the Criminal Code, every person commits an offence who possesses a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, other than a replica firearm, or any prohibited ammunition, unless the person is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it.

(3) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1) or (2) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction and liable

(a) for a first offence, to a fine not exceeding one thousand two hundred and fifty dollars and to a minimum fine of five hundred dollars;

Government Orders

(b) for a second offence, to a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars and to a minimum fine of one thousand two hundred and fifty dollars; and

(c) for a third or subsequent offence, to a fine of not more than two thousand dollars or to imprisonment for six months or to both.

(4) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply to

(a) a person who possesses a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition while the person is under the direct and immediate supervision of a person who may lawfully possess it, for the purpose of using it in a manner in which the supervising person may lawfully use it; or

(b) a person who comes into possession of a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition by the operation of law and who, within a reasonable period after acquiring possession of it,

(i) lawfully disposes of it, or

(ii) obtains a licence under which the person may possess it and, in the case of a firearm, a registration certificate for the firearms

101.11 (1) Where a peace officer believes on reasonable grounds that a person is in possession of a firearm in respect of which the person does not hold a registration certificate, the peace officer shall seize the firearm and may, for this purpose, search the person or a vehicle, in accordance with the provisions of the Criminal Code concerning search and seizure.

(2) Any thing seized pursuant to subsection (1) shall be dealt with in accordance with sections 490 and 491 of the Criminal Code, subject to subsection (4).

(3) A peace officer who seizes a firearm in accordance with subsection (1) shall give to the person who had possession of the firearm a notice in writing that the person shall obtain a registration certificate for the firearm within seven days of receiving the notice.

(4) The firearm that was seized shall be returned to the person who is lawfully entitled to its possession where the person obtains a registration certificate for the firearm within the period of time set out in subsection (3).

101.2 (1) A person who has been convicted of an offence under paragraph 101.1(3)(a) or (b) is deemed not to have been convicted of a criminal offence.

(2) An offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(a) or (b) does not constitute an offence for the purposes of the Criminal Records Act.

(3) For greater certainty, notwithstanding subsection (1), the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to summary conviction offences apply to an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(a) or (b).

(4) For greater certainty, nothing in this section prevents the punishment to which a person might otherwise be lawfully sentenced on a conviction for an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(a) or (b).

(5) Subject to subsection (6), every person is guilty of an offence who discloses to any person any record of a conviction for an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(a) or (b) or the existence of such a record or the fact of the conviction.

(6) No person commits an offence under subsection (5) where that person discloses anything referred to in that subsection to a prescribed person for the purposes of allowing the prescribed person to determine whether a person found guilty of an offence under subsection 101.1(3) has been previously convicted of an offence under that subsection.

(7) Every one is guilty of an offence who uses or authorizes the use of an application form for or relating to any of the following matters that contains a question that by its terms requires the applicant to disclose a conviction for an offence referred to in paragraph 101.1(3)(a) or (b):

(a) employment in any department, as defined in section 2 of the Financial Administration Act;

(b) employment by any Crown corporation, as defined in subsection 83(1) of the Financial Administration Act;

(c) enrolment in the Canadian Forces; or

(d) employment on or in connection with the operation of any work, undertaking or business that is within the legislative authority of Parliament.”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 134

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 17, on page 51, the following new Clause:

“102.1 (1) Every person commits an offence who knowingly makes, before a peace officer, firearms officer or chief firearms officer, a false report or statement concerning the loss, theft or destruction of a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, any prohibited ammunition, an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(3) In this section, “report” or “statement” means an assertion of fact, opinion, belief or knowledge, whether material or not and whether admissible or not.”

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 28, on page 51, the following new Clause:

“104.1 (1) Subject to subsections (3) and (4), every person commits an offence who is an occupant of a motor vehicle in which the person knows there is a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, other than a replica firearm, or any prohibited ammunition, unless

(a) in the case of a firearm,

(i) the person or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is the holder of an authorization or a licence under which the person or other occupant may possess the firearm and, in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, transport the prohibited firearm or restricted firearm,

(ii) the person had reasonable grounds to believe that any other occupant of the motor vehicle was the holder of an authorization or a licence under which that other occupant may possess the firearm and, in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, transport the prohibited firearm or restricted firearm, and

Government Orders

(iii) the person had reasonable grounds to believe that any other occupant of the motor vehicle was a person who could not be convicted of an offence under this Act or any other Act of Parliament; and

(b) in the case of a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition,

(i) the person or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is the holder of an authorization or a licence under which the person or other occupant may transport the prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, or

(ii) the person had reasonable grounds to believe that any other occupant of the motor vehicle was

(a) the holder of an authorization or a licence under which the other occupant may transport the prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, or

(b) a person who could not be convicted of an offence under this Act or any other Act of Parliament.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply to an occupant of a motor vehicle who, on becoming aware of the presence of the firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition in the motor vehicle, attempted to leave the motor vehicle, to the extent that it was feasible to do so, or actually left the motor vehicle.

(4) Subsection (1) does not apply to an occupant of a motor vehicle where the occupant or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is a person who came into possession of the firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition by the operation of law."

Motion No. 137

That Bill C-68, in Clause 106, be amended by replacing lines 41 to 44, on page 51, with the following:

"106. (1) Every person commits an offence who

(a) possesses a firearm, unless the person is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess the firearm and, where the firearm is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, unless the person holds a registration certificate for that firearm; or

(b) contravenes, in respect of a firearm, a condition of a licence, registration certificate or authorization held by the person.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) in the case of a first offence, is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction;

(b) in the case of a subsequent offence, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years."

Motion No. 138

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.1 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without lawful excuse, possesses a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition and

(a) does not hold a licence under which the person may possess it; or

(b) contravenes a condition of a licence or authorization held by the person.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 139

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.2 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, transfers a firearm or ammunition.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 140

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.3 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, transfers a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 141

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.4 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, imports or exports a firearm or ammunition.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction."

Motion No. 142

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

"106.5 (1) Every person commits an offence who, without authorization under this Act or any other Act of Parliament or regulation made thereunder, imports or exports

(a) a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition; or

Government Orders

(b) a component or part designed exclusively for use in the manufacture of or assembly into automatic firearms.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.”

Motion No. 143

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

“106.6 Any proceedings in respect of an offence under subsection 106.4(1) or 106.5(1) of this Act may be commenced at the instance of the Government of Canada and conducted by or on behalf of that government.”

Motion No. 144

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 44, on page 51, the following new Clause:

“106.7 Subsections 106(1) and 106.1(1) do not apply to

(a) a person who possesses a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition while the person is under the direct and immediate supervision of a person who may lawfully possess it, for the purpose of using it in a manner in which the supervising person may lawfully use it; or

(b) a person who comes into possession of a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition by the operation of law and who, within a reasonable period after acquiring possession of it,

(i) lawfully disposes of it, or

(ii) obtains a licence under which the person may possess it and, in the case of a firearm, a registration certificate for the firearm.”

Motion No. 146

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 10, on page 53, the following new Clause:

108.1 (1) Every person commits an offence who

(a) having lost a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device, any prohibited ammunition, an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate, or having had it stolen from the person's possession, does not with reasonable despatch report the loss to a peace officer, to a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer; or

(b) on finding a firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted weapon, a prohibited device or any prohibited ammunition that the person has reasonable grounds to believe has been lost or abandoned, does not with reasonable despatch deliver it to a peace officer, a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer or report the finding to a peace officer, a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.”

Motion No. 147

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 10, on page 53, the following new Clause:

“108.2 (1) Every person commits an offence who

(a) after destroying any firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, or

(b) on becoming aware of the destruction of any firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition that was in the person's possession before its destruction, does not with reasonable despatch report the destruction to a peace officer, firearms officer or chief firearms officer.

(2) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1)

(a) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years; or

(b) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.”

Motion No. 163

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clauses:

“129.1 Where, in any proceedings for an offence under any of sections 106, 106.1, 106.2, 106.3, 106.4, 106.5 and 108.1, any question arises as to whether a person is the holder of an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate, the onus is on the accused to prove that the person is the holder of the authorization, licence or registration certificate.”

Motion No. 164

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clause:

“129.2 (1) In any proceedings under this Act or any other Act of Parliament, a document purporting to be an authorization, a licence or a registration certificate is evidence of the statements contained therein.

(2) In any proceedings under this Act or any other Act of Parliament, a copy of any authorization, licence or registration certificate is, if certified as a true copy by the Registrar or a chief firearms officer, admissible in evidence and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, has the same probative force as the authorization, licence or registration certificate would have had if it had been proved in the ordinary way.”

Motion No. 165

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clause:

“129.3 (1) A certificate purporting to be signed by an analyst stating that the analyst has analysed any weapon, prohibited device, ammunition, prohibited ammunition or explosive substance, or any part or component of such a thing, and stating the results of the analysis is evidence in any proceedings in relation to any of those things under this Act or under section 19 of the Export and Import Permits Act in relation to subsection 15(2) of that Act without proof of the signature or official character of the person appearing to have signed the certificate.

(2) The party against whom a certificate of an analyst is produced may, with leave of the court, require the attendance of the analyst for the purposes of cross-examination.

(3) No certificate of an analyst may be admitted in evidence unless the party intending to produce it has, before the trial, given to the party against whom it is intended to be produced reasonable notice of that intention together with a copy of the certificate.

Government Orders

(4) For the purposes of this Act, service of a certificate of an analyst may be proved by oral evidence given under oath by, or by the affidavit or solemn declaration of, the person claiming to have served it.

(5) Notwithstanding subsection (4), the court may require the person who appears to have signed an affidavit or solemn declaration referred to in that subsection to appear before it for examination or cross-examination in respect of the issue of proof of service."

Motion No. 166

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 33, on page 65, the following new Clause:

"129.4 (1) The Governor in Council may, by order, declare for any purpose referred to in subsection (2) any period as an amnesty period with respect to any weapon, prohibited device, prohibited ammunition, explosive substance or component or part designed exclusively for use in the manufacture of or assembly into an automatic firearm.

(2) An order made under subsection (1) may declare an amnesty period for the purpose of

(a) permitting any person in possession of any thing to which the order relates to do anything provided in the order, including, without restricting the generality of the foregoing, delivering the thing to a peace officer, a firearms officer or a chief firearms officer, registering it, destroying it or otherwise disposing of it; or

(b) permitting alterations to be made to any prohibited firearm, prohibited weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition to which the order relates so that it no longer qualifies as a prohibited firearm, a prohibited weapon, a prohibited device or prohibited ammunition, as the case may be.

(3) No person who, during an amnesty period declared by an order made under subsection (1) and for a purpose described in the order, does anything provided for in the order, is, by reason only of the fact that the person did that thing, guilty of an offence under this Part.

(4) Any proceedings taken under this Part against any person for anything done by the person in reliance of this section are a nullity."

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 173

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 8, on page 72, with the following:

"(3) For the purposes of sections 92 to 95, 99".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 174

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 8 and 9, on page 72, with the following:

"(3) For the purposes of sections 95, 99, 100, 103 and 117.03 of this Act and".

Motion No. 175

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 5, on page 73, with the following:

"(b) a registration certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm if".

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 176

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

(a) by replacing line 13, on page 73, with the following:

"who uses a firearm or an imitation firearm"; and

(b) by replacing line 29, on page 73, with the following:

"using the firearm or imitation firearm."

Motion No. 177

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 19 and 20, on page 73, with the following:

"tent A firearm), 272.1 (sexual assault with a weapon), 273 (aggravated sexual assault)."

Motion No. 178

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

(a) by deleting lines 30 to 39, on page 73;

(b) by replacing line 2, on page 74, with the following:

"under subsection (1) is guilty of an";

(c) by replacing line 26, on page 74, with the following:

"offence under subsection (1) shall be"; and

(d) by replacing lines 32 and 33, on page 73, with the following:

"the person for an offence under subsection (1)."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 179

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 34 to 47, on page 74 and lines 1 to 11, on page 75.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 180

That Bill C-68 in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 35, on page 75, with the following:

"under subsection (1) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years."

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 181

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 16 to 45, on page 76 and lines 1 to 10, on page 77.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 182

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 16 on page 76 and substituting the following:

Government Orders

“91. (1) Subject to subsections (4) and (5) and section”

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 183

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

(a) by replacing line 18, on page 76, with the following:

“possesses a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, unless the person is;”

(b) by replacing lines 38 and 39, on page 76, with the following:

“(a) a person who possesses a prohibited firearm, a restricted firearm, a”;

(c) by replacing line 14, on page 77, with the following:

“possesses a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm knowing that the person is”;

(d) by replacing line 28, on page 78, with the following:

“prohibited firearm, a restricted firearm, a prohibited weapon, a restricted”;

(e) by replacing line 8, on page 79, with the following:

“in which the person knows there is a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm,”;

(f) by replacing lines 17 to 20, on page 79, with the following:

“may possess and transport the firearm,”;

(g) by replacing lines 29 to 32, on page 79, with the following:

“possess and transport the firearm, and”;

(h) by replacing line 26, on page 80, with the following:

“ing aware of the presence of the prohibited firearm, restricted firearm,”

(i) by replacing line 36, on page 80, with the following:

“of the prohibited firearm, restricted firearm, prohibited weapon, restricted”;

(j) by replacing line 33, on page 98, with the following:

“(a) a person in possession of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm who”;

(k) by replacing line 4, on page 99, with the following:

“may seize the prohibited firearm, restricted firearm, prohibited weapon, re-”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 184

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 16 to 45, on page 76 and lines 1 to 11, on page 77.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 185

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by adding, immediately after line 11 on page 77, the following:

“(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person who possesses a firearm that is neither a prohibited firearm nor a restricted firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(a) has borrowed the firearm;

(b) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it; and

(c) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain the person or the person’s family.”

Motion No. 186

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 12 on page 77 and substituting the following:

“92. (1) Subject to subsections (4) and (5) and section”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 187

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 12 to 47, on page 77 and lines 1 to 23, on page 78.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 188

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 14 on page 78 and substituting the following:

“(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person who possesses a firearm that is neither a prohibited firearm nor a restricted firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(a) has borrowed the firearm;

(b) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it; and

(c) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain the person or the person’s family.

(6) Where a person is charged with an”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 189

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 24 to 45, on page 78 and lines 1 to 4, on page 79.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 190

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 5 on page 79 and substituting the following:

“94. (1) Subject to subsections (3) to (5)”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 191

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 5 to 46, on page 79 and lines 1 to 38, on page 80.

Motion No. 192

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 1 and 2, on page 80, with the following:

“95. (1) Subject to subsection (3), every person commits an offence who, in”

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 193

Government Orders

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by adding, immediately after line 38 on page 80, the following:

“(5) Subsection (1) does not apply to an occupant of a motor vehicle where the occupant or any other occupant of the motor vehicle is a person who possesses a firearm that is neither a prohibited firearm nor a restricted firearm and who is not the holder of a registration certificate for the firearm if the person

(a) has borrowed the firearm;

(b) is the holder of a licence under which the person may possess it; and

(c) is in possession of the firearm to hunt or trap in order to sustain the person or the person's family.”

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 194

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 32 to 37, on page 81, with the following:

“under subsection (1) is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding ten years and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of three years.”

Motion No. 195

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 38 to 40, on page 81.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 196

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 19, on page 82.

Motion No. 197

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 20 to 43, on page 82, and lines 1 to 11, on page 83.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 198

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 22 and 23, on page 82, with the following:

“subsection 101.1(1) of the Firearms Act or subsections 92(1), 93(1), 94(1) and 95(1) of this Act, possessed a firearm without a firearm”; and

(b) by replacing lines 36 and 37, on page 82, with the following:

“the coming into force of any of subsection 101.1(1) of the Firearms Act or subsections 92(1), 93(1), 94(1) and 95(1) of this Act, possessed”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 199

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 11, on page 83.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 200

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 2 and 3, on page 83, with the following:

“between the coming into force of subsection 101.1(1) of the Firearms Act or subsection 92(1) or 94(1) of this Act and the later of January”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 201

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 3 to 9, on page 83 with the following:

“91(1), 92(1) or 94(1) and January 1, 1996, possesses a firearm that, as of that date, is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until December 31, 2000, the”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 202

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 7 to 21, on page 84.

Motion No. 203

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 18 to 34, on page 85.

Motion No. 204

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 28, on page 86.

Motion No. 205

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 29 to 43, on page 86 and lines 1 to 5, on page 87.

Motion No. 206

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 6 to 24, on page 87.

Motion No. 208

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 43, on page 89, with the following:

“(5) Sections 114 to 117 apply in respect of”.

Motion No. 210

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 5, on page 91, with the following:

“(5) Sections 114 to 117 apply in respect of”.

Motion No. 212

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 15, on page 92, with the following:

“(7) Sections 114 to 117 apply in respect of”.

Motion No. 213

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 1 to 46, on page 93 and lines 1 to 13, on page 94.

Motion No. 214

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by deleting lines 3 to 7, on page 96.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 220

Government Orders

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended

(a) by adding, immediately after line 9 on page 106, the following:

“(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to section 117.1, no individual who is employed by a business as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act that itself is the holder of a licence is guilty of an offence under this Act or the Firearms Act by reason only that the individual, in the course of the individual’s duties or employment, possesses, manufactures or transfers, or offers to manufacture or transfer, a partially manufactured barrelled weapon that, in its unfinished state, is not a barrelled weapon from which any shot, bullet or other projectile can be discharged and that is capable of causing serious bodily injury or death to a person.”

(b) by renumbering the subsequent subclause and any crossreferences thereto accordingly.

Motion No. 221

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by adding, immediately after line 21 on page 106, the following:

“(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to section 117.1, no individual who is employed by a museum as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act that itself is the holder of a licence is guilty of an offence under this Act or the Firearms Act by reason only that the individual, in the course of the individual’s duties or employment, possesses or transfers a firearm that is designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, an antique firearm if the individual has been trained to handle and use such a firearm.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, but subject to section 117.1, no individual who is employed by a museum as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act that itself is the holder of a licence is guilty of an offence under this Act or the Firearms Act by reason only that the individual possesses or transfers a firearm in the course of the individual’s duties or employment if the individual is designated, by name, by a provincial minister within the meaning of subsection 2(1) of the Firearms Act.

(5) A provincial minister shall not designate an individual for the purpose of subsection (4) where it is not desirable, in the interests of the safety of any person, to designate the individual.

(6) A provincial minister may attach to a designation referred to in subsection (4) any reasonable condition that the provincial minister considers desirable in the particular circumstances and in the interests of the safety of any person.”

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 222

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing line 29, on page 106, with the following:

“offence under any of sections 89, 90, 93.”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 223

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 29 and 30, on page 106, with the following:

“offence under sections 89 or 90, any question arises as to”.

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 228

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 38 on page 108, the following new Clause:

“117.16(1) Every section in this Part expires on January 1, 1999 unless prior to that date, with respect to each section

(a) the Auditor General has prepared and caused to be laid before Parliament a report on whether the section has been or will be a successful and cost-effective use of public funds to achieve an increase in public safety and a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms,

(b) the report of the Auditor General has been referred by the House to such committee as the house may designate for the purpose,

(c) the committee has considered the report of the Auditor General and made a report to the House on the success and cost-effectiveness of the section and on the extent to which

(i) public safety has been or will be increased or decreased,

(ii) the incidence of crime related to the use of firearms has been or will be reduced or increased, and

(iii) a cost-effective use of public funds has been or will be made to achieve an increase in public safety or a reduction in the incidence of violent crime involving the use of firearms, and

(d) the committee has recommended to the House that the section should not expire, and

(e) the House has concurred in the report of the committee.

(2) Where a section is to expire as result of subsection (1), the Governor in Council may, by order, defer its expiry for a period not exceeding one year, if the section contains matters that do not relate to firearms control and the deferral is necessary in order for legislation to be proposed to Parliament to continue the other matters in force after the expiry of the section.”

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 230

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 135.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 231

That Bill C-68, in Clause 135, be amended by replacing line 21, on page 109, with the following:

“ment for a term of one year; and”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 232

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 136.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 233

That Bill C-68, in Clause 136, be amended by replacing line 32, on page 109, with the following:

“ment for a term of eight years; and”.

Government Orders

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 234

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 137.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 235

That Bill C-68, in Clause 137, be amended by replacing line 43, on page 109, with the following:

“ment for a term of six years; and”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 236

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 138.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 237

That Bill C-68, in Clause 138, be amended by replacing line 16, on page 110, with the following:

“term of six years.”

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 238

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 139.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 239

That Bill C-68, in Clause 139, be amended by replacing line 10, on page 111, with the following:

“(a) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis—”.

Motion No. 240

That Bill C-68, in Clause 139, be amended by replacing line 30, on page 110, with the following:

“272. (1) Every person commits an aggravated assault who wounds, maims, disfigures or endangers the life of the complainant.

(2) Notwithstanding section 85, every person who commits an aggravated assault is guilty of an indictable offence and liable

(a) where a firearm is used in the commission of the offence, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years and to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of six years; and

(b) in any other case, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years.”

272.1 (1) Every person commits an offence”.

Motion No. 241

That Bill C-68, in Clause 139, be amended by replacing line 14, on page 111, with the following:

“a term of six years; and”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 242

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 140.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 243

That Bill C-68, in Clause 140, be amended by replacing line 22, on page 111, with the following:

“(a) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis—”.

Motion No. 244

That Bill C-68, in Clause 140, be amended by replacing line 25, on page 111, with the following:

“ment for a term of six years; and”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 245

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 141.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 246

That Bill C-68, in Clause 141, be amended by replacing line 42, on page 111, with the following:

“(a) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis—”.

Motion No. 247

That Bill C-68, in Clause 141, be amended by replacing line 2, on page 112, with the following:

“ment for a term of six years; and”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 248

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 142.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 249

That Bill C-68, in Clause 142, be amended by replacing line 10, on page 112, with the following:

“(a) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis—”.

Motion No. 250

That Bill C-68, in Clause 142, be amended by replacing line 13, on page 112, with the following:

“ment for a term of six years; and”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 251

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 143.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 252

Government Orders

That Bill C-68, in Clause 143, be amended by replacing line 20, on page 112, with the following:

“(a) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis—”.

Motion No. 253

That Bill C-68, in Clause 143, be amended by replacing line 23, on page 112, with the following:

“ment for a term of six years; and”.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 254

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 144.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 255

That Bill C-68, in Clause 144, be amended by replacing line 30, on page 112, with the following:

“(a) where a firearm or an imitation firearm is used in the commis—”.

Motion No. 256

That Bill C-68, in Clause 144, be amended by replacing line 33 on page 112, with the following:

“ment for a term of six years; and”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 259

That Bill C-68, in Clause 148, be amended by deleting lines 20 and 21, on page 115.

Motion No. 264

That Bill C-68, in Clause 172, be amended

(a) by replacing line 1, on page 127, with the following:

“(8) Sections 114 to 117 of the Criminal”

(b) by deleting lines 4 to 9, on page 127.

Motion No. 265

That Bill C-68, in Clause 183, be amended by deleting lines 21 to 29, on page 133.

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak to the motions under group No. 4, since this series of amendments basically deals with the decriminalization of the whole registration system for certain categories. In any case, the Bloc, under Motion No. 133, for instance, proposes to decriminalize failure to register shoulder arms. Let me explain that shoulder arms means shotguns and rifles. Contrary to certain comments by the government or even by the third party, we do not want to decriminalize all guns but only shotguns and rifles, referred to as shoulder arms.

Throughout this debate, I was surprised to see that although both the gun lobby and the anti-gun coalition raised some arguments that were very emotionally charged, there was no

discussion, although there should have been, about what society wants out of this bill.

I think society wants better gun control. I think it makes sense, in a society like ours, that people who own guns should register them. But do we really want to make criminals of people who, either out of stubbornness or sheer ignorance—although all citizens are supposed to know the law, there are a number who do not—because they do not know all the details of the legislation, will not register their shoulder arms?

Does the minister want to make criminals of these people? I hardly think so.

I was on the committee when the minister came to testify and seemed to be willing to open the door to decriminalizing failure to register a firearm. I felt the minister was listening very carefully. I felt he wanted to make the legislation more flexible in this respect, but I also felt that there was a huge lobby out there asking the minister not to give in, because the public ought to feel the government is very serious about this legislation.

With the amendment proposed under Motion No. 133, the government could have sent a message showing it was serious just the same, since I do not think that giving someone who fails to register a criminal record proves anything about the government's intentions. Sure, it shows it is being serious, but at what price? Some people will be prosecuted for failing to register the old twelve-gauge in the closet—this is one of my favourite examples—will they have a criminal record, with everything that entails? For instance, someone with a criminal record may have trouble finding a job or obtaining a passport. Is that what the Minister of Justice really wants? I do not think so. So why not make this clear in the bill?

With this amendment, we could also have sent a very clear message to the public that it is a serious matter to fail to register, by imposing substantial fines. For the first violation, a fine of between \$500 and \$2,500, which is quite a substantial sentence. We could also send a clear message by saying that unregistered guns will be seized and the owner will have seven days to register, upon receipt of a notice to that effect. The objective is to register these guns so that the objective will be met without criminalizing a group of people for no good reason.

I think we could have achieved the purpose of this bill. But no, as I said earlier, there is this debate between two groups at the opposite ends of the spectrum, about the same bill. The first group says: Listen, the legislation goes too far, it is too totalitarian and will cost too much money. What this group really wants is no legislation at all.

(1620)

On the other hand, the coalition and every other group in favour of firearms registration would like the legislation to go

further. The penalties are never severe enough; they are asking for pretty outrageous sentences. Basically, what would make them happy is for no one to be allowed to own weapons.

I think that the Bloc's proposal regarding decriminalization makes for a balanced amendment. I think that this kind of amendment favours neither the gun lobby nor the coalition. The ultimate objective could be served by such an amendment.

This bill is certainly a step in the right direction. There is obviously a need for the government to legislate in this area. This bill meets a need. I think that the statistics showing a large majority of voters in Canada and Quebec in favour of increased gun control are right.

I spoke to my constituents, not only hunters or representatives of one group or another, and they have told me that they want increased control. But they do not necessarily agree with certain specifics, such as criminalization. I think that a considerable education effort is still required if we want to know what the people really want us to do in this regard.

Yes, the people want firearms legislation, but I think this is not the kind of legislation they want. In light of the amendment proposed by the Bloc Quebecois in committee, the government has relaxed a number of clauses in its bill along the lines of what the Bloc had suggested. Much to its credit it paid attention, in certain respects, to the amendments and suggestions made by the Bloc Quebecois on Bill C-68.

If what the government is looking for is a bill that meets a consensus, a bill that will gain the widest support possible, the bill before us contains a stumbling block called decriminalization and, on this subject, the government should consider the proposed amendment carefully.

Ten minutes is a very short time to debate these amendments, but since I can speak only once and this bill is being debated globally, let me say that we cannot address decriminalization without addressing something else at the same time. As regards the issue of decriminalization, I feel that the minimum sentence of four years is unconscionable. To provide a minimum sentence of four years for certain offences committed with a firearm is to yield to the gun lobby.

Why remove the courts' discretionary power? Why remove the discretion which judges can use, given the evidence before them? The government argues that, on average, the courts currently impose a four year sentence for such offences. But why force them to automatically impose that sentence? Why not let them weigh the evidence? Why not trust the courts and the appointed judges, who are supposed to represent the public?

Why not let them weigh all the evidence and then impose the sentence which they feel, is the most appropriate, given the evidence before them? This is an aspect which the Minister of

Government Orders

Justice should look at very carefully, to comply with the existing legislation and to promote Canada's objectives in that respect.

There is also the issue of universal application of the act in Canada. The Minister of Justice repeatedly said that the act would apply everywhere in Canada. I hope it does, including on Indian reserves. If this act is going to be implemented everywhere, why does clause 110, among others, provide that the government can exclude a person?

(1625)

Since the past is indicative of the future, we are well aware that some people, particularly aboriginals, will be excluded because hunting is an important activity for their survival.

Why not pass legislation which will not only apply everywhere, but also to everyone? In conclusion, if the government is prepared to listen to Canadians, including Quebecers, it will accept the amendments proposed by the Bloc Quebecois regarding decriminalization. This would ensure that people are really treated fairly, and it would also ensure that the legislation targets those who should be targeted, which is not the case right now.

[English]

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I will just take a few minutes to address my amendment here. It has to do with the subject of decriminalizing the offences that are now in the Criminal Code.

If we look at sections 91 and 92, we see that the penalties under indictment of both of those sections are absolutely draconian. Section 92 allows for an individual who knowingly refuses or neglects to register his or her firearm to be sentenced to a term of ten years. Under section 91 if they proceed by way of indictment they can be sentenced to imprisonment for a term of five years.

There has been a new section put into the act at committee stage, I think it is 107.1, which makes it a summary conviction offence. However, the police will have the authority to arrest anyone in possession of a firearm under any of those sections, even the most draconian, which is under section 92. They can arrest them. It is an indictable offence. They can charge them, fingerprint them, and then they can reduce or withdraw the charge afterwards, while that person's fingerprints are on file.

We see the same kind of thing occurring to a certain degree under section 85 of the Criminal Code, where they lay charges against individuals for using a firearm in the commission of an offence and then later withdraw those charges as a plea bargaining tool. I see the same kind of power and authority being granted through these sections.

Therefore, the purpose of our amendments is to eliminate the draconian measures and penalties that are included in this bill. I might bring to everyone's attention that the idea of sentencing someone or making them liable to a penalty of ten years for

Government Orders

deliberately neglecting to register their .22 or their shotgun is absolutely absurd and unacceptable.

We all remember Mr. Lortie, who went into the Quebec assembly and murdered three people. He served ten years. To equate that kind of an act and that kind of punishment with the failure to register a rifle or a shotgun is to me beyond comprehension and absurd.

These amendments are designed to decriminalize offences where there is no mens rea involved, no intent and no overt act to endanger anyone. It is simply that they have failed, whether deliberately or inadvertently, to fulfil an administrative act, which is to register. It should not be a criminal offence and there should be no means whereby the police can arrest the person under those circumstances and have that person face an indictable offence where the punishment is as much as ten years or five years, depending on whether it is under section 92 or 91 of this act.

Those are my comments on that.

(1630)

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I am delighted to have the opportunity to speak to the amendments to Bill C-68. The reason I am so delighted is that since the government invoked time allocation last Thursday, I find myself being one of the chosen few who will be able to speak at report stage.

The government's motive is one of fear. It knows that many of its backbenchers are already going to vote against the bill and they are afraid that if Bill C-68 is not dealt with before summer, many more of their backbenchers would find themselves having to commit that greatest of all sins a Liberal member can commit, the sin of representing one's constituents.

That is what I am attempting to do with this bill. I am trying to gauge the sentiments of my constituents. The bill is one of the few issues where people have expressed a great deal of interest. In my recently released householder I provided each side of the argument with the opportunity to state the case for or against the bill. Representing those who support the bill is none other than the Minister of Justice.

My householder is in the homes of my constituents. While I have started to receive responses, the government's artificial deadline will prevent many of their voices from being heard. If the majority of my constituents wanted registration, given the opportunity, I would support the registration portion of Bill C-68.

It seems the government wants as few voices heard as possible. The bill has been rushed through the entire process. The schedule to hear witnesses was fixed in advance, ignoring hundreds of requests by groups and individuals to appear.

The timeframe to enter amendments was rushed, not allowing sufficient time to have legislative counsel prepare amendments. The clause by clause consideration was rushed, forcing the committee to sit until one o'clock in the morning.

What can one say about report stage and third reading? The tactic of introducing time allocation before debate even starts is a tactic that would have made the Mulroney administration blush.

The Liberals always complained when the Tories introduced closure but they have fully embraced the concept themselves. What is interesting is that there has never been a hint that the Reform Party or anybody else was attempting to filibuster the bill.

We have played by the rules, trying to improve a poorly drafted bill in case it passed third reading. How badly drafted was this bill? Let me say that during the clause by clause consideration the member for Crowfoot noticed that the wording of one clause would make it necessary for anybody wishing to buy a box of ammunition, even a box of .22 shells, would have been required to obtain prior approval of the chief firearms officer of the province.

It was interesting to see the look of confusion on the faces of the parliamentary secretary and the assistant deputy minister when they quickly realized that that was not their intent.

The bill has been amended but this is an example of the poor quality of legislation that goes through when Parliament rushes. Another example of the quality of this bill is the list of 37 amendments that the Minister of Justice is making at report stage. This is in addition to approximately 80 amendments that the government made in committee during clause by clause.

Government members say: "So what? Who cares? We are sitting so high in the polls". One wonders if they will remember that the Ontario Liberals went into their provincial election riding high at 53 per cent in the opinion polls as well. Probably not, since Liberals have very short memories. After all, it was only in the last Parliament when Liberals were loudly protesting over rules by the Tory government to introduce more legislation where Parliament would be bypassed with orders in council.

However, these protests are now silent as the government has created unprecedented provisions for government by order in council. There are 75 instances in this bill that call for regulations to be introduced. The government's attitude is forget Parliament, the cabinet knows what is best for Canada. After all, if amendments had to come through Parliament there may be

more of those Liberal backbenchers who may try and represent their constituents. The government would not want that to happen, would it?

Its attitude is: "Trust us. We know what is best". Having sat through the committee hearings on Bill C-68, it is apparent that the government does not know what it is doing.

The pretence under which this bill was introduced was that it would reduce crime and save lives. Unfortunately there was no such substantive evidence presented that indicated this bill would do either. The bill was purported to go after the criminal use of firearms, yet most of the bill is directed against the ordinary law-abiding gun owner.

(1635)

Those aspects of the bill that do deal with the criminal use of firearms are insignificant. That is why I have introduced the amendments I have.

The government chose to identify 10 serious crimes such as manslaughter, attempted murder, aggravated sexual assault, robbery and to create a minimum four year sentence if a firearm was used. However, what difference will these minimum sentences make? Not very much because the down side of minimum sentences is that they all too often because maximum sentences. Unless the minimum sentence is raised to a level that is sufficiently higher than the current average sentence, there will be no deterrent effect.

Will a four year minimum sentence for manslaughter with a firearm prevent any deaths? The average sentence for manslaughter in British Columbia is currently four years. Under current law, if a firearm is used in a death an additional one year sentence is added under section 85. How is it possible that a four year minimum sentence could have any deterrent effect when the average sentence is already five years?

That is why I have entered amendments that would increase the minimum sentence for manslaughter to eight years. For eight other crimes it would be increased to six years and for one crime, criminal negligence causing death, we are suggesting the minimum sentence should be reduced.

Another flaw in the bill is that under these 10 specific crimes, it is necessary to prove that the object used in the crime is a firearm. While this may not be difficult in manslaughter cases or those charged with causing bodily harm, what about cases involving sexual assault, kidnapping or robbery? If the gun is not fired or if it is not recovered, how does the crown prove that the object used meets the legal definition of a firearm? The short answer is that it cannot. Thus, in many of these cases there will never be a charge of using a firearm because the crown simply will not be able to prove that a firearm is used.

Government Orders

That is why I am moving the second set of amendments. It will no longer be necessary to prove whether the object used was a firearm or just an imitation firearm. The victim of a sexual assault may not know if the object used is a real firearm or just a replica. The terror is equal in any event. To let a sex offender walk away from this crime because the victim is unable to state whether it was a real firearm or just an imitation is wrong. These clauses must be amended.

Bill C-68 is bad legislation. It does not do what it sets out to accomplish. If this law is not bad enough, the way the government has handled it is even worse. How can anyone justify closing down debate before it even started on legislation that will not come fully into effect for another eight years? They cannot. Arrogant governments believe they do not have to explain anything, except when they try to explain to themselves why they have been rejected by the voters and have fallen into oblivion.

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in listening to the debate I cannot help but wonder why the opposition is all of a sudden so exercised about time allocation when in fact we dialogued about this bill for almost a year.

The Minister of Justice went from coast to coast to coast speaking to groups on the bill. The subject matter of the bill was brought forward on November 30 and the bill was brought forward based on that subject matter on February 14, 1995. There has been a lot of dialogue and a lot of consultation.

The committee has met, but not all the witnesses who wanted to appear could appear. There was a restriction on the number of witnesses, but it was done with the belief that those witnesses would have their points of view brought forward by either a national organization to which they belonged or a similar organization which would speak for the the interests of witnesses. There were individuals who wanted to come forward. That was not possible.

(1640)

Many people wanted to speak to the bill as with most important bills. It is not democracy to hear everybody. That is not the way it has been practised since Athens and the days of Pericles. The way it is done is to choose representatives to come before the committee.

Also, we are talking about the amendments today at report stage. In some cases we are getting a point of view on these amendments and in other cases we are not. The fact of the matter is we have third reading yet to come.

Perhaps not everybody who wants to speak at third reading will be given the opportunity to do so. At committee stage we allowed members to have five minute interventions on points before the committee, which was requested.

Government Orders

Members will know that as speakers come before the House and speak at third reading that the first speeches are 20 minutes and then the other speeches are 10 minutes. Many members are giving those 10 minutes speeches here today.

Relating to the last speaker on minimum sentences, this area has been given a great deal of attention. The member is not satisfied that in 10 very serious offences the minimum sentence would be four years. She wants it increased to eight years in the case of manslaughter and six years in other cases. That is one point of view.

We have had witnesses before the committee who felt that a 10 year minimum, and in fact the previous speaker from the Bloc condemned the government for having a four year minimum in these cases, saying that the discretion should be allowed to go to the courts as is the case at the present time. We have heard it from both sides. We feel four years is a period of time that is defensible in this case.

Minimum sentences are never something that a government wants to bring forward because it takes discretion away from the courts. The courts are put in place to judge the actions of our fellow citizens in relation to the laws, both statute and common law. They are to use their discretion and they are trained professionals in the law and with experience on the bench.

To say that we are going to implement minimum sentences is a curtailment of that discretion and to say that we are going to have a minimum sentence of eight years is an absolute affront to that discretion. The question is, would a minimum sentence of that extent in fact not be challenged under the charter of rights and freedoms. Frankly I feel that it would.

We have have a minimum sentence for those 10 situations. We have a minimum sentence of one year for illegal importation and exportation of a firearm and also for other criminal offences as well. We have attempted to impress on Canadians the seriousness of the wrongful use of a firearm with these minimum sentences. There is a limit to how far we can go and many people and institutions have told us we have gone too far already. We do not think so but we do not think that going further will gain any respect for the law. It is only going to lead to a complete and utter disrespect for the law where the law arbitrarily is imposing extremely harsh sentences without the judge being able to have some latitude.

We talk about section 85 and plea bargaining and also about section 85 with respect to an imitation firearm. If we are going to give four years for a firearm, it is awfully hard to give four years to an imitation firearm that is not a danger to the person on the other side of the counter. There has to be some discretion. It is still possible for the judge to give a stronger sentence. That imitation firearm would still come under section 85 where

robbery is included. There would then be a subsequent one year sentence for the imitation firearm.

(1645)

The case is also put to the attorneys general and provincial ministers of justice as to why these extra charges are plea bargained away. This area is within their discretion. It does not have to happen in the provincial jurisdiction because the provinces have control over the administration of justice. As in the case of dangerous offenders they have to say these offences are not to be plea bargained away.

I want to mention Motion No. 133 as brought forward by a member of the Bloc Quebecois. Motion No. 133 would impose a simple fine for first and second offences. These are offences that would be under clause 107.(1), the new offence under the firearms bill which takes the possession of unregistered long guns out of the Criminal Code and puts them into the firearms act.

The member suggests a simple fine for first and second offences of not only illegal long guns but also for possession of prohibited fully automatic firearms, silencers and prohibited ammunition such as armour piercing bullets. Such a lenient offence would be a mockery of what we are attempting to do under this legislation. Clause 107.(1) attempts to treat leniently and with some kind of compassion those who honestly did not register their long guns. It is certainly not an intent to excuse people with prohibited fully automatic firearms from non-registration.

The penalties the member would impose under Motion No. 133 are much less severe than is the case right now. It would say to someone who blatantly violates the law that they would not be convicted of a criminal offence. As I mentioned, it would trivialize the severity of possessing firearms without a licence and a registration certificate.

We have attempted to bring forward laws and eventually regulations that will not minimize the seriousness of the offence but which will honestly recognize the honest mistake of non-registration. They will also allow those who are in charge of enforcing these laws to deal with the offences in a humane and a compassionate way relating to the facts of the situations as they see them.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Waterloo—national defence.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the motions before us in group No. 4, if I am not mistaken. I would like to point out that the Criminal Code currently provides a number of mandatory minimum punishments. The one of interest to us today is set out in section 85 of the Code. It reads as follows: "Everyone who uses a

firearm while committing [—]an indictable offence [—]is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment, in the case of a first offence, [—]for not more than fourteen years and not less than one year, and, in the case of a second or subsequent offence, [—]for not more than fourteen years and not less than three years”.

(1650)

As we can see, the Criminal Code already provides a mandatory minimum sentence of one year for the use of a firearm with criminal intent. It also provides a minimum sentence of three years for all subsequent offences. These sentences are served consecutively to any other sentence. That means that an individual found guilty of robbery, for example, would be sentenced for the principal offence—the robbery itself—and would then have this sentence extended by one or three years, as the case may be.

The proposal by the Minister of Justice to increase the minimum sentence to four years would not improve the situation in any way. At best, individuals would be given only the minimum sentence of four years. At worst, the Supreme Court would consider the provisions setting the mandatory minimum punishment at four years unconstitutional, because it would consider such punishment cruel and unusual under section 12 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

At the moment, an individual found guilty of one of the offences set forth in the new section 85 could very easily be sentenced to a term longer than that contemplated by the Minister of Justice. In fact, the combination of a consecutive mandatory sentence and sentencing for the principal offence could easily exceed four years.

Section 85 of the Criminal Code is therefore amended in Bill C-68 with the addition of a list of ten violent offences to which the provision will apply. We have wondered about the seriousness of the minister in establishing this list. It includes manslaughter, a crime without criminal intent, but it does not include armed assault. Is punishment to be the same, regardless of whether the victim survives his or her wounds?

Forcible confinement is not on the list either, although kidnapping and hostage-taking are. I must say I have serious doubts about the deterrent effect of an increase in the minimum sentence provided in section 85 and related sections.

I would like to point out that the working document prepared by the Department of Justice on the present section 85, in particular, and on the imposition of minimum sentence in general, concludes that the public as a whole is not aware which offences carry mandatory minimum sentence. It is hard to see how such a measure would deter potential delinquents, since they generally do not know what the minimum sentence is.

Government Orders

In addition, the same document that the Minister of Justice should have examined more closely concludes that mandatory minimum sentences probably have very little effect as deterrents and on the rate of the commission of serious crimes. Robbery is a prime example. And what is worse, apparently juries are less inclined to find someone guilty if they know that the crime the defendant is accused of committing carries a mandatory sentence.

If judges choose not to allow sentences for multiple offences to be served concurrently, the result would be a substantial growth in the prison population. In fact, the minimum sentence of four years would be the starting point to which any additional period of detention necessary would be added, depending on the circumstances surrounding the offence.

Obviously, an individual accused of several offences could serve sentences consecutively. The Minister of Justice seems to believe naïvely that detention centres will be able to hold more inmates. He argues, in fact, that his bill will be a deterrent and will decrease the number of crimes perpetrated with a weapon.

He has no way of knowing what impact his bill will have on the number of convictions made under his reformed system in the future. Let us not forget that a chain is only as strong as the weakest of its links.

(1655)

If we increase the minimum sentence provided for in section 85 of the Criminal Code, we must expect the prison population to swell although we do not have the facilities needed to accommodate the new inmates.

The warning issued by Université de Montréal Professor Pierre Landreville is worthy of consideration. In an article published in the December 23, 1994 edition of *Le Devoir*, Mr. Landreville outlines the danger of such legislation, and I quote: “[—] every year in Quebec, some 1,500 individuals are convicted and could eventually be sentenced to a minimum of four years in prison, in addition to the sentence given for the main offence. Quebec’s prison population, which is now around 4,000, would almost double in the first four years following the implementation of this measure”.

The increase in the prison population would lead to an increase in related costs. Did anyone bother to find out how much Bill C-68 would cost, when we know that, in 1992-93, the annual cost of keeping a single inmate averaged \$56,000 in maximum security and \$36,000 in medium security?

The mandatory minimum sentence is the minimum number of years to be served. In a so-called clarification effort, minimum punishment was included in the wording of the offence itself. That is why we find the phrase “to a minimum punishment of imprisonment for a term of four years” in 10 different clauses

Government Orders

listing possible sentences for the offences in question. I am talking about clauses 135 through 144 of Bill C-68.

The amendments put forward by the Bloc Québécois in Motions No. 182 and following are all aimed at eliminating the mandatory minimum sentence by revoking these clauses. Significantly increasing mandatory minimum sentences is an ill-advised public relations exercise. There is no better way to score points.

The Minister of Justice wanted to ease the fears of a generally misinformed public and to make the pro-gun lobby swallow the pill by claiming that Bill C-68 does not deal with the registration of long guns. He failed miserably in both cases.

Increasing mandatory minimum sentences involves far too many uncertainties, considering eventual tangible benefits. Bill C-68 is a bill on public safety and not a marketing operation. The Minister of Justice would have been better off explaining his bill and answering gun owners' legitimate questions. Had he done so, he would not have provoked such a general outcry.

I therefore urge the House to support the Bloc motions, which reflect the kind of society we all want to live in.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ): Madam Speaker, I welcome this opportunity today to express my support for the amendments proposed by the Bloc Québécois and put them into the context of this debate.

In this instance the emphasis is mainly on decriminalization, and that is entirely in line with the position taken by the Bloc Québécois which is to make this a balanced piece of legislation. This seems to have been a rather difficult debate, with some very active lobbies on both sides, and I must say that in my case, I got some firsthand experience of this in my riding, and with citizens who want to make sure that this process produces some effective results.

So with this in mind, the Bloc worked on this bill and tried to come up with some satisfactory results.

What is the primary objective? Basically, to improve gun control. Prevention is the main thing, in other words, we want to ensure that now and in the near and not so near future, we can improve the situation. Through better control, we also want to reduce the number of guns that are out there but are not being used, and a number of examples come to mind. Everyone knows people who, somewhere in a closet, have a gun they inherited and which they still have but do not use. They still own it but hardly ever use it. There are a lot of guns around.

(1700)

This bill is rather well received by the general public, especially in Quebec. However, the groups that are directly affected are more sceptical. They have expressed certain reservations and, in some cases, out and out dissent. Generally

speaking, the people most likely to be affected—and I am thinking of hunters, of whom I represent a certain number in my riding—are wondering what will happen. There are a lot of rumours about what it might actually cost them. They have sometimes felt that the government was out to get them.

Many people who use guns, either hunting rifles or revolvers, use them responsibly. So we do not really want to brand them as criminals, and that is why we would like to see some flexibility with respect to criminalization. We are suggesting ways to make this position more flexible.

In the case of Quebec, the registration of firearms, including hunting rifles, has been in effect for a number of years. The problem is how the process is used. Now the government wants to create a national registry. I realize some people are going to say that it is like starting all over again. They say: when I bought my gun at the store, they took down the serial number and all that. Now, when they want to set up a national registry, for Canada, in this case, we have to more or less repeat the same process. I agree there are some costs involved in implementing the system. The bulk of the cost would be during the start up phase, but subsequently, we can assume that the system would become much simpler and far more flexible. Nevertheless, there are some questions about these new measures.

I want to make it clear that we in the Bloc Québécois support the principle of improving gun control. However, we want to minimize the impact on the individual, and in this case, the user. Since this bill is intended to benefit the general public, it would perhaps make sense for everyone to contribute to the start up costs. I do not own any firearms and it would not bother me to contribute as a citizen, as a taxpayer, to this system's start up or to pay for a firearm's registration, if one day I decide to purchase one, on the condition, of course, that the fees are reasonable.

Throughout the process, we have maintained pressure on the government to banish the rumours regarding figures and to reassure people that the cost would be reasonable. Because a bill is just a bill, its effectiveness relies on the decision of individuals to respect the system and the law. It is they who ultimately determine how effective a law is going to be. When the majority of people respect it, it becomes a standard for society. At that point, it becomes easier to enforce. The best way to have people respect a law is peer pressure.

Therefore, I agree with the statement that we all have to contribute and that users also have to do their part. Under the current proposal, a \$10 fee will be imposed for the registration of the first 10 firearms. Most Canadians do not own more than 10 firearms. These fees seem reasonable. Some people do have more than 10, for example collectors, but there are special provisions for them. Now, an ownership certificate is also involved. To be able to own a firearm, people will have to purchase a certificate at a cost of approximately \$10 per year, payable for a period of five years. It is important to note that this

ownership certificate replaces a certificate that already exists, the firearms acquisition certificate.

For a good many people, the only fee involved will be the initial cost of registering their firearms, \$10. I think that this is reasonable and so do a good number of my constituents. The fear they have is that an amendment will be introduced later which will raise costs exponentially. They want reassurances, like the one discussed in committee, that the government will not pull a fast one on them.

(1705)

In this regard, we suggested indexing it to the cost of living, which would appear to be one of the most reasonable proposals made. We cannot, however, use the same formula, because of the way the House works. So, I now propose, instead, that these fees be frozen for 20 years, although I still think our first position was better and more acceptable to the government.

However, we make the point again to the government that this would be one way it could ensure the greatest support and the least resistance for its bill. I think the people in my region and in other regions will accept this system, so long as it means the least possible inconvenience for them, including any financial inconvenience that may be involved. The registration fee must not be seen as a disguised tax on firearms.

The other point is to ensure as well that an inefficient bureaucracy is not created with the legislation. As members of the opposition, we must ensure over time that the system exists without accompanying machinery of no practical value and that the people working in the system do what they are supposed to be do, that is, control weapons, so that we do not end up with a system costing more than it should.

If these points can be assured, I think the bill will be more saleable. Of course, there has been considerable debate about the effectiveness of registration. Will it really meet the prevention goals? This is, I admit, where debate was perhaps the most difficult. People, experts from both sides testified for and against registration. We as legislators must make up our minds after listening to experts who disagree on this subject and to people from both sides who lobby hard to get their message across. Some of them even resort to threats, linking this to election and political issues, which I find somewhat regrettable because there are other, more important matters.

That said, we must make up our minds, and I am now one of those who have come to support this bill, because I think that we must take this step in our social development. Although we may have some doubts, are these doubts enough to abstain, in my

Government Orders

case, or dissent? I think not, and that is why we must support this bill.

But—and I will conclude on this—we are asking the minister to be a little more flexible to ensure that people will rally behind this bill, and that any negative impact on those affected will be minimal. In this regard, I think that their only concern at the present time is the matter of costs. I feel that going along the lines of the amendments that follow would allow us to take a very important step while being a little more flexible on decriminalization.

[*English*]

Mr. Jim Abbott (Kootenay East, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I heard earlier in a speech by one of the government members that the objective of the legislation was to improve public safety on the streets and in our homes. Every single Reform member in the House is out for exactly the same objective, to improve public safety on the streets and in our homes. Unfortunately the bill has very little to do with that.

I have asked a number of people, including members of the House, to explain what they think the bill is all about. One member suggested that it was the warm fuzzies, the warm fuzzies simply being that it makes us feel good, that it makes us feel better.

The justice minister has been very interesting in coming forward with a figure of \$85 million to make his creation work, \$85 million to register seven million guns. We are taking a look at the imposition of registration and we are taking a look at the expenditure of \$85 million. It reminds me an awful lot of the idea of what it would cost for transportation of a particular entity.

(1710)

If we take into account only the capital cost of the car and not any of the actual running expenses, we might get a rather distorted picture.

I do not buy the justice minister's estimate of \$85 million by a long shot. I do not think it is anywhere even remotely close. At best, even if that was the federal cost, what about the provincial cost?

I asked the justice minister about a situation where environmental activist Paul Watson talked about the fact that he had used a stun gun in either New Brunswick or the province of Quebec, I cannot recall. He rose in the House and made the very clear point that the administration of justice was a provincial issue, a provincial responsibility.

Government Orders

Even if the \$85 million figure were believable, which I do not think it is, the real cost of administering this useless program will fall to the provinces.

I also cite from page 13480 of *Hansard*, June 8, wherein the Speaker of the House made a ruling on a point of order raised by the House leader for the Reform Party. I recognize that clause 98 was dealt with in Motion No. 3. Nonetheless this is germane to my argument. He said:

Clause 98 as introduced in the House had the concept of "police officer" for which the concept of "inspector" has been substituted by the committee. It still remains a provincial ministerial responsibility as to which class of individuals shall be so designated. It may well be that a provincial minister decides to recruit an entirely new class of individuals for the purpose of clause 98, but it clearly remains the decision of the provincial authority to do so. Whether the class of individuals are called inspectors or police officers has no direct impact on the royal recommendation attached to the bill.

He was ruling on the fact, in the judgment of the Speaker, that the costs of the program were actually going to be borne by the provinces in the same way as the cost of driving the automobile once it is purchased are borne by the owner. In actual fact the cost to the Canadian taxpayer, even if we could believe the \$85 million as a starting point, is \$85 million to buy into the initial registration of the program. The enforcement of the program will be something quite different.

Let us deal with the \$85 million figure. I want to restate for the third or fourth time that I do not buy the \$85 million figure even at the federal level. What could we do with money equivalent to that?

I read in the June 10 *Gazette*:

The RCMP will spend \$68 million over the next few years in an attempt to curb smuggling along the 700-kilometre border between Quebec and the U.S.

The largest number of new officers will go to the Valleyfield detachment, near the Akwasasne Mohawk reserve.

Akwasasne, which straddles the Canada-U.S. border and incorporates parts of Quebec and Ontario, is considered a key crossing point for contraband.

If we are to spend \$68 million in that case or if we are to spend, as the justice minister has suggested, this impossible figure of \$85 million, would it not be good if we could actually spend it on something that would accomplish that for which it is being spent?

It seems rather illogical when one refers to the polls that the justice minister and parliamentary secretary keep referring to. They say that 60 per cent, 68 per cent or 75 per cent of people are in favour of registration. That is terrific, except invariably—and I will make up a figure—68 per cent of people are in favour of registration but 72 per cent of people do not think it will do anything. What is the point of the registration program if in the belief of Canadians it will not do anything? Why are we getting

into it in the first place? Why are we harassing ordinary law-abiding Canadians?

(1715)

With respect to the source of weapons coming into Canada, I will read a small part of a very profound report by the MacKenzie Institute. It is rather detailed but is also quite enlightening.

By the time of writing, 102 weapons which have been sold to the four Mohawks were recovered by Canadian police forces. Details on these firearms include the following: 65 light semi-automatic pistols; 32 semi-automatic pistols; four revolvers; one submachine gun; at least another 21 light semi-automatic pistols, 39 semi-automatic pistols and four Cobray submachine guns pass through this connection into Canada.

What possible effect did or would the registration program have on the passage of this arsenal?

Other weapons that were not traced to Vermont but were seized along with those 102 weapons included five assault rifles, two submachine guns, a sawed off shotgun, 14 other pistols and 23 unspecified weapons. At least five of these were also smuggled in from the United States. Of the 102 weapons, various Canadian police forces have provided information on the crimes the firearms were associated with, and/or the history of the suspects who had been in possession of the firearms.

The arms provided by the four Mohawks were linked to the following crimes and criminals. Again, I am only going to read a small part of the list. "Thirty-five were associates and/or members of the Russian Mafiya, Armenian thieves", and it goes on and on.

The connections are amazing. The point I am trying to make is that our border at this point is no bar to guns. A registration program is going to have no effect in changing that situation. This is underscored and underlined even by the Canadian Police Association.

My point is why are we going after targeting law-abiding Canadian citizens when the surveys themselves which supposedly support registration say that people recognize registration will make no difference. We are going after the wrong people.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Fillion (Chicoutimi, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am far from happy with Bill C-68 in its present form. As usual, I think the government has turned a deaf ear to the various motions in amendment put forward by the Bloc Québécois. Once again, the government has missed a wonderful opportunity to improve its bill by incorporating the findings of the various committees, the conclusions reached at public hearings or quite simply the views contained in letters sent in by our constituents throughout this country.

One thing is for sure: for or against, this bill leaves no one indifferent. I have said it before, and I will say it again, although this is a very controversial bill, it is, in my view, essential and in the interests of all Quebecers and Canadians that the gov-

Government Orders

ernment pass it so that citizens are better protected against the upsurge in crime and violence that can strike anyone at any time.

I cannot, at this time, go into all the details of this bill, but it is clear from the controversy surrounding it that it has some major flaws. I will mention just two in particular. First, in a move designed to impress the public, the Minister of Justice included in his bill a minimum sentence of four years, in lieu of the provisions of section 85 of the Criminal Code. In its present form, section 85 provides that a criminal who uses a firearm while committing an offence will have to serve an additional consecutive sentence of one year. In the case of a second or subsequent offence, the additional sentence is three years.

(1720)

Surely the Minister of Justice cannot seriously think that a minimum sentence of four years on top of the original sentence will have a dissuasive effect. It will not. It will merely serve to worsen the already serious problem of overcrowding in Canada's prison system.

Furthermore, I would remind you that members of the Quebec bar told the committee that a minimum sentence of four years for use of a firearm in committing an offence could result in something like an additional 250 people a year joining the prison population. When you think about how much it costs taxpayers to keep one offender in jail, I do not know whether this country, which is bankrupt, currently has the means to support another 250 people in jail. The auditor general also spoke of this subject.

My colleague, the hon. member for Saint-Hubert, the Bloc Québécois justice critic, is proposing to simply drop clauses 135 to 144, which merely list ten crimes with a minimum sentence of four years. I think that we should stick to the current rules established in the Criminal Code. It should be up to judges to set the sentences for the various crimes committed by offenders.

Would it not be wiser to follow Quebec's example in justice matters, and to channel our efforts towards better understanding, by putting emphasis on prevention and bringing in measures which promote rehabilitation, instead of giving in, like this government has, to repressive movements from all over the country, which are expounded mostly by the Reform Party.

Another point that is of particular concern to me is that section 106 of the current Criminal Code stipulates that people who make a living from hunting do not have to pay the licencing fees related to firearm ownership.

I know very well that we have grown accustomed to the government's double standards over the past two years, but this bill is too serious and important for that kind of game. Clause 110 of the bill would effectively allow the governor in council to introduce discriminatory regulations uniquely for the benefit of

aboriginal peoples. I fail to see why belonging to a certain class of persons changes the application of the legislation.

It is therefore imperative that any person who owns a firearm be obliged to pay registration fees, whether that person lives off the proceeds of the hunt or is a native. This government must not allow the creation of different classes of citizens. It is not helpful at all and merely creates conflicts within our society.

Guns must be controlled and regulated by laws that are logical, sensible and apply to all citizens of this country, irrespective of their age, sex, occupation or cultural heritage.

I know this bill does not enjoy unanimous support, but we must remember that as elected representatives, it is our duty to protect our constituents, often from themselves.

This bill should respond to the main concerns which have been raised constantly in the past five to ten years with respect to gun control.

(1725)

We know this bill is not a panacea for the crime and violence that exist in our society. However, it is time to acquire the additional tools we need to deal with these problems. I think this bill is a tool that will help society evolve, and that a few years from now, it will be too late.

Finally, I may recall that at the present rate, there will be about four million guns of all kinds in less than ten years. We cannot afford to leave this legacy to future generations. It is time to act now. This has gone on long enough.

[English]

Mr. Hugh Hanrahan (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to discuss report stage of Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons. This is perhaps the most controversial piece of legislation the House has seen since the implementation of the GST. It is also a piece of legislation which has caused a great deal of debate and at times heated discussion since this issue was first raised in the House.

I have learned there is little or no middle ground on the issue of gun control. It is an issue that Canadians either do or do not support. I surveyed my constituents of Edmonton—Strathcona twice to gauge their feelings on this issue. I did this through household surveys and received conflicting results. Some individuals suggested the first question was too broad and all encompassing and others felt the second question was too narrow. This is a problem in which each side is divided into black and white; there does not seem to be any shade of grey.

How do we resolve this conflict in order to vote according to the wishes of the majority of our constituents? I felt the best way to resolve the problem was to bring in an independent third party. In this case it was an independent pollster. This polling

Government Orders

firm's objective was to find out how my constituents truly felt on the issue of gun control. The results were as follows.

Just under 50 per cent of the respondents said they believed the government's proposed gun control legislation should not be passed without modification or amendment, while only 28 per cent said it should be passed. Over 55 per cent believed that the potential benefits of the proposed legislation would not justify the cost of the bureaucracy required to enforce it compared with 30 per cent on the yes side. An astonishing 70 per cent believed that the authorities would be granted too many powers concerning the issues of search, seizure and compensation, while less than 25 per cent felt that the new powers would be justified. Finally, almost 80 per cent of the constituents from Edmonton—Strathcona believed that criminals would not comply with the justice minister's proposed gun control legislation compared with only 11 per cent who said that criminals would.

It is also interesting that this government seems to be traveling down the same road as the previous Conservative government. There was an outcry of self-righteousness from the Liberals while they were in opposition over the Conservatives' use of time allocation to ram through legislation.

The Liberals had managed to make the most faithful individuals of our democratic process turn into pessimists. This Liberal government is trampling on Canadians' democratic rights by limiting the time in which we as parliamentarians can debate legislation put forward in this House.

(1730)

The Mulroney government used time allocation 35 times to pass 200 bills. That is 17 per cent of the Mulroney government's bills, which is shamefully unacceptable, as was indicated by the other side.

Now let us look at the government's record, in which time allocation has been used an unprecedented 14 times on only 59 bills, including this one, Bill C-68. On this bill time allocation has been used not once, not twice, but three times. In other words, the government has used time allocation 24 per cent of the time, 7 per cent more than the Mulroney government. That is totally unacceptable to me and to the constituents of Edmonton—Strathcona and I believe to all Canadians.

The government must start to listen to the people and not the spin doctors, or else it as well will be able to hold its caucus meetings in a phone booth.

The people of Edmonton—Strathcona have spoken out on this issue, and the majority concur with the Reform Party's position that registration is not the means to an end in which the end is a

decrease in crime. It is for this reason that the Reform Party has brought forward amendments to split the bill during second reading. We would have passed the crime control measures immediately, which would have allowed us more time to spend debating the merits and pitfalls of a full scale registration plan.

We as a caucus applaud the justice minister's endeavour to curtail the deliberate criminal misuse of firearms. He has done this through increased penalties for criminal misuse of firearms and through an increased effort to further enhance controls on illegal border crossings.

Unfortunately certain aspects of Bill C-68 will have a detrimental impact on the competitive sports shooting group. If we are to believe the majority of shooting organizations, they feel there is a real possibility of the loss of Canada's sports shooting structure. Prohibiting or restricting firearms that are commonly used in legal, legitimate, recreational circumstances such as casual target shooting or in formally organized competition does not prevent criminal acts. It only further restricts the rights and freedoms of law-abiding citizens.

As the Reform Party's critic for amateur sports, I feel obligated to speak directly to the specific sections of the bill that have the most direct effect on sports shooting organizations across Canada. We proposed amendments in committee that would have allowed those individuals who are members of the registered recognized shooting associations to be exempt from Bill C-68, and this was defeated. Our position is that we do not want to prohibit guns that are used specifically for competition and thereby prohibit those at the entry level from entering the sport.

Our reasoning is that you do not come into the world of competitive shooting with a \$5,000 or \$6,000 target pistol. You start off at the entry level with a very inexpensive firearm. You join a club and you take up shooting. Invariably these firearms tend to have barrel lengths of four inches or so and to be .32 calibre, which is what the Olympic shooters use.

It is a concern for me that the proud tradition that Canada has in competitive shooting may be lost. A perfect example was during the Commonwealth Games last year, an event that resulted in 43 medals for Canada. Twenty-two were shooting medals. That is over 50 per cent of Canada's total medals awarded. Under this bill, that number will decline dramatically.

Bill C-68 prohibits two-thirds of the pistols owned by law-abiding citizens. Many of these are collectors' items or are target pistols in current use in competitions such as the Olympics and Commonwealth Games. Some of these firearms may be grandfathered, but that is simply a delay.

Government Orders

(1735)

The majority of my constituents feel that Bill C-68 is an ineffective and intrusive piece of legislation. What Canadians, both rural and urban, want is crime control, plain and simple.

Until these types of problems which I, the rest of the Reform caucus, the people of my constituency and the people of Canada have raised are dealt with, we as a party and I as an individual cannot support this bill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Laurin (Joliette, BQ): Madam Speaker, I wanted to rise and speak on these amendments to Bill C-68, first because we supported the bill at first and second reading. We supported the principle, because we believe virtue is unassailable.

Surveys reveal that 79 per cent of Canadians and Quebecers agree with the adoption of measures making it more difficult to obtain firearms. We see this as a modern measure with an eye to the future. We want to take steps to limit violence, and this is why we approved the bill at first and second reading.

We also want to continue to support this bill. However, some amendments seem reasonable, and the government should permit some changes to the bill. In some cases, the changes sought are even more stringent than what was proposed. We want legislation that is more balanced and fairer for people.

It must be credible. The people governed by it must believe that it will improve things. If people do not believe in it, it becomes like other oppressive legislation, like burdensome taxes, which we already know about. When taxes become burdensome, what do people do? They start smuggling and black marketeering. They find a way to get around the law.

If people see this legislation, which is so important, as exploiting them, if some people, such as hunters, feel they have to pay a hidden tax, they, and there are more of them than any other group covered by the legislation, will probably be less likely to comply with it, because they find it oppressive.

We therefore proposed certain amendments, on decriminalization among other things, because someone who forgets to register a weapon is not a criminal. This person presents no danger to society. This person does not deserve to go to prison, as someone said before me, at a cost of \$50,000, \$60,000 or \$78,000 a year in a federal penitentiary. This is what it costs to keep a person in prison.

It seems to us that certain sentences are not consistent with their intent or with the offence committed. We understand that a punishable offence must be tied to a reasonable sanction. The proposals we are making, however, seem more reasonable than what the bill currently provides.

We do not think that, if these amendments are voted down tomorrow morning,—or tonight, because we will probably vote tonight—that we will vote against the whole bill. No, that will not be the case. We want to play fair. We therefore propose to the government that it accept some of the amendments that will make it easier for people to accept the bill without putting their peace and security at risk and that will enable it to co-operate, to accept some help from the opposition so that this legislation may be civilized, modern and fair to everyone.

(1740)

Other inexpensive measures could be implemented. Hunters have never been opposed to safety measures. Quebec already has a law requiring people to store firearms in a separate, locked cabinet, and to keep bullets in another room of the house. We proposed in amendment an inexpensive locking device that can be obtained for \$10 or \$15.

If the manufacturer were required to supply this device with the firearm, it would cost even less. The purchaser of a firearm would automatically have the locking device and citizens would be safer. This is a small, one time outlay, but the continuing costs of licences or registration certificates are much less acceptable to hunters. If, however, sportsmen in Quebec and in the rest of Canada were certain that, despite the cost to them, the bill would save lives, I think that they would throw their support behind it tomorrow morning. While there is still time, let us take the action that will make it easier for people to comply.

I hope that the government will see the validity of the amendments put forward by the official opposition and that it will vote in favour of these amendments this evening.

[*English*]

Mr. Cliff Breitreuz (Yellowhead, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is quite clear that the Liberal government has bitten off a lot more than it bargained for as it proceeds to ram Bill C-68 through the House.

The government contends its gun control bill will do wonders to prevent gun related crimes. The government contends that Canadians from coast to coast want Bill C-68. The government contends that the cost for tighter gun control is minimal. While the government contends, Canadians are learning the facts about gun control and the facts about gun related crimes.

Let us start with the government's premise that gun control will reduce violent crime. Statistics Canada reported in 1991 that a total of 753 homicides were committed. Two-thirds of the murderers had prior criminal records. Almost half, 46 per cent, of those homicides were committed during the perpetration of another criminal offence, and only 36 per cent of these homicides were committed with firearms, half of which were committed with handguns, which are already required to be registered. If we look further into the statistics we see that 71 per

Government Orders

cent of these homicides were committed by individuals who could not even legally obtain a firearm.

Despite the fact that Canadians have been required to register their handguns since 1934, gun related crime has remained relatively constant over the years. That is because those restrictions have not prevented criminals from getting handguns. Tougher gun control will merely drive up the street value of weapons, making gun smuggling more lucrative than ever.

Bill C-68 in all likelihood will actually increase the criminal element in our society instead of reducing it.

It is worth mentioning that New Zealand abandoned firearms registration in 1983 after the police there said that registration diverts police away from more important duties. In Australia more than 40 per cent of firearms have not been registered, even after decades of requirements that they do so. The justice minister would do well to look at the experiences with gun registration in other countries.

The Liberals also contend that Canadians from coast to coast want Bill C-68. The Canadian Medical Association, the Canadian Bar Association, and a host of provincial governments are not in favour of the very contentious provisions of Bill C-68.

(1745)

Polls show that as more people learn about Bill C-68 the support drops. That is why the government is ramming Bill C-68 through the House by invoking closure.

There is the cost of universal registration of guns. The Liberals will have Canadians believe that registration will only cost \$85 million. That is totally and completely erroneous and the justice minister knows it. The government bases its cost on the premise that there are only about 6.5 million firearms which would need to be registered at a cost of \$85 million. The facts speak for themselves. Why does it currently cost \$82 to register a handgun and why would it be only \$13 to register long guns?

In 1976 the Solicitor General of Canada estimated Canadians owned ten million firearms. Each year approximately 200,000 additional firearms are legally imported into Canada, suggesting there should now be at least 14 million guns.

A 1992 United Nations survey found that over seven million Canadians, 26 per cent, own firearms. At the same time a justice department study showed that each owner had an average of 2.7 firearms for a total of 19 million. In April 1995 the deputy commissioner of the RCMP stated that there could be as many as 25 million firearms in Canada, two and a half times the 1976 figure.

If high firearm numbers equate with high crime then the crime rate should be two and a half times higher than it was in 1976. In fact, justice department statistics show that the crime rate in all categories has been stable with only minor fluctuations over the same period. Despite the claim that gun control impacts directly on crime, neither Bill C-51, the Trudeau bill nor Campbell's Bill C-17 have had any observable affect on this trend. What is the justification for more gun laws?

The people of Yellowhead want a criminal justice system which works for them. They want tough laws to deal with young offenders and they want tough laws to deal with the criminal element. They want their property and their rights protected. They will not be punished for not registering their firearms. They want the bad guys punished.

Under this terribly misguided gun control bill those who inadvertently fail to register their firearm face a summary conviction offence which would result in, at the very least, a criminal record, and at the most it could end up in a five year jail sentence. If a person knowingly fails to register their firearm they could face a maximum of 10 years in jail. That is for law-abiding citizens, but the thugs who steal firearms face a maximum of two years in jail. What kind of country are the Liberals building for the future?

Section 99 of this ill conceived Bill C-68 puts at risk fundamental liberties handed down from the Magna Carta, going all the way back to 1215. Section 99 allows for warrantless searches to be conducted. Section 107 criminalizes non-cooperation with police. Sections 91 and 92 enforce harsh penalties for non-compliance with gun registration. All of these single out law-abiding citizens. So much for almost 800 years of judges and scholars; 800 years of jurisprudence. This firearm legislation has the potential to abrogate and trample Canadians' liberties and freedoms, not only for gun owners but non-owners as well.

I speak on behalf of the majority of my constituents when I say that the bill will do little to protect them from the criminal use of firearms. I have stacks of anti-gun control letters and scores of petitions signed by thousands of constituents who want the government to reconsider the legislation. I will quote from a couple of these. Mrs. Dorothy Harrison of Barrhead, Alberta writes: "The criminals will not register their guns and law-abiding citizens will be penalized. The present justice industry is a gold mine for lawyers and totally inadequate".

(1750)

Mr. John Rae of Whitecourt, Alberta writes: "As a concerned citizen of the Yellowhead riding, I am alarmed at the number of

Government Orders

flaws in the gun control legislation that will turn law-abiding citizens of this country into law breakers”.

This bill is more than just about firearms legislation. It is really about raw political power exercised by the state over its citizens.

If the government was really serious about reducing crime it would look at the causes of crime and the causes of urban violence. But to do so, the government would have to tackle some very holy sacred cows, sacred cows that this government along with previous governments helped to build.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, this will be the only opportunity I have to address Bill C-68 in the Chamber. I was not able to speak to the bill at second reading because there was time allocation then. Now there is time allocation at report stage and time allocation again at third reading. There has been time allocation at every stage of the bill. It is unfortunate that in the end most members will be lucky to have 10 minutes to speak to this bill.

It is my intention to oppose the bill at report stage and at final reading unless substantive amendments are made. I have mentioned before that in the last election I made certain commitments to represent Calgary West in the House of Commons and to do so on the basis of Reform principles and policies. All Reformers ran on those principles.

Among those principles and policies is a commitment to ascertain the views of our constituents and to vote those views where they can be ascertained. Specifically, on moral issues and on the issue of gun control, I have made a particular commitment to discover and to vote the wishes of my constituents. I have followed a process in attempting to do that.

Through my householder I surveyed the general opinions of my constituents on gun control prior to the tabling of Bill C-68. That survey covered three general areas that are included in the bill. It covered the area of registration of all weapons, tougher penalties on gun crime and also the area of further restrictions and prohibitions on various classes of weapons. All of those things were supported in principle by a large majority of those who responded to the survey. That was prior to the tabling of Bill C-68. Consistent with that I supported Bill C-68 at second reading despite my own misgivings about some elements of it.

At that time I sent out a second survey to my constituents giving a little more information on the bill and asking very specific questions about the contents of Bill C-68 as well as giving my own views on it. Those questions, which were much more complex, asked about elements of the bill. As well they asked for their overall feeling on the bill. It came back with a somewhat different result that I think reflects not only greater

knowledge of the bill but a change in public opinion that has occurred in Calgary in the past few weeks.

While some elements of the bill remain strongly supported by the population I should say that both my householder survey and the scientific survey I have conducted have indicated that there is still broad support for the general principles of the bill. However there are some very severe concerns about specific matters, about some of the penalties for non-registration, the confiscatory elements of the legislation and the cost concerns.

Some areas are supported and some are not. In the end the households that replied indicated about 60 per cent overall disapproval of the bill. I will reflect that in my vote.

(1755)

From my own personal standpoint I believe there are elements of gun control and specifically of this bill that could be helpful. The government has over reached in a number of areas of the bill and it is unfortunate that we cannot get a more modest package.

Let me make some comments from my perspective as inter-governmental affairs critic of the Reform caucus because there are several areas of the gun control package that deserve some comment. We know that the Department of Justice retains overall responsibility for gun control but the program is predominantly administered by provincial and territorial governments, through chief firearms officers and local police agencies.

In 1993, the auditor general concluded that delays in reaching financial agreement with the provinces and territories under the authority of section 111 of the Criminal Code could well weaken the gun control program. Financial agreements had been initiated in 1979 and extended several times. The agreements expired on March 31, 1993 and now new agreements have been signed only with the maritime provinces.

I have been told the funds that the provinces received are not adequate to cover their costs. For example, in the case of Saskatchewan, it has not received payment for its administration of existing gun control programs since April 1, 1993 and it appears that little progress toward resolving this conflict has been made.

The federal government's latest offer amounts to only about two-thirds of the actual cost incurred for these programs. Agreements with the provinces are also mandated under section 108 of the Criminal Code to ensure maximum co-ordination with regard to administration of gun control.

We know that several of the provincial and territorial governments, and I include here Alberta, Saskatchewan, the Yukon territory, the Northwest Territories and now Ontario are not supportive of the bill. Clearly a high degree of provincial support is needed if this program is to be implemented with any degree of success.

Government Orders

Many amendments have been suggested to the bill, including the creation of a new level of bureaucracy, gun control inspectors, for which no cost estimates are available and about which all provinces are very concerned.

It would seem to me that a government that wanted to have its provincial counterparts on side would slow down and consult with them more on the bill, on the amendments and on its implementation. Instead we have a situation where at least two provincial governments, Saskatchewan and Alberta, are considering constitutional challenges or perhaps even refusing to administer gun control programs. That is unfortunate but it is part of what I talked about earlier in my speech where we have a situation where in many areas the government has over reached itself. In some cases it raised some very legitimate areas of concern and in other areas raised concerns where concerns were not necessary.

My own feeling, having talked to many people in my riding about this, people who own guns and do not own guns, people who are for the bill and who are against the bill, gun owners who are for and gun owners who are against, non-gun owners who are for the bill and non-gun owners who are against it, is that there is a fairly broad consensus on the kind of gun and crime control that is needed.

Many citizens would be more than willing to register their weapons and co-operate with police if they felt that in so doing this would affirm the legitimacy and respect for their responsibly used property rights and for responsible gun ownership.

Unfortunately there has been a pattern of legislation in the past decade where registration has been followed by increased regulation, ultimately by restriction, prohibition and then by confiscation, often without compensation. This has led to fears that some may say are unfounded but which do have their grounding in people's experience with gun laws.

These are people who have tried consistently to obey the law. That is unfortunate. Government has reinforced that impression by concentrating on the issue of gun control. Most people see a role for gun control but we have a government that refused to move in most areas of criminal justice reform.

The Young Offenders Act remains unreformed. Sentencing remains not reformed satisfactorily. We have ongoing debates about capital punishment and other areas of the criminal justice system which the government has not touched at all.

All in all, the government's fairly one dimensional determined agenda in this area has probably cost it the support of many Canadians who might otherwise support this legislation.

(1800)

I will be the first to admit that it is very difficult to measure public opinion on this bill. Certainly when this bill was originally brought before the House my constituents were overwhelmingly in favour of its general direction. There has been a shift in public opinion. That shift has been away. The fact of the matter is that no clear consensus now exists for many of the measures in this bill. For that reason, I will be supporting a wide range of the amendments to the bill, and if those amendments are not adopted I will oppose the bill on the final vote.

[Translation]

Mr. Osvaldo Nunez (Bourassa, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to participate in today's debate at report stage of Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons. I already had an opportunity to speak on February 16, during the second reading debate on this bill. I then supported this bill and I—like my party, the Bloc Quebecois—continue to do so. I would, however, like the House to adopt the amendments proposed by my Bloc colleagues, the hon. members for Saint-Hubert and for Berthier—Montcalm.

These amendments would decriminalize the failure to register a firearm, impose a 20 year freeze on licensing and registration fees, ensure that all parties are treated fairly in this matter, and eliminate the minimum four year sentence for some criminal offences involving a firearm.

I generally agree with the institution of a national system to register all firearms and the inclusion of new offences in the Criminal Code, except for the amendments proposed by my Bloc colleagues. I think that we must staunch the illegal flow of firearms into and within Canada and tighten border controls. We all know that enormous quantities of firearms are imported into Canada every year.

The debate on Bill C-68 has been and still is too emotional, in my opinion. The discussions so far have been very heated. I have received hundreds of letters, protesting this bill I must admit, most of which are from English Canadians. I think that the campaign against this bill was mostly orchestrated by the firearms industry. I also believe that the Reform members gave in too easily to the lobbying of firearms manufacturers.

I consulted my constituents in the riding of Bourassa. An overwhelming majority recognizes the need to bring in stricter gun control laws. Over the past year, firearms were used in some crimes in my riding, which has swayed public opinion towards better protection of the public. Of course, stricter firearm controls cannot in themselves resolve the problem or all of the problems associated with criminal activity. We must admit however, that they will, however, be of great help.

Government Orders

The registration of all firearms is a positive move. Gunowners will also have to find ways of storing them safely. I support Motions Nos. 84 and 135 in particular, which were proposed by the hon. member for Saint-Hubert, and which would oblige the manufacturer, importer or exporter of firearms to equip them with a safety lock.

(1805)

I think that these amendments markedly improve this bill and would be relatively inexpensive to enforce. After consulting with the citizens of my riding, I can state that they support the main points in this bill. I think that this piece of legislation is a step in the right direction, despite its omissions and shortcomings.

The number of deaths caused by firearms is unfortunately still too high. In Quebec alone, between 400 and 450 deaths are caused by firearms per year. Firearms are the weapons used in most homicides and in three out of four suicides in Quebec, which total approximately 300 per year.

Therefore, we must combat the criminal use of firearms more effectively. According to the polls, Quebec shows the strongest support for gun control. This is particularly true within the labour movement where I come from. Quebec's three labour congresses support the broad principle of this bill, as do the municipalities, the Quebec Bar Association and public health experts.

However, I have serious reservations about several provisions in Bill C-68, especially those dealing with procedures and registration costs. The government claims it will cost \$85 million, spread over seven years, to set up this system. However, the Government of Quebec has already indicated that in Quebec alone, it will cost more than \$300 million.

Why does the Minister of Justice refuse to give us the figures for the real cost of registration? The minister said that on average, a woman dies of gunshot wounds every six days in this country. Guns are used in most domestic murders.

The government has a right and a duty to protect citizens against the unlawful use of firearms. Public safety must be better protected. I will therefore vote in favour of the amendments presented by my colleagues in the Bloc Québécois.

[English]

Mr. Ray Speaker (Lethbridge, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I want to make a few remarks with regard to Bill C-68 and the amendments put forward by my colleagues.

On time allocation, we must understand in this assembly that there are many Canadians interested in this subject, and to set a time limit on the amount of debate when we have such an

important bill before us is not the act of a responsible government.

Look at the number of amendments that have been placed before this Parliament. There are 267 different motions before us right now. What does that say about the bill? In a very clear way, this to me says that the bill is inadequate. It says that the bill does not meet the needs of Canadians. From those 267 amendments that are before us, there are all kinds of ideas that are expressed by Canadians as to ways and means by which the bill could be adjusted to better meet the objectives, whatever they are.

However, the government has not listened to the 267 motions that are here. We have had very little debate today by the Liberals. They have made up their minds. They are determined to ram this thing through and put closure on it. Tomorrow we will have third reading. The bill will then go on to the Senate, and supposedly the government has done its job. It has not. That is one of the things I have concern about.

(1810)

The second thing is who really asked for this legislation? What were Canadians asking for? They were asking during the last campaign for legislation that would be tougher on the criminals. That was their major objective.

If we listen to all the debate that is going on in this House, what are we talking about? We are talking about the registration of guns, which is a major concern supposedly, but it is not the first priority. It has been the focus of the discussion. We have set aside a major, thorough, knowledgeable, good discussion on the first priority of Canadians, and that is legislation and laws in the country and actions of the court that will punish the criminal and protect the responsible citizens of this country.

We have mixed up the priorities. We have before us poor legislation, which is not doing the job. We have a government that is focused on registration, which is unacceptable to the Canadian public and is not meeting the needs.

There are three areas I will concentrate on. First, we have to look at the question, which has been raised in the House a number of times, of whether it will prevent crime. Will this legislation prevent any harmful act occurring to another citizen? Second, what about the cost of this legislation? Will this registration be worth the cost to the Canadian taxpayer? Whether they pay it because of their licence fee, whether they have to pay money for registering their gun, it is still a tax. It is still a cost to the Canadian taxpayer. Is that cost going to be worth while and bring about the benefits we want? Third, what about the freedom of responsible individuals in Canada? Does this legislation infringe on their rights and their freedoms to act as responsible citizens? I would like to address those three items

Government Orders

with regard to this legislation and also relative to the amendments that are before us today.

First, will registration of long guns really fight crime and prevent crime? The answer is clearly no. That has been reinforced by the minister, not only in this House. It has been reinforced by the Minister of Justice making comments on radio, television, and through the written media that he can produce no evidence that registration will prevent crime and stop any harmful act in the streets of Canada, no evidence at all. So why are we doing it? There has not been any justification.

Second, has registration in the past of handguns prevented crime from happening in the streets? Has it controlled the use of these weapons in an offence? We had very strict comprehensive gun control legislation brought into this assembly in 1977 and again in 1991. We have found that legislation has had no effect, that the rate of crime has gone up. It has had no impact on the incidence of homicides, on suicides, on violent crime or crimes committed with firearms. It has had no effect at all.

Today we are trying to put another layer of legislation in that requires registration and licensing of Canadians who have guns, and no one has answered that basic question: will it help to fight crime and to reduce the amount of crime or the harm that occurs to individuals? Nobody can answer that. I am sure at the moment there is no answer.

We have been convinced as the Reform Party that registration is not the answer to crime control at all. I know many Canadians tell us that in a very clear way.

(1815)

I wish to cover a second point with regard to cost. The conclusion is very clear. The registration of guns will be a huge waste of taxpayers' money. Whether taxpayers pay \$85 million directly, whether taxpayers have to pay a licensing fee or a registration fee for one gun or a number of guns, it will be a huge cost to Canadians.

Estimates are \$500 million. Others estimate it to be even more. It will be an unnecessary huge cost at a point in time when Canadians have a limited amount of money to spend on the extra things government would demand of them. It seems to be a very useless exercise to spend money on something that does not have results.

One of the authorities of the country who has been mentioned a number of times in this assembly, the auditor general, has said very clearly that before we pass new legislation we should look at past legislation to see whether it has met its objectives and has been cost effective in any way.

I have already cited the 1977 legislation and the 1991 legislation passed by the House. From all estimates or judgments the expenditure of money out of the public purse to put that legislation in place has not brought about the results Canadians

want. It has not lowered the rate of crime or reduced it or stopped the number of killings that have been going on. It has done nothing.

Again Canadians are being asked to spend millions and millions of dollars, over half a billion dollars most likely when the bill is tallied, to try to register them and then supposedly reduce the amount of crime. It has not happened in the past and it will not happen in the future.

I asked my constituents, like everybody else has, what they thought of registering guns. Thirty-one per cent said that stiffer gun control would be effective, in other words registration, in reducing crime or crime related activities. Sixty-nine per cent said that it would not. Thirty-six per cent agreed with registration.

That was a reflection of southern Alberta attitude that was very accurate. When I walked around my constituency and went door to door, business to business, I found that 99 per cent of my constituents—and I talked to at least 200 or 300 of them on the street—came to me on a volunteer basis to say clearly that registration was not the way to go and that I should vote against it in Parliament.

With the government invoking closure, a government that has not allowed us to discuss it fully, how else can we vote?

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to make a couple of brief comments that I think are relevant to the debate as many Canadians are watching the deliberations of the House on Bill C-68.

The previous speaker mentioned that some 267 amendments would be considered at report stage. I took out the Order Paper and Notice Paper for today to find out the exact source of all the amendments. I found, even when reviewing the last 60, that some 45 of them were put before the House at report stage by two members of the Reform Party who were also members of the justice committee that dealt with the bill.

Motions at report stage are admissible if the committee has not dealt with the matter. I think there is another condition. However it raises an interesting question.

(1820)

The previous speaker tended to indicate that all these items had to be raised. If many of the amendments that have been raised before the House at report stage are still to be addressed by the House, it begs the question why members of the committee who were there to discuss the bill did not raise these questions and motions at the justice committee. Why are they now tying up the time of the House?

As I stated earlier, if all 267 motions were to be debated in the House with all the time members would want, we would be here until next Christmas. Frankly I think Canadians are saying that we have consulted more than enough on the gun control legislation.

Government Orders

The member also referred to the government ramming legislation through. It has been almost a year since the discussion documents were tabled by the justice minister. He has travelled from coast to coast. He has talked to Canadians about the issues. As a result of the committee work the justice minister has brought forward many extremely important amendments that respond to the concerns of Canadians. One example would be with regard to first time offenders and the non-registration of weapons. Those were positive and constructive changes with regard to the messages the justice minister heard.

Throughout the day I have seen the justice minister in the House and in the lobby. He has followed the debate very closely. He has listened to all hon. members whether it was in committee or in the House. He has certainly listened to Canadians.

I had an opportunity to be with the minister in Toronto. We went to Regent Park, a subsidized housing development, where there were ordinary people from a number of walks of life, gun owners and non-gun owners alike, who all had an opportunity to speak. It was a very interesting meeting. We heard from the people in that community that it was commonplace for them to hear a gunshot at night when their children were playing in the streets. They were very scared and concerned about what was happening to safety in our communities.

Considering the priorities of Canadians, community safety is certainly an important issue. One issue I keep hearing about from members of the Reform Party is the issue of registration. They proposed initially that registration and addressing the crime element should be separated, but the minister has explained clearly that there is an important and integral relationship between registration and crime control. One example concerns the importation of firearms.

Recently in Toronto there was a case where a gun dealer legally imported firearms but subsequently marketed them on the black market. Registration under the legislation, for instance, would require that on importation the weapons would be registered by the importer. There would be a clear trail of the weapons from the time they enter the country.

Another aspect concerns the importance of the relationship between Canada and the United States. Many members have suggested that we have to go after the criminals and those who are smuggling in firearms from the United States. Members know well that some 1,400 guns are reported lost, missing or stolen each year by Canadians. We can imagine how many weapons are actually lost, missing or stolen. Clearly those weapons are in the hands of the criminal element.

Therefore it is important to ensure that all Canadians who have firearms and register them are well aware of their responsibilities. In talking with gun clubs and other large gun owners I

have found that the educational aspect of the consultative process has been extremely valuable to the Canadian public. Only about 10 per cent of Canadians actually own firearms. The other 90 per cent are probably not very familiar with the rules regarding firearms.

(1825)

The comfort level of Canadians at large has been improved substantially because of education, knowing that there is licensing, knowing that there are courses, knowing that there are restrictions on transportation and ammunition sales, and knowing that registration will ensure gun owners have an opportunity to show they support law, order and safety in communities.

The whole issue of crime control comes down to whether we wait until we have a problem in Canada with regard to safety and crime in our communities or whether we respond proactively. If we took into account that for every one incident of a firearms related crime in Canada there are 100 incidents in the United States, and if we took into account the population differential of ten to one, for every incident in Canada there are ten in the U.S. on a per capita basis.

Could we imagine what the reaction of the Canadian public would be if the crime rate due to guns in Canada were to double? That would mean there would be only one incident for every five in the U.S. I dare say that most certainly the Canadian public would be extremely upset about the decay within society.

We have something in Canada of which we are very proud and must protect, that is safety in our communities. As we all know, the Prime Minister has boasted about safety in Canada. We can safely walk in our parks. As a result of initiatives such as this one we will ensure that Canada remains a safe country in which to live and a safe country for our children.

I do not think the honest hunter, gun collector or target shooter will be impacted in any material way by the legislation. The cost is not an issue. Ten dollars for 10 guns for five years is not an issue.

People in my own riding have come to see me and I have asked them how it would affect them. After we got over the cost issue it got down to the issue of confiscation. There are questions about confiscation. My constituents continue to raise the spectre that the government wants to register guns because it wants to take their guns away.

The justice minister has made it very clear that confiscation is absolutely not an objective of the government. Canada has a very vibrant economy in hunting, target shooting and collecting that will remain. When it gets down to paramilitary weapons, automatic weapons and guns that have absolutely no purpose except to hurt people, they are the ones Canadians say should be off the streets and out of the hands of those most likely to cause harm to our community.

Business of the House

It is clear the amendments brought forward by the committee are constructive. The vast majority of the 267 amendments presented by the Reform Party at report stage are nothing more than a disruption of the House of Commons.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, in the words of my colleague, I should like to straighten out the previous speaker from the Liberal Party on a couple of issues.

He suggested that we were tying up the time of the House on the bill. He more or less said that it was terrible for us to do so and that it was not all that important. In my community and in communities across the country it is important to people. If the hon. member wants to look back at the number of petitions presented in *Hansard*, he would see that the numbers of names on them are extensive. If he says it is not important he is missing the boat.

He also said that we have been debating the issue for over a year. It is my understanding that the bill was introduced on February 14. It must be another short year for the Liberals.

There were amendments to the gun laws in 1977 and 1991. Many people ignored those changes. I have evidence from several studies which indicate that is exactly what will happen next. As much as these folks are insisting on putting these things in, a lot of people are saying it is hogwash and will not work.

(1830)

There is something about the costs they say are small but I wonder about the costs of all the policing, of this whole exercise, of making sure all the law-abiding citizens remain law-abiding citizens or perhaps trying to find them as being criminals.

The cost of their time spent enforcing gun laws as opposed to time looking at the more severe problems of drugs and so on is extra ordinary cost. For a member of the other party to put that swing on it is absurd.

I recently competed in a politically correct competition with the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club in my riding. If I could not use a prop—

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am very sorry to interrupt the member. Pursuant to Standing Order 45(6), the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the motion of Mr. Gray under government business No. 25.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The House resumed from June 9 consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Call in the members.

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

(Division No. 251)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Collins
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Dhaliwal	Dingwall
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jacob	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Landry	Langlois
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Lebel
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunez
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Sheridan	Skoke
Speller	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)

*Government Orders***GOVERNMENT ORDERS***[English]***FIREARMS ACT**

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-68, an act respecting firearms and other weapons, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 4.

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West, Ref.): Madam Speaker, before the vote I talked about the closure issue. Closure was forced upon the democratic principles of the House by the Liberal government before debate really took place on the Bill C-68 gun issue. Although the justice committee talked about the gun control legislation, there is more to it than that. The public has a right to hear from all members, all of its representatives from across the country on this issue. I do not think what the Liberals have done is in the least bit democratic. Back in my riding people are asking why such an imposition has occurred on this particular bill.

In fact, the Reform Party introduced 138 amendments to Bill C-68. I would like to ask the government, with closure limiting debate to six hours at report stage and another six hours at third reading, how on earth is it possible to debate 138 amendments? It surely does not allow the members of the Reform Party to accurately describe what is wrong with Bill C-68. This is forcing an anti-democratic bill through the House and it is wrong.

That is in part what is wrong with a majority government. This government has not taken the hint from the last government that was in majority in this House of Commons. It got arrogant. It got overconfident. In the early stages, those are the signs we are seeing from this Liberal government. That is unfortunate, but fortunate for the rest of the land because we only have about two years to put up with this nonsense.

(1900)

There are two other bills of particular note going through here on the basis of closure, and they are Bill C-41 and Bill C-85, the criminal justice system and MPs' pensions. Again, this government invoked closure on perhaps the most important legislation they could dream up since Parliament opened. They forced closure on it. It is absolutely unbelievable.

I can tell members that there are many people across this land who do not understand why, including myself. They make jokes about it here as I talk. We will see where the jokes go two years from now when we hit the election.

Before the votes started I was about to talk a little about the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club, one of many rod and gun clubs in

Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Szabo
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Ur
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—174

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Duncan
Forsyth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson

Ablonczy
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
de Jong
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Taylor
White (Fraser Valley West)—48

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringnette—Maltais
Walker
Young

(1855)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I declare the motion carried.

Government Orders

this country. I had the privilege of participating in a shoot in that club about three weeks ago. I won one of the competitions. It was on a politically correct gun competition with pistols and politically incorrect guns. I had never really shot these pistols before, although I am a gun owner myself; I have three rifles. What surprised me in particular about this competition was the level of pride and satisfaction these members had. There was an extreme level of competence these people had.

One of the members who spoke here previously from the Liberal Party said that these people do not mind Bill C-68. Every person at the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club was extremely upset at it.

I do not understand how a government that invokes closure on this bill, says it is not costly, and whose members say that people agree with what they are doing could be so wrong. I guess what we are going to see is a lot of this Liberal arrogance for the next two years. It is going to catch them and it is going to catch them hard.

These people at the Ridgedale Rod and Gun Club, I have admiration for people who have collections of any sort. There were several people there. One fellow had one of the better collections of Enfield rifles in Canada. He was asking: "Why are they doing this? What is this for? Come and look at my collection. I will show you what safety is all about". I did not get to see the collection, but as far as safety goes with these folks, they are probably number one in the country. They know what gun safety is all about.

I do not understand what the direction is here. I thought we were after crime and criminals. These people are not criminals. These are not crime makers unless a government chooses to head them in that direction by way of calling them criminals by virtue of non-compliance with Bill C-68.

An hon. member: It is not going to happen.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): I hear over here that it is not going to happen. If not, why does the government not allow us to debate this issue instead of calling closure on it? The government is saying it can read the Canadian people so well, but it is absolutely wrong. It is wrong on Bill C-68, on Bill C-41, and on those preposterous MP pensions on Bill C-85, which it is insisting on bringing in.

The Ontario Handgun Association I believe wrote all MPs letters. I will give members information it provided to us.

(1905)

Recent survey data indicate that a minimum of one-third of Canadian gun owners will refuse to comply with the proposal by the Minister of Justice to register all firearms. In the 1995 gun control survey organized by Professor Gary Mauser of Simon

Fraser University, Canadian firearm owners were asked the following question: "If the government's proposal to register all firearms becomes law, do you plan on registering all, some or none of your firearms?" The response to this question is in the final analysis nearly one-third of all Canadian firearm owners candidly admitted to a stranger over the telephone that they would not register their firearms.

What is wrong with a government that puts through closure on such an important issue when Canadians will tell it to stick it in its ear?

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak to on Bill C-68 under protest to the closure limiting the members in this House to a six-hour debate on report stage.

The constituents in Mission—Coquitlam want crime control, not gun control. We have gun registration now and we have laws now that would help control crime in our country. However, the courts do not enforce many of our laws and often our police are frustrated at the lack of substance in sentencing.

Bill C-68 as it now stands will not prevent abuse with a firearm. It will, however, punish many good, law-abiding Canadians who are gun collectors, hunters, and gun club members. To force a national registration on these law-abiding citizens I believe is a waste of time and money and a waste of the necessary manpower we will need to put this registration into permanent record.

The justice minister tells us that there are pretty scary statistics out there dealing with the use of guns. Every six days a woman is murdered by a gun. Over 1,000 suicides per year are the result of gun usage. After reciting these statistics, we are also told that these are the reasons we need gun control. We are never told two things: first, how will the registration of rifles and shotguns reduce these numbers; second, what percentage of these acts takes place with guns that would be required to be registered under this legislation?

The Reform Party's position is crystal clear on law and order. The party stands for tougher laws to deal with criminals and more protection for potential victims of crime. The party has stated on many occasions that Canadian laws need to be tougher on criminals.

The gun registration system proposed by Bill C-68 will do nothing to prevent the use of handguns and rifles in the commission of crimes.

When analysing the part of the bill dealing with gun registration one has to go back to first principles of what problem this legislation is trying to address. The problem is a proliferation of firearms, both handguns and rifles, and their use in criminal activities. This being the problem, it is difficult to see how a system of national gun registration would be of any benefit.

Government Orders

All can appreciate that criminals are not going to register illegal weapons or weapons acquired illegally. The registration of a weapon will not stop its use in a domestic quarrel. Recently here in Ottawa we had the tragedy of the shooting of a young boy and a young girl. Registration of that firearm would not have prevented that tragedy.

Some of the problems can be addressed through action taken at the United States border, allowing customs officials to stop the importation of guns, and stiffer penalties for those who commit crimes with guns. The bill addresses both of these issues, although not in sufficient depth to suit the Reform caucus. Customs officials should be empowered to prohibit the importation of firearms, and any crime committed with a gun should result in an increased sentence, which is mandatory and cannot be plea bargained away.

I also am in support of those parts of the bill that would attack the problem of gun smuggling in Canada. It is vitally important that those who patrol our borders be given real powers to deal with those who would import guns illegally into Canada. Again, I think this is something the justice committee should look at in detail. Should the people who patrol our borders be given powers to be more than revenue collectors? Should the provincial police or RCMP in particular provinces be required to maintain a presence at the borders? A true police presence at our borders would, to my way of thinking, reduce smuggling. I am not saying we should arm our customs agents, but they should be backed up with trained police.

I am also concerned because the registration system will be computerized. We all know that sophisticated criminals can break into virtually any computer system constructed, especially with the availability of Internet and World Wide Web. There is the distinct possibility that criminals will be able to break into the computer code and the registration system to determine where the guns are. It will be like shopping at home for criminals. It will mean that those who register guns will not be safe and will be under the constant threat of being broken into by criminals to steal their guns. Gun registration will not save lives, but tougher laws to deal with criminals will.

(1910)

To reiterate, here are ten points I feel we have to address regarding the registration system.

The registration section does not stand up to a cost-benefit analysis. That is, the lowest cost estimate is now at \$85 million, without any indication from the government as to its beneficial effects on crime. Legislation should not be passed when the government cannot tell taxpayers how much it will cost to implement.

The analysis of the cost and effectiveness of gun control legislation already in place has not been completed, as requested by the auditor general in 1993.

It is argued we must have registration because the chiefs of police support it. The chiefs also support capital punishment and repealing the section of the Criminal Code that grants murderers the opportunity for early parole. The Liberals do not support these positions. Either the chiefs are right or wrong. Liberals cannot cherry pick to suit their purposes.

Proposed clause 112 of the bill states that regulations made pursuant to the bill will not have to come before Parliament for scrutiny. This is objectionable. What is the government trying to hide?

Proposed clause 117 allows police to search your car, house, et cetera, without a warrant if they believe you have a weapon that was used in a crime. However, if during the search they find an unregistered gun, it may be seized.

With reference to the arguments raised regarding the number of suicides in Canada and domestic violence, this bill does nothing to address the root causes of either of those problems. These are social problems, which will not be resolved through a registration procedure.

In the polling results showing public support recited by advocates of this bill the questions regarding support for gun control usually link it with a question: "Are you in favour of legislation to reduce crime?" That also affects the response one gets to that question.

The car licensing analogy is used to justify registration: if we register cars then we can register guns. If the analogy is to be complete then legislation should be changed to require safe storage of cars, and any accidents caused by stolen cars should be the responsibility of the owner. Alternatively, has vehicle registration done anything to prevent drunk driving or the prevention of accidents?

There has been no answer from the government to those who argue that a computer registry of guns could be accessed by a computer hacker. This would give potential thieves the location of virtually every gun in Canada.

Handguns have been subject to registration since 1934. There is no evidence and it is the government's argument that this has had no effect on reducing the criminal use of handguns.

The justice minister knows very well that a registration system will not reduce the number of murders or suicides by firearms one bit. He should know that Canada is a large and diverse country, which in many ways starts at the borders of metropolitan Toronto. This country is not metropolitan Toronto.

The justice minister should read the legislation that is presently in place in relation to gun control. He will find the present laws in Canada are among the toughest in the world with respect

Government Orders

to firearms. Therefore I urge members opposite, members from outside of metropolitan Toronto, to look at Canada and see it for what it is: a vast country where hunting and outdoor activities are a way of life to some and a recreation to others.

The registration system proposed in this bill will not accomplish the goals set forth. Therefore, when it comes time to vote for the bill, vote it down until the necessary amendments are a part of the bill.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Madam Speaker, I will talk for a minute about why I joined the Reform Party. Obviously my colleagues and I supported other political parties in the past. What caused us to join the Reform Party?

We recognized a long time ago that we needed to change the system. I do not think Prime Minister Trudeau ever made a more accurate and truthful statement than when he said that MPs are nobodies. I think no MPs in this House should know that and feel that more than the backbench MPs on the opposite bench. They are nobodies. When they stand up to speak out and vote against the government on a bill, they are chastised, reprimanded and punished for representing their constituents. That is what we are here for; we are here to change the system.

(1915)

The Conservatives under Prime Minister Mulroney wanted to get the GST through this House. What did they do? They cracked the whip and got their backbench MPs, even though their constituents solidly told them they did not support the GST, to vote in favour of it. Where are the Conservatives now? I do not see them around this House. That is where these people are going to be after the next election as a result of the kind of activities they have engaged in over the last few days. There is no change in sight.

I would like at this juncture to take a minute and commend those Liberal MPs who had the courage, the fortitude and the tenacity to stand up and vote against this bill even though they knew they were going to be punished for doing so. They were being true to their constituents. They were representing their constituents which is what they were elected to do. In the face of adversity they were prepared to do it and I commend them for it. We may have differing views and different philosophies but by and large I can admire people who are prepared to stand up for their constituents.

Reformers will be in every Liberal riding at the next election. We will remind the constituents how the Liberals treated parliamentary democracy in this session, what they did to ram through these government bills and how they abused their power and position.

It has been said that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. This goes back to the heart of why we need to change the system. We need to take some of the power away from cabinet and away from the Prime Minister and distribute it

among the MPs. We would then have the opportunity to see real democracy in action and not the executive kind of authoritarian democracy we have had in Canada, these democratic dictatorships we have had over the last 30 or 40 years.

In speaking to the bill itself, it is an established rule that justice should not only be done but should be seen to have been done. In other words the law must not only be just but it must be seen to be just. Can this be said about Bill C-68 and the agenda behind it? I do not think so.

Gun control is a controversial subject. It is clear that real and serious disagreements exist in Canada over it. I am aware and I acknowledge that the opinion polls show a majority of Canadians tentatively support the government's position at the present time. I would caution my colleagues opposite that the more and more people find out about it, the less supportive they are.

I also caution that in the words of Thomas Jefferson, great initiatives should not rest on slender majorities. If a majority supports something but does not feel very strongly about it and a minority opposes it very strongly, it undermines the rule of law to ram it through.

There is something else that undermines the rule of law even more directly and that is when governments say one thing and do another. It erodes the very foundation of our society if governments misrepresent. That is why I want to ask my colleagues opposite to do a little soul searching on this bill. I want them to look at themselves in the mirror and ask this question: Is this legislation a prelude to confiscating citizens' firearms entirely? I do not expect them to concede that in this House.

Let me point out a couple of quotations that worry me. First, when this whole business began the Minister of Justice said openly that in his view only agents of the state, police and soldiers, should have weapons. He has since stopped saying it, but has he stopped believing it? His assistant, Darryl Davies, recently said that hunting is a barbaric and murderous activity and should be banned in Canada. He also said nobody in a civilized country needs a gun. This is a high level official working in the minister's office.

(1920)

The minister has not to my knowledge repudiated either of these remarks. Can we believe the assurances that hunters and hunting are not targeted by this bill with these kinds of statements made by such senior people in the minister's office?

Other prominent gun control advocates including former Metropolitan Toronto Police Services Board chair Susan Eng have made it quite clear: "Gun registration will start the process of stigmatizing gun use, just like drinking and driving. In their hearts, gun owners know this and this is what makes them so mad". We know what Ms. Eng is up to here and we know what

Government Orders

the real agenda is behind the legislation when we hear these kinds of statements.

Manitoba Liberal leader Lynda Haverstock said in May 1994: "I think what we should be doing is ensuring there is less and less and less availability to having guns", which she justified on the grounds that "sometimes our overall responsibilities have to override individual rights".

I know my colleagues opposite and my colleagues on this side of the Chamber have very serious differences about the bill as it now stands. The sweeping powers it gives the police worry us. The security of the universal system of registration worries us. The severe penalties for infringing this law in a society where murderers are free to go out on the street a short time after they are convicted strike us as unbalanced. The implied assault on the way of life of millions of Canadians troubles us.

What worries me most at this moment is that this entire bill is a massive fraud. I am concerned that all the pious assurances that confiscation is not contemplated are just a smokescreen behind which the legislation permitting confiscation can be put in place. Then the very people who say no private citizen should own guns will act on that belief.

Perhaps my colleagues opposite have not given this much thought. Perhaps they have accepted the smooth assurances of the Minister of Justice. I hope they will take the time to consider before voting on this whether the real agenda is outright confiscation at some time in the future. If it is, then I challenge them to either put it on the table openly right now and let us debate it, or put it aside and put the legislation aside that will make it possible.

This bill is bad enough as it is. What we really wonder is why the Minister of Justice is so determined to pass it when it is well established that there is no correlation between rates of violence and gun crime and laws respecting firearms ownership.

What is the real purpose of the bill? If it is a prelude to confiscation then it is extremely dangerous to the credibility of our government and to the notion of the rule of law in Canada if the government does not come forward and is clean with people right now telling them that is what is on its mind.

I hope my colleagues opposite will not vote to pass such a bill. I can assure them if they do, we will be there at the next election to remind their constituents how they voted today on closure, how they voted last Thursday morning on closure and how they voted on this very, very important piece of legislation, Bill C-68.

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River, Ref.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to address the House on Bill C-68 this evening. I say it is a pleasure because I am one of only

three Reform MPs who has had the opportunity to address the House on this very important piece of legislation three times in the past. The first time was at second reading, the second time was on the Reform amendment to split the bill which was also at second reading before the government enacted time allocation and the third time is tonight.

As has already been said by many of my colleagues, we find it absolutely deplorable that on such a crucial piece of legislation which has elicited such high emotions across the land, we find the government has yet again enacted time allocation at report stage and at third reading.

(1925)

The government limited the debate at second reading and forced the bill to the committee. It gave assurances that all of the pertinent facts, data and arguments could be brought forward at committee. Today in arguments put forward by Liberal members we were questioned why we were bringing forward these amendments at report stage. We were asked why we wanted, in their words, to tie up the House debating this legislation when we could have done it at committee stage. Those of us who participated at committee stage know that the exact opposite happened. There simply was not time to adequately address all of the concerns.

The Liberals limited the number of witnesses who could appear before the committee. Today I heard that while all MPs had the opportunity to appear before the committee they were limited to five minutes to make their points. As anyone who has ever made a public address knows, five minutes goes very quickly, especially when one is trying to make points on as many issues as are encompassed by this comprehensive piece of legislation known as Bill C-68.

Bill C-68 is a very detailed, lengthy and intricate piece of legislation with some 132 clauses in the firearms act and amendments to another 100 sections in part III of the Criminal Code. For the government to suggest we can get through that and bring forward all the pertinent points by concerned constituents and concerned Canadians across this land in a few hours of debate is absolutely ludicrous.

I find it deplorable that the government would enact time allocation and ram this through the House. That is exactly what is happening tonight. It is exactly what will be happening in a day or two when we are limited to six hours of debate at third reading as well.

I would like to speak about our amendment at second reading stage to split the bill. The Reform Party feels very strongly that we are dealing with two completely separate issues in Bill C-68. One issue is further regulation and restrictions on law-abiding firearms owners. The second issue is what to do and how to get

Government Orders

tough with criminals who misuse firearms and actually use them as weapons.

It is interesting to note that one of the Liberal members earlier today suggested an amendment to actually change the name of the act to “an act respecting firearms and other related matters” rather than “an act respecting firearms and other weapons” as it is presently named. I would certainly support that amendment.

As I have travelled throughout my riding, a lot of people have expressed concern that people do not differentiate between a firearm and a weapon. It is an important distinction to law-abiding firearm owners that a firearm is only a weapon at such time as it is used in the commission of a criminal offence. Prior to that it is simply viewed to many people as a tool, or something used in a hobby if they are a shooter. It is not considered by them to be a weapon. It is merely private property. It is an important distinction.

Some of my colleagues have talked about the fact that what we are discussing here is the fourth group of amendments. It is interesting to note that we are being asked to debate in a few short hours some 267 amendments to this legislation. How can we do that justice? How can we adequately debate the pros and cons of those individual amendments? We simply cannot. For the purpose of debate some of them have been grouped. Group No. 4, for example, which we are currently debating has 33 individual motions. How can we do them justice and adequately discuss them in that short time frame?

I am very concerned with the erosion of democracy. The Reform Party feels very strongly that the primary purpose of members of Parliament, which I have spoken about before in the House, is to properly and effectively represent the wishes, concerns and views of the majority of their constituents where that view can be ascertained.

(1930)

How can I do that? I have made that point as well. How can I do that on this piece of legislation when it deals with two distinctly separate issues?

The constituents of Prince George—Peace River have made it very obvious to me that they want to get tough with criminals. They want to bring in tougher sanctions on the criminal elements in the country. Therefore I support the part of the legislation that deals with the amendments to part III of the Criminal Code.

At the same time my constituents are telling me that they want to have no part of registration. Why do they not want to have registration? We hear ludicrous arguments that we register our dogs and our cars so why should we not register our firearms?

They are concerned for three main reasons. One is the cost and we have talked about that before. They are concerned about the

paperwork time and the cost to police forces that are already stretched to the limit. Hundreds and thousands of useless hours will be spent compiling the information.

We pointed out in committee as well as in the House that the mailing system proposal of the justice minister will not work. How can a firearm be identified if it is not actually physically seen and inspected? It is interesting to note that Quebec has indicated that it wants \$300 million if the government goes ahead to administer the registration program in that province. Yet the justice minister is still clinging to his \$85 million total cost, which is obviously far from accurate.

Constituents are concerned and law-abiding gun owners are concerned about the cost recovery that has been bandied about from the other side. What will that mean in the future? What will the costs of paying an annual ownership fee amount to if they want cost recovery?

The second issue in addition to cost is the security of the list that some of my colleagues have addressed. I spoke about it earlier in the House. Will this not provide a shopping list for criminals? We all know that hackers break into computer systems practically on a daily basis across the nation and around the world. If they can break into IBM and can break into the Pentagon, what makes the justice minister think they will not be able to break into this computer system to get a hold of the list? It will provide criminals with a list of where the firearms are and what types of firearms they are so that they can steal the firearms they want to use. It will also by omission provide them with a list of what homes in which communities do not have firearms and therefore the home owners are defenceless.

The third issue on registration is future confiscation with which some of my colleagues have dealt. Above all is the statement that it will not be effective. New Zealand, Australia and other countries have tried it. I note that draconian gun controls brought into effect in the United Kingdom in 1988 were followed by dramatic increases in crimes involving firearms. They were not effective. It has been proven around the world that registration and stiffer gun controls are not effective.

I will make a point, which my constituents make to me on almost a daily basis, to the Liberals opposite because they will know about it pretty soon. There is another election before registration becomes mandatory and the voters will be there to remind them about this legislation.

Mr. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I want to take but a few minutes to set a few facts straight in the House and possibly to assist or enlighten some of my colleagues across the way. While we will try to enlighten the people across the way, I recognize it may be a major challenge. Nevertheless let us spare no effort in the noble cause of enlightening the people across the way who say that it is undemocratic to propose this bill.

Government Orders

(1935)

The bill is supported by the vast majority of Canadians in every province. Furthermore the bill is proposed by a government elected under a program including the bill among others.

According to the opposition we have the following proposition: "The majority of people want it. The majority of Parliament want it. The majority of people have asked the majority of Parliament to enact it but it does not matter. It is undemocratic for us to be voting for that which the people want". However, in the eyes of the Reform Party, it is far more democratic to agree with the leader of the Reform Party because he said so.

There is something wrong with that way of thinking by the people across the way. Then members of the Reform Party say that they have not had enough time to debate the bill and that the use of time allocation is wrong.

I invite colleagues across the way to pay attention because we will be asking questions later. This is the way it works. A few weeks ago we had in the House a bill regarding no less an issue than the rail strike in Canada. At that time two of the three parties in the House proposed time allocation, and the Reform Party was one of the two parties. If the use of time allocation is not proper, why was it proper on an issue the Reform Party liked as opposed to one they disliked?

Mr. Abbott: It was a national crisis.

Mr. Boudria: I hear a bit of heckling from across the way. I do not think I am being particularly provocative on the issue. Nevertheless let me submit this to you, being far more objective than I am and seeing it through the neutral eyes of Madam Speaker, that they say they have only had a few short hours of debate. The bill has been debated longer in the House and in committees than the throne speech, budget speech and all the budget bills put together. All that debate combined is not as long as debate on the bill dealing with guns, and for them it is still not long enough.

The last member of the Reform Party who spoke said: "I need much more time to speak on these profound amendments". Most of the so-called profound amendments would delete all the clauses in the bill. How much time does one need for that kind of nonsense?

The Reform Party argues it is more democratic to allow it in the minority more time to remove the clauses supported by the majority of members of Parliament and the majority of Canadians. This is Reform Party logic. It makes sense to a few people but a very small and decreasing number of people. That is what is wrong with that logic.

I do not want to be too provocative about it but members of the Reform Party are trying to prevent the majority of Canadians

from having legislation they want. They are against the democratic principles they pretend to espouse.

[*Translation*]

And this is what is wrong with the Reform Party. I know that the members of the Reform Party tend to kick up a fuss from time to time. We hear their cry from time to time in the House. Nevertheless, the members opposite are not in a bit of a state because the majority of Canadians are supporting them.

[*English*]

One member said a little earlier tonight that gun registration would not have eliminated a particular crime. The member described victims of a particular criminal incident and said that registering the guns would not have had the desired effect in that case. That is about the same as asking—and I have had a few people ask me about it—how many lives the registration of guns would save.

Mr. Abbott: Zero.

(1940)

Mr. Boudria: That is a good point. I am glad the hon. member across the way is wide awake and listening. It is about the same as asking how many lives licence plates on motor vehicles will save.

If we do nothing else of course it will not save any. Who says it is not in the interests of society to do anything else? It is the same with licence plates on motor vehicles. It permits one to determine when cars are being used in an inappropriate way, to chase them down, to give tickets and to take other measures to provide greater safety for Canadians.

[*Translation*]

It is the same thing with gun control. It is the same thing. The members in this party and most Canadians want laws in this country that differentiate us from our neighbours to the south, in the United States of America. I have a great fondness for the United States, a great land of prosperity. However, the Americans have laws that permit people to bear arms in the street in some states, like Texas, for example.

Now this is not the sort of society we want in Canada. I say this to the members opposite over the outcry and all the noise the Reform Party is making—we do not want this sort of society. This is not at all what we want.

We want a society in which we will—

[*English*]

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sure hon. members would be interested in hearing the final moments of the speech of the government whip.

Government Orders

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that I am trying not to be provocative, it is getting a few members across the way a bit more than excited. Nevertheless this is a serious piece of legislation proposed by a minister who has travelled the country to listen to the views of Canadians.

We have debated the bill longer than any other piece of legislation has been debated since we have been in office. We debated the bill, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, longer than we debated the throne speech, the budget debate and all the budget bills combined. We have nothing to apologize for. Canadians have been consulted.

Now that they have been consulted, the time for decision has come. This is a government that does not hesitate to make decisions. The government will make the necessary decisions. The government will enact the legislation necessary to make this a better, finer and safer society for all.

In a few years from now some of the members across the way in the Reform Party will be apologizing to the people of Canada for the wrongheaded decisions they are taking today. They will be apologizing for those blunders, as the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands put eloquently. That is what will happen. I say to members across the way that it is still time for them to change their minds. There is still time to vote for the legislation the people of Canada have asked us to enact. There is still time to do what the majority of Canadians want.

If members across the way think they are behaving in a way that is deserving of the support of the majority of the people they pretend to represent, now is the time to show it. Now is the time to vote on a measure the people of Canada want.

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.): Madam Speaker, the purpose of the bill as every bill is to make the country a safer place. I will indicate how the bill will do the exact opposite. It will make our streets less safe in the future.

As I only have two minutes I will be very brief. I will dispense with all the rhetoric and take the minister's argument a part piece by piece.

When passed the legislation will cost between \$85 million and \$500 million. That money has to come from somewhere and will be taken away from the functional arm of justice. There is something called opportunity cost. When it is pulled away from one arm of justice to another it should be put into an area with better efficiency. Unfortunately it has been proven that gun registration does not work and will not make our streets safer. Studies have been done in Australia, New Zealand and other countries.

The minister says that we will have less homicide. The reality is that of the 720 homicides in the country last year 220 were committed with firearms and 5 were committed with legally owned handguns. The minister says that we will have less suicide. Persons who are going to commit suicide do not go out to get a gun registration or an FAC. They do not go through all the loops necessary to get a gun. They kill themselves or attempt to kill themselves with whatever is available.

In short, that is why the registration aspect of Bill C-68 will not work. It will make our street less safe because it will take money away from the functional arm of justice.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 7.45 p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, June 8, and in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 78(2), it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Pursuant to agreement made earlier, all motions in Group No. 4 are deemed put and recorded divisions are deemed requested and deemed deferred.

Pursuant to agreement made earlier all the motions in Group Nos. 5 to 11 are deemed proposed and seconded, questions put, divisions requested and deemed deferred.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 13

That Bill C-68, in Clause 5, be amended by replacing line 21, on page 5, with the following:

"safety of any other person, that the".

Motion No. 14

That Bill C-68, in Clause 5, be amended

(a) by replacing line 13, on page 6, with the following:

"against any other person; or"; and

(b) by replacing line 17, on page 6, with the following:

"other person."

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-68, in Clause 21, be amended by replacing lines 35 and 36, on page 16, with the following:

"desirable, in the interests of the safety of any other person, that the".

Motion No. 209

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 23 and 24, on page 90, with the following:

"ble in the interests of the safety of any other person, to make an order".

Motion No. 211

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 17 and 18, on page 91, with the following:

"the interests of the safety of any other".

Motion No. 217

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

Government Orders

(a) by replacing lines 40 and 41, on page 99, with the following:

“desirable in the interests of the safety of any other person, for the person”;

(b) by replacing lines 4 and 5, on page 100, with the following:

“in the interests of the safety of any other person, for the person to possess any”; and

(c) by replacing line 11, on page 100, with the following:

“safety of any other person, it”.

Motion No. 219

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 25 and 27, on page 101, with the following:

“interests of the safety of any other”.

Motion No. 258

That Bill C-68, in Clause 147, be amended by replacing lines 41 and 42, on page 114, with the following:

“n the interests of the safety of any other person.”

Motion No. 260

That Bill C-68, in Clause 151, be amended by replacing lines 4 and 5, on page 116, with the following:

“the interests of the safety of any other person, to include as a condition”.

Motion No. 262

That Bill C-68, in Clause 169, be amended by replacing lines 21 and 22, on page 123, with the following:

“interests of the safety of any other person, to make an order prohibiting the”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 15

That Bill C-68, in Clause 6, be amended

(a) by replacing line 30, on page 6, with the following:

“6. A person is eligible to hold a licence”; and

(b) by deleting lines 36 to 39, on page 6.

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 16

That Bill C-68, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 34, on page 7, with the following:

“restricted firearms only if the individual successfully completes a restricted firearms safety course that is approved by the attorney general of the province in which the course is given.”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 17

That Bill C-68, in Clause 7, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 42, on page 8, and lines 1 and 2, on page 9, with the following:

“dividual against whom a prohibition order was made merely because another person against whom a prohibition order was made cohabited with, or was an associate of, the individual.”

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 18

That Clause 8 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 29 and 30 on page 9 and substituting the following:

“individual has consented, in writing or in any other manner that is satisfactory to the chief firearms officer, to the issuance of the licence.”

Mr. Charles Hubbard (Miramichi, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-68, in Clause 62, be amended by replacing lines 4 to 10, on page 33, with the following:

“individual who is eighteen years old or older remains valid unless revoked pursuant this Act.”

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 102

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 19, on page 38, the following new Clause:

“70.1 (1) A chief firearms officer shall not revoke or refuse to renew the licence of an individual to possess a restricted firearm, or a handgun referred to in paragraph 12(6)(a), where the individual

(a) is not eligible to hold the licence or have it renewed by reason only of illness, travel or other valid reason; and

(b) lends the firearm or handgun to the Her Majesty, a police force or other borrower, in accordance with this Act, for the period of the ineligibility.

(2) The Registrar shall not revoke the registration certificate for a firearm or handgun in the circumstances referred to in subsection (1).”

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 21

That Clause 9 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 14 to 21 on page 10 and substituting the following:

“holder to acquire restricted firearms.

(3.1) In subsection (3), “firearm” does not include a partially manufactured barrelled weapon that, in its unfinished state, is not a barrelled weapon

(a) from which any shot, bullet or other projectile can be discharged; and

(b) that is capable of causing serious bodily injury or death to a person.”

Motion No. 22

That Clause 9 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 31 to 35 on page 10 and substituting the following:

“(a) who, in the course of duties of employment, handles or would handle only firearms that are designed or intended to exactly resemble, or to resemble with near precision, antique firearms, and who has been trained to handle or use such a firearm; or”

Motion No. 33

Government Orders

That the French version of Clause 17.1 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 27 and 28 on page 15 and substituting the following:

“(iii) désire la transporter aux fins de réparation, d’entreposage, de vente, d’exportation ou d’évaluation.”

Motion No. 34

That the French version of Clause 17.1 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 30 to 32 on page 15 and substituting the following:

“d’armes à feu.”

Motion No. 36

That the French version of clause 18 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 7 and 8 on page 16 and substituting the following:

“(iii) désire la transporter aux fins de réparation, d’entreposage, de vente, d’exportation ou d’évaluation.”

Motion No. 47

That the French version of Clause 29 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 5 on page 21 and substituting the following:

“ques, techniques ou scientifiques relatives”.

Motion No. 57

That the French version of Clause 33 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 13 on page 22 and substituting the following:

“bées, de dispositifs prohibés, d’armes à autorisation restreinte, de”

Motion No. 72

That clause 43 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 23 to 28 on page 27 and substituting the following:

“(c) holds a licence authorizing it to possess those goods, except where those goods are to be shipped in transit through Canada by a business that does not carry on business in Canada;”

Motion No. 74

That the French version of clause 44 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 36 on page 27 and substituting the following:

“l’autorisation d’exportation à l’agent des”

Motion No. 80

That the French version of clause 48 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 6 on page 29 and substituting the following:

“tion de marchandises visées à l’article 42 doivent faire l’objet d’une autorisation”

Motion No. 89

That the English version of clause 54 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 13 and 14 on page 31 and substituting the following:

“54. (1) a chief firearms officer is responsible for issuing licences.”

Motion No. 90

That the English version of clause 55 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 20 to 22 on page 31 and substituting the following:

“55. a chief firearms officer is responsible for issuing authorizations to carry and authorizations to transport.”

Motion No. 171

That the French version of clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 30 to 33 on page 70 and substituting the following:

«exporter» Exporter hors du Canada, notamment exporter des marchandises importées au Canada et expédiées en transit à travers celui-ci.”

Motion No. 172

That the French version of clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 37 to 40 on page 70 and substituting the following:

«importer» Importer au Canada, notamment importer des marchandises expédiées en transit à travers le Canada et exportées hors de celui-ci.»

Motion No. 227

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 36 and 37 on page 108 and substituting the following:

“prohibited device or prohibited ammunition if, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, the thing to be prescribed is reasonable for use”

Motion No. 261

That clause 161.1 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 30 to 32 on page 118 and substituting the following:

“(d) have been taken as a sample or seized under the Firearms Act or any other Act of Parliament; or”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-68, in Clause 12, be amended by replacing lines 19 to 20, on page 13, with the following:

“and for which on”.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 27

That Bill C-68, in Clause 12, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 44 to 45, on page 13, with the following:

“1977 if the particular individual is the spouse or a brother, sister, child or descendent of an”; and

(b) by adding after line 2, on page 14, the following:

“(7.1) Where the particular handgun referred to in subsection (6) was manufactured between 1945 and 1977, the particular individual referred to in subsection (7) is only eligible for the licence if the individual submits, with the application for the licence, a statutory declaration declaring the handgun to be a family heirloom and stating the reasons for that belief.”

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 159

That clause 113 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 19 to 25 on page 59 and substituting the following:

“tion certificate;

(b) in the case of an individual referred to in subsection 12(2), (3), (4), (5), (6) or (8), to acquire and possess any prohibited firearms referred to in that subsection that are acquired by the holder on or after the commencement day; and

(c) in the case of a particular individual who is eligible under subsection 12(7) to hold a licence authorizing the particular individual to possess a handgun referred to in subsection 12(6) (pre-February 14, 1995 handguns) in the circumstances described in subsection 12(7), to acquire and possess such a handgun in those circumstances, if the particular handgun is acquired by the particular individual on or after the commencement day."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 160

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 40, on page 59, the following new Clause:

"113.1 (1) Every person who, immediately before the coming into force of any of subsections 106(1), 106.2(1) and 106.4(1), possessed a firearm without a firearm acquisition certificate because

(a) the person possessed the firearm before January 1, 1979, or

(b) the firearm acquisition certificate under which the person had acquired the firearm had expired, shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until January 1, 2001 or such other date as is prescribed, the holder of a licence under which the person may possess the firearm.

(2) Every person who, immediately before the coming into force of any of subsections 106(1), 106.2(1) and 106.4(1), possessed a firearm and was the holder of a firearm acquisition certificate shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until January 1, 2001 or such other date as is prescribed, the holder of a licence under which the person may possess the firearm.

(3) Every person who, at any time between the coming into force of subsection 106(1), 106.2(1) or 106.4(1) and the later of January 1, 1998 and such other date as is prescribed, possesses a firearm that, as of that date, is not a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm, shall be deemed for the purposes of that subsection to be, until January 1, 2003 or such other date as is prescribed, the holder of a registration certificate for that firearm."

Motion No. 168

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 34, on page 69, with the following:

"(a) a handgun that has a barrel equal to or less than 105 mm in length".

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 169

That clause 133 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out line 34 on page 69 and substituting the following:

"a .25 or .32 calibre cartridge,"

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 226

That Bill C-68, in Clause 133, be amended

Government Orders

(a) by replacing line 32, on page 108, with the following:

"(2) Subject to subsection (3), in making regulations, the Governor in"; and

(b) by adding after line 38, on page 108, the following:

"(3) The Governor in Council may not prescribe any handgun that is designed or adapted to discharge a .25 or .32 calibre cartridge to be a prohibited firearm."

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 26

That Bill C-68, in Clause 12, be amended

(a) by replacing line 21, on page 13, with the following:

"February 28, 1995 a registration certificate"; and

(b) by replacing line 25, on page 13, with the following:

"(a) on February 28, 1995".

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-68, in Clause 19, be amended by replacing line 19, on page 16, with the following:

"12(6) (pre-February 28, 1995 handguns) may".

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-68, in Clause 26, be amended by replacing line 10, on page 19, with the following:

"subsection 12(6) (pre-February 28), 1995".

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-68, in Clause 27, be amended by replacing line 26, on page 19, with the following:

"12(6) (pre-February 28, 1995 handguns) or".

Motion No. 86

That Bill C-68, in Clause 52, be amended by replacing line 17, on page 30, with the following:

"in subsection 12(6) (pre-February 28, 1995)".

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-68, in Clause 63, be amended by replacing line 3, on page 34, with the following:

"12(6) (pre-February 28, 1995 handguns) for".

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-68, in Clause 65, be amended

(a) by replacing line 10, on page 35, with the following:

"(pre-February 28, 1995 handguns) a chief"; and

(b) by replacing line 26, on page 35, with the following:

"(28, 1995 handguns) that are possessed by an".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 30

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 15.

Motion No. 31

That Bill C-68, in Clause 16 be amended by replacing lines 1 to 4, on page 13, with the following:

"16. (1) A registration certificate for a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm may be issued to only one person.

Government Orders

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply in the case of a prohibited firearm or a restricted firearm for which a registration certificate”.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-68, in Clause 16, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 42, on page 14, with the following:

“of a firearm where

(a) two spouses, who each hold a licence to possess the firearm, apply to have the registration certificate issued to them jointly; or

(b) a registration certificate referred to in section 121 was issued for the firearm to more than one person.”

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 114

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 80.

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 81.

Motion No. 116

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 82.

Motion No. 117

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 83.

Motion No. 118

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 84.

Motion No. 119

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 85.

Motion No. 120

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 86.

Motion No. 121

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 87.

Motion No. 122

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 88.

Motion No. 123

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 89.

Motion No. 124

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 90.

Motion No. 125

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 91.

Motion No. 126

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 92.

Motion No. 127

That Bill C-68, in Clause 93, be amended by replacing lines 22 to 24, on page 46, with the following:

“registration certificates and authorizations; and”.

Motion No. 128

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 97.

Motion No. 129

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 98.

Motion No. 130

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 99.

Motion No. 131

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 100.

Motion No. 132

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 101.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 148

That Bill C-68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing line 44, on page 55, with the following:

“(p) subject to section 110.1, prescribing the fees that are to be paid to”.

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 149

That Bill C-68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing line 44, on page 55, with the following:

“(p) prescribing, after consultation with the committee of the House of Commons that normally considers matters relating to justice, for a period of twenty years following the coming into force of the regulations, the fees that are to be paid to”.

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

Motion No. 150

That Bill C-68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing lines 3 to 5, on page 56, with the following:

“(q) prescribing, in a manner that is equal and fair for every one, the method of payment for the fees payable under paragraph (p);”.

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 151

That Bill C-68, in Clause 110, be amended by deleting lines 12 and 13, on page 56.

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

Motion No. 152

That Bill C-68, in Clause 110, be amended by replacing lines 30 to 33, on page 56, with the following:

“provision of this Act or the regulations applies;”.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 153

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 26, on page 57, the following new Clause:

“110.1 (1) The fees referred to in paragraph 110(p) shall not be increased during any period by a percentage greater than the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for the same period.

(2) For the purposes of this section, the Consumer Price Index for a period means the average of the Consumer Price Index for Canada, as published by Statistics Canada under the authority of the Statistics Act.

(3) No fee shall be prescribed under paragraph 110(p) for the transfer of a firearm by an individual to an immediate family member."

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 155

That Bill C-68, in Clause 111, be amended by replacing lines 44 to 46, on page 57, and lines 1 to 5, on page 58, with the following:

"(3) A proposed regulation that has been laid pursuant to subsection (1) may be made

(a) on the expiration of thirty sitting days after it has been laid; or

(b) at any time after it has been laid, where the federal Minister is of the opinion that the making of the regulation is urgent."

Motion No. 156

That Bill C-68, in Clause 111, be amended by adding after line 5, on page 58, the following:

"(3.1) A regulation shall be made subject to affirmative resolution of Parliament."

Motion No. 157

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 112.

Motion No. 161

That Bill C-68, in Clause 121, be amended by replacing lines 40 to 43, on page 62, and lines 1 and 2, on page 63, with the following:

"(2) For greater certainty, a registration certificate that is deemed to be a registration certificate issued under section 58 is valid until it expires by virtue of section 64."

Motion No. 162

That Bill C-68, in Clause 123, be amended by replacing lines 39 to 44, on page 63, with the following:

"(3) A permit expires on the expiration of the period for which it was expressed to be issued."

Motion No. 263

That Bill C-68, in Clause 169, be amended by deleting lines 39 to 43, on page 123.

Mr. Brent St. Denis (Algoma, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-68, in Clause 29, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 5 and 6, on page 21, with the following:

"relate or distinguish the one or more restricted firearms or handguns in his or her collection;"; and

(b) by replacing line 10, on page 21, with the following:

"handguns collection is to be kept; and".

Government Orders

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-68, in Clause 31, be amended by replacing line 31, on page 21, with the following:

"sections 20 to 27, 29, 30, 39 to 41 and 45 to".

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 34.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 62

That Bill C-68, in Clause 34, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 24 and 25, on page 22, with the following:

"licence may import a restricted firearm if, at the time of the"; and

(b) by replacing lines 34 and 35, on page 22, with the following:

"(iii) produces an authorization to transport the".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 35.

Motion No. 64

That Bill C-68 be amended by deleting Clause 36.

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-68, in Clause 36, be amended by replacing lines 7 and 8, on page 24, with the following:

"licence may export a restricted firearm that was imported by".

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 66

That Bill C-68, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 1 to 5, on page 25, with the following:

"(ii) produces his or her licence and, in the case of a prohibited firearm or a re-restricted firearm, the registration certificate for the prohibited firearm or the restricted firearm and the authorization to transport the prohibited firearm or the restricted firearm; and".

Mr. John Murphy (Annapolis Valley—Hants, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 67

That Bill C-68, in Clause 37, be amended by replacing lines 3 and 4, on page 25, with the following:

"and an authorization to".

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-68, in Clause 39, be amended

(a) by replacing lines 27 to 29, on page 25, with the following:

"accordance with that section and an authorization to transport the"; and

Government Orders

(b) by replacing lines 31 and 32, on page 25, with the following:

“(c) in the case of a restricted firearm for which a registra—”.

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.) moved:

Motion No. 75

That clause 45 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 8 to 13 on page 28 and substituting the following:

“(a) holds a licence authorizing it to acquire and possess those goods, except where those goods are to be shipped in transit through Canada by a business that does not carry on business in Canada;”

Motion No. 83

That clause 51.1 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 26 to 34 on page 29 and substituting the following:

“51.1 No business shall import a prohibited firearm, prohibited weapon, prohibited device or prohibited ammunition that is to be shipped in transit through Canada and exported.”

Mrs. Pierrette Venne (Saint-Hubert, BQ) moved:

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding immediately after line 34 on page 29 the following new article:

“51.1 (1) A person shall not import or export a firearm that has not been rendered inoperative by a secure locking device.

(2) For the purposes of this section, “secure locking device” means a device that

(a) cannot be opened or unlocked except with an electronic, magnetic or mechanical key or an alphanumeric combination lock; and

(b) once installed on an unrestricted firearm or a restricted firearm, prevents it from shooting.

(3) Every person who commits an offence under subsection (1) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(4) A person who has been convicted of an offence under subsection (1) is deemed not to have been convicted of a criminal offence.

(5) An offence referred to in subsection (1) does not constitute an offence for the purposes of the Criminal Records Act.

(6) For greater certainty, notwithstanding sub section (4), the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to summary conviction offences apply to an offence referred to in subsection (1).

(7) For greater certainty, nothing in this section prevents the punishment to which a person might otherwise be lawfully sentenced on a conviction for an offence referred to in sub- section (1).

Motion No. 135

That Bill C-68 be amended by adding after line 24, on page 51, the following new Clause:

“103.1 (1) A person shall not complete the assembly or manufacture of a firearm without equipping the firearm with a secure locking device.

(2) For the purposes of this section, “secure locking device” means a device that

(a) cannot be opened or unlocked except with an electronic, magnetic or mechanical key or an alphanumeric combination lock; and

(b) once installed on an unrestricted firearm or a restricted firearm, prevents it from shooting.

(3) Every person who commits an offence under sub section (1) is guilty of an offence punishable on summary conviction.

(4) A person who has been convicted of an offence under subsection (1) is deemed not to have been convicted of a criminal offence.

(5) An offence referred to in subsection (1) does not constitute an offence for the purposes of the Criminal Records Act.

(6) For greater certainty, notwithstanding sub section (4), the provisions of the Criminal Code relating to summary conviction offences apply to an offence referred to in subsection (1).

(7) For greater certainty, nothing in this section prevents the punishment to which a person might otherwise be lawfully sentenced on a conviction for an offence referred to in subsection (1).

Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.) moved:

Motion No. 229

That Bill C-68, in Clause 134, be amended by replacing lines 11 and 12, on page 109, with the following:

“ing knowing it is unauthorized”).”

Motion No. 257

That Bill C-68, in Clause 145, be amended by deleting lines 3 and 4, on page 113.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Call in the members.

(2005)

And the division bells having rung:

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If you were to seek it I think you would find unanimous consent to deal first with report stage Motion No. 267 and then to deal with the motions in the order in which they are listed on the Order Paper.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: On a point of order, I recognize the hon. member for York South—Weston.

[English]

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I note there are some 267 amendments. It would be helpful if we were to receive a brief explanation of what the purpose of each amendment is.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to disappoint the hon. member for York South—Weston but it would take up a great deal of time for the Chair to try to explain each amendment.

Government Orders

If the hon. member is rising on the same point of order, the Chair has already dealt with it. If it is a different point of order, I will recognize the hon. member for York South—Weston.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I understand you are requesting unanimous consent. I am simply indicating that members need to vote intelligently on these amendments. When bills are presented to the House there is an explanatory note. For those of us who did not sit at the justice committee or sit through the evidence this is the first opportunity for the House to consider 267 amendments. I am not asking that each and every amendment be dealt with in great detail but for a brief explanation as to what the effect of the amendment would be.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the Chair take it the hon. member is not giving unanimous consent to deal with Motion No. 267 first?

Mr. Nunziata: I am content to deal with Motion No. 267 first but I would like someone to explain in 30 seconds what amendment 267 is all about.

The Deputy Speaker: I take it there is unanimous consent to deal with Motion No. 267 first. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 267.

(The House divided on Motion No. 267, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 252)

YEAS

Members

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Abbott | Ablonczy |
| Althouse | Arseneault |
| Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing) | Bellehumeur |
| Benoit | Bernier (Gaspé) |
| Blaikie | Bouchard |
| Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) | Bridgman |
| Brien | Bélair |
| Bélisle | Caron |
| Culbert | Cummins |
| Daviault | Debien |
| de Jong | de Savoye |
| Duceppe | Dumas |
| Duncan | Epp |
| Fillion | Finlay |
| Forseth | Frazer |
| Gauthier (Roberval) | Gilmour |
| Gouk | Grey (Beaver River) |
| Grubel | Guay |
| Hanger | Hanrahan |
| Harper (Calgary West) | Harper (Simcoe Centre) |
| Harris | Hermanson |
| Hill (Prince George—Peace River) | Hoepfner |
| Hopkins | Jennings |
| Johnston | Kerpan |
| Laurin | Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry) |
| Leblanc (Longueuil) | Lee |
| Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe) | Loubier |
| MacDonald | Manning |
| Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) | Mayfield |
| McClelland (Edmonton Southwest) | McCormick |
| McGuire | Mills (Red Deer) |
| Mitchell | Murphy |
| Nault | Nunez |
| Nunziata | Penson |
| Picard (Drummond) | Plamondon |
| Pomerleau | Ramsay |

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Rideout | Riis |
| Ringma | Rocheleau |
| Sauvageau | Scott (Skeena) |
| Serré | Silye |
| Solberg | Speaker |
| Speller | St. Denis |
| Steckle | Stinson |
| Strahl | Taylor |
| Telegdi | Thompson |
| Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata) | Tremblay (Rosemont) |
| Ur | Venne |
| White (Fraser Valley West) | Wood—96 |

NAYS

Members

- | | |
|---|---|
| Adams | Alcock |
| Allmand | Anderson |
| Assad | Assadourian |
| Augustine | Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) |
| Bakopanos | Barnes |
| Beaumier | Bellemare |
| Bertrand | Bethel |
| Bevilacqua | Blondin—Andrew |
| Bodnar | Bonin |
| Boudria | Brown (Oakville—Milton) |
| Brushett | Bryden |
| Bélanger | Caccia |
| Campbell | Cannis |
| Catterall | Cauchon |
| Chamberlain | Chan |
| Chrétien (Saint—Maurice) | Clancy |
| Cohen | Collenette |
| Comuzzi | Cowling |
| DeVillers | Dhaliwal |
| Discepola | Dromisky |
| Duhamel | Eggleton |
| English | Fewchuk |
| Finestone | Flis |
| Fontana | Fry |
| Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine) | Galloway |
| Gerrard | Godfrey |
| Goodale | Graham |
| Guarnieri | Harb |
| Harvard | Hickey |
| Ianno | Jackson |
| Jordan | Karygiannis |
| Keyes | Kirkby |
| Knutson | Kraft Sloan |
| Lastewka | Lincoln |
| Loney | MacAulay |
| MacLaren | MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys) |
| Maheu | Malhi |
| Maloney | Manley |
| Marchi | Marleau |
| Martin (LaSalle—Émard) | Massé |
| McKinnon | McTeague |
| McWhinney | Mifflin |
| Milliken | Minna |
| Murray | O'Brien |
| Pagtakhan | Paradis |
| Parrish | Parry |
| Payne | Peric |
| Peters | Peterson |
| Phinney | Pickard (Essex—Kent) |
| Pillitteri | Reed |
| Regan | Richardson |
| Robichaud | Robillard |
| Rock | Rompkey |
| Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury) | Sheridan |
| Stewart (Brant) | Stewart (Northumberland) |
| Szabo | Terrana |
| Thalheimer | Tobin |
| Torsney | Valeri |
| Vanclief | Verran |
| Volpe | Walker |
| Wappel | Wells |
| Zed—123 | |

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(2020)

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 267 lost.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the member for Mississauga East voted twice on the motion. Am I correct in assuming that the House would count her first vote in support of the motion?

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary rose to explain that she had been counted in error and therefore she was counted with her second vote.

The next question is on Motion No. 1. The Chair's understanding is that the Chair is not going to have to read each of the motions, that the number is sufficient.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, it appears that only two members are voting in favour of the motion. Perhaps I could ask for unanimous consent that the members who have voted on the previous motion be recorded as voting nay, with the exception of one or two who could rise to ask that their vote be recorded as yes.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent to that motion.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a bit of misunderstanding on how you vote on these issues. The clerk has looked on both sides of it. Can you explain to members which side you will be looking at first when you are voting?

The Deputy Speaker: Actually, neither side. The clerk has to do the counting. We try not to look on either side. We look wherever somebody is standing.

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 253)

YEAS

Members

Arseneault	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hopkins
Hubbard	Mayfield
Mitchell	Nault
Riis	Serré
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Ur	Wappel
Wood—17	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumur
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Benoit	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Cummins
Daviault	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Finlay	Fis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazier	Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guarnieri
Guay	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harb
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Harvard
Hermanson	Hickey
Hoepfner	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karygiannis	Kerpan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
LeBlanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald

Government Orders

MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Sheridan
Silye	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Thompson
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri	Vanclicf
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wells	White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—209	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Deshaiies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringnette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(2030)

*[Translation]***The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 lost.*[English]*

Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was voting in favour of the motion and I inadvertently got a vote ahead. I want to make sure that my name was not recorded twice in error.

*[Translation]***The Deputy Speaker:** The next question is on Motion No. 10.*[English]*

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save a bit of time, I wonder if there would be a disposition that the members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting nay. Perhaps the mover of the motion and others could stand and indicate if they wish to vote differently.

*[Translation]***Mr. Duceppe:** The Bloc members will vote in favour of this motion.*[English]*

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party members vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise. As the member for Calgary Centre, I wish to record my vote as a yea.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote nay on this motion, including the member for Kamloops who had voted yea on the previous motion.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent among all the members to proceed as has been proposed?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(2035)

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It would be helpful when the government whip rose if he stated which motion number it was applying to.

The Deputy Speaker: It is Motion No. 10. That has been agreed to and the vote will be counted shortly.**Mr. St. Denis:** Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if we have finished the count, but I want to be shown as being in favour of Motion No. 10.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, do we get up on a point of order and indicate that or do we just stand up? Please explain. I was voting in favour of the motion. Do you require us to get up on a point of order to do that or do you just look to either side to see who gets up?

The Deputy Speaker: That is a good point. Is anybody not satisfied that their vote has not been indicated by what was said or by what they have done?

Government Orders

Mr. Nault: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 10, if that is the motion we are voting on now.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear as well that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 10.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Miramichi on a point of order.

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, we know the Miramichi is a great river, but the Restigouche is even greater. I would be voting in favour of the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Nipissing and the hon. member for the great river of Miramichi.

Mr. Hubbard: No.

Mr. Wood: I am voting in favour, Mr. Speaker.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negatived on the following division:)

*(Division No. 254)***YEAS**

Members

Arseneault	Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Duceppe	Dumas
Fillion	Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay	Hopkins
Hubbard	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Loubier
Mitchell	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Shepherd
Silye	Speller
St. Denis	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
Wood—39	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	de Jong
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky

Duhamel	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Finlay
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Frazer
Fry	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guarnieri
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Harvard	Hermanson
Hickey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karygiannis	Kerpan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutsen	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Miffin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Serré
Sheridan	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—187	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel

Government Orders

Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Crawford
Dalphond-Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

[*English*]

The House is now voting on Motion No. 158.

(2040)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House would concur to apply the result just taken on the vote on report stage Motion No. 10 to report stage Motion No. 158 which is the one we are now dealing with. The votes appear prima facie at least to be identical. Perhaps the House could seek that and any member wishing to indicate otherwise could rise at that point.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. McCormick: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have it recorded that I voted in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Wappel: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Finlay: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Dromisky: Mr. Speaker, I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Serré: Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to show that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Steckle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to record my vote as being in favour of Motion No. 158.

Mr. Shepherd: In favour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I vote yes on the motion.

Mr. Verran: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the motion.

Ms. Ur: In favour, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. Skoke: In favour, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make sure that my vote is recorded as a nay for Motion No. 158.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like it to be recorded that I am voting in favour of Motion No. 158.

I think part of the problem is that the sheet the Speaker is using which has grouped the votes is not available to the members which may be slowing down the vote. Perhaps if the Speaker could give us the list of motions as they are in groupings, that would allow us to get the votes done a little quicker because we will be able to anticipate what the vote is going to be on.

The Deputy Speaker: Anything that would speed things up would be fine.

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

(*Division No. 255*)

YEAS

Members

Arseneault	Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Dromisky	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Finlay	Gauthier (Roberval)
Guay	Hopkins
Hubbard	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Loubier
MacDonald	McCormick
Mitchell	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Serré	Shepherd
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Steckle
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Ur	Venne
Verran	Wappel
Wells	Wood—50

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bellemare	Benoit
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie

Government Orders

Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	de Jong
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Duhamel
Duncan	Eggleton
English	Epp
Fewchuk	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Frazer
Fry	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guarnieri
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Harvard	Hermanson
Hickey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karygiannis	Kerpan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Morrison	Murphy
Murray	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Penson
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Sheridan
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Walker	White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—177	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(2045)

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 167.

Mr. Silye: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to put some order back into this evening's proceedings. This is at the prompting of some of the ministers of the crown on the front benches.

I suggest we have a stand up vote on Motion 167 and we duly record everyone's wishes. I think it will follow what we have agreed to beforehand as the whips. If that is the case, then we can proceed with the applied votes and reverse applied if it works out that way.

The Deputy Speaker: Anything for order, I am sure we are all for that.

The House divided on Motion No. 167, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 256)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Cummins
de Jong	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Riis	Ringma
Scott (Skeena)	Shepherd
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Taylor
Thompson	White (Fraser Valley West)—50

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Davault
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélangier
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi

Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Zed—175

Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Coppes
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringette—Maltais
Walker
Young

(2055)

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 266.

(The House divided on Motion No. 266, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 257)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Assad
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Davault
de Jong
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Nunez
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Ringma
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Speller

Ablonczy
Arseneault
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit
Blaike
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Cummins
Debien
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Finlay
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mitchell
Ménard
Nunziata
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Riis
Robinson
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Stinson

Government Orders

Strahl
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Wappel

Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)—86

Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette-Maltais
Walker
Young

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collette
Cowling
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robillard
Rompkey
Sheridan
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Walker
Zed—137

Alcock
Anawak
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Murphy
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Robichaud
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Wells

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Coppes
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin

(2100)

[*Translation*]**The Deputy Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 266 lost.[*English*]

Moving on to group No. 2, the next question is on Motion No. 5.

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 258)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters

Alcock
Allhouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collette
Cowling
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson

Government Orders

The next question is on Motion No. 145.

The House divided on Motion No. 145, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 259)

YEAS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Cowling
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finlay
Fontana
Gagliano
Gerrard
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—153

Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Culbert
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
English
Finestone
Flis
Fry
Gallaway
Godfrey
Graham
Guarnieri
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Phinney
Pillitteri
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—152

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélisle
Cummins
Debien
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazier
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne

Ablonczy
Benoit
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bryden
Caron
Davialt
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Penson
Plamondon
Ramsay
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)—74

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copp
Crête
Deshaias
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette—Maltais
Walker
Young

(2110)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 carried.

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brien
Bélisle	Caron
Cummins	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazer	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guay	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard	Nunez
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)—71	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphonde—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(2120)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 145 carried.

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 4. The vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 6 and 154.

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

(Division No. 260)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Culbert
Cummins	de Jong
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Frazer
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)	Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harris	Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hoepfner
Hopkins	Hubbard
Jennings	Johnston
Kerpan	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick
Mills (Red Deer)	Mitchell
Morrison	Murphy
Nault	Penson
Ramsay	Riis
Ringma	Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Speller
Stinson	Strahl
Taylor	Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)	Wood—60

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Bouchard	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélanger
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone

Government Orders

Flis	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Guarnieri	Guay
Harb	Harvard
Hickey	Ianno
Jackson	Jordan
Karygiannis	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murray	Ménard
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Pomerleau
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Zed—163	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(2130)

[English]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 4 defeated. Motions Nos. 6 and 154 are also therefore negated.

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 23 I am told only ensures that the French and English texts are the same. Perhaps you, Mr. Speaker, could ask if there are five members who actually desire a vote on this. If not, we could then deal with it accordingly.

The Deputy Speaker: Members have heard the words of the whip of the government. Are there five members who are concerned about this matter? It would seem not.

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

(Motion No. 23 agreed to.)

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 24.

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

(2140)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 24 negated.

[English]

The next question is on Motion No. 28. A vote on Motion No. 28 applies to Motions 29, 43, 49, 51, 60, 69, 71, 76, 79, 92, 95, 100, 207, 215, 216, 218 and 225. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 28 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motion No. 50. A negative vote on Motion No. 28 necessitates the question being put on Motion No. 50.

All those in favour of Motion No. 28 will please rise.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you will find that Motion No. 76 should not be included in the grouping.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that acceptable?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Government Orders

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save time let me try again to see if there would be unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken on report stage Motion No. 24, in other words the last one, to report stage Motion No. 28, which is the one now before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: Members have heard the terms of the proposal. Is there unanimous consent to apply the vote just taken to the motion now before the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it understood that all of the motions that were indicated earlier would also be affected by the vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 261*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger): I declare Motion No. 28 negatived. Therefore Motions Nos. 29, 43, 49, 51, 60, 69, 71, 76, 79, 92, 95, 100, 207, 215, 216, 218, 225 are negatived.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent success, let me ask for unanimous consent to apply the vote taken on the last motion to Motions 50, 41, 42 and 45. They all stand in the name of the same hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, I can try for a few more if the House is so disposed. We can also try to determine whether or not there is agreement to apply the same vote to report stage Motions Nos. 87, 88, 8, 174, 187, 189, 191, 197, 199, 223, 134, 136, 146, 147, 164, 166, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 196, 202, 228, 231, 240, 13, 15, 17, 93, 102, 25, 27, 160, 31, 161, 53, 61 and 66.

(2145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 261*]

The Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 50, 41, 42, 45, 87, 88, 8, 174, 187, 189, 191, 197, 199, 223, 134, 136, 146, 147, 164, 166, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 196, 202, 228, 231, 240, 13, 15, 17, 93, 102, 25, 27, 160, 31, 161, 53, 61 and 66 are negatived.

(*Division No. 261*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Althouse
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
de Jong
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Riis
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Taylor
White (Fraser Valley West)—49

Ablonczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Bouchard
Brien
Bryden
Bélanger
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Fiis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Davialt
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Gerrard
Goodale
Guarnieri

Government Orders

Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Robichaud
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Wood
Zed—173	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

[Translation]

The next question is on Motion No. 78.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you were to seek it you would find unanimous consent to apply the result just taken in reverse to the motion now before the House, Motion No. 78.

I believe you would also find unanimous consent to do the same on Motions Nos. 109, 111 and 169.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent by all members to what has just been proposed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 78, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 262)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Bouchard	Boudria
Brien	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee

Government Orders

Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Robichaud
Robillard	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
Wells	Wood
Zed—173	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Cummins
de Jong	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Riis	Ringma
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Taylor	Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)—49	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

The Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 78, 109, 111 and 169 are agreed to.

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 54.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to determine if there is unanimous consent that the members who voted on the motion just prior to this be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House in the following manner, with Liberal members voting yea.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois are also in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that Reform Party members will vote no to this motion, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

(2150)

The Deputy Speaker: If any members wish to vote otherwise indicate so now.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will vote yea.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 54, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 263)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier

Government Orders

Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Daviault
de Jong
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
English
Fillion
Fliis
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Godfrey
Graham
Guay
Harvard
Hopkins
Ianno
Jordan
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Mitchell
Murphy
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robillard
Rock
Sauvageau
Shepherd
Skoke
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Taylor
Terrana
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Debien
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Eggleton
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Gerrard
Goodale
Guarnieri
Harb
Hickey
Hubbard
Jackson
Karygiannis
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McGuire
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Regan
Rideout
Robichaud
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—180

Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson

Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)—42

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copp
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringette—Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 54 carried.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the same vote to Motion No. 103.

The Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: The same could be done on Motion No. 220 if we are seeking unanimous consent and for Motion No. 75.

The Deputy Speaker: We are only dealing with Motion No. 103 at the moment.

Mr. Silye: Reform Party members vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise. The member for Swift Current may wish—

The Deputy Speaker: Would the Reform Party members who wish to vote otherwise please indicate so now.

Mr. Taylor: We vote in favour, Mr. Speaker.

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Frazer
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)

Government Orders

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 263.*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 103 carried.

Is there unanimous consent to apply those votes as indicated?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 263.*]

The Deputy Speaker: Therefore Motions Nos. 220 and 75 are agreed to.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 7. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 133, 173, 181, 198 and 222. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 7 obviates the necessity of the question being put on Motions Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12, 137, 144, 163, 114, 182, 184, 192, 197, 199, 201 and 223.

(2155)

A negative vote on Motion No. 7 necessitates the question being put on Motions Nos. 8, 174, 184, 197 and 223.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek unanimous consent that the members who just voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting against this particular motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The members of the Bloc Québécois support this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members are against this motion and vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present vote yea unless otherwise noted.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I vote nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 264*)

YEAS

Members

Althouse	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bellehumeur	Bernier (Gaspé)
Blaikie	Bouchard
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Daviault
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)	Guay
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	Ménard

Nunez
Pomerleau
Rocheleau
Taylor
Tremblay (Rosemont)

Picard (Drummond)
Riis
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—34

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Benoit	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Cummins
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guarnieri
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Harvard	Hermanson
Hickey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karygiannis	Kerpan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Ramsay

Government Orders

Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Silye	Skoke
Solberg	Speaker
Speller	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)	Wood
Zed—189	

(2200)

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats vote yea.**Mr. Robinson:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I vote nay.

(The House divided on Motion No. 184, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 265)

YEAS

Members

Asselin
Bergeon
Calder
Coppes
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepolo
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette—Maltais
Walker
Young

Abbott
Althouse
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Caron
Davault
de Jong
Duceppe
Duncan
Fillion
Frazer
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Laurin
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Loubier
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Nunez
Picard (Drummond)
Ramsay
Ringma
Sauvageau
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
Thompson
Tremblay (Rosemont)
White (Fraser Valley West)—77

Abлонczy
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Benoit
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bélisle
Cummins
Debien
de Savoye
Dumas
Epp
Forseth
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gouk
Grubel
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Ménard
Penson
Pomerleau
Riis
Rocheleau
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Taylor
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 rejected. Consequently Motions Nos. 133, 173, 181, 198 and 222 are negated.**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could seek unanimous consent that the same result apply to report stage Motions Nos. 200, 148, 149 and 150.**The Deputy Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?**Some hon. members:** Agreed.*[Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 264.]***The Deputy Speaker:** Motions Nos. 200, 148, 149 and 150 are negated.**Mr. Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent that members voting on the previous motion could be recorded on the present motion with Liberal members voting nay on Motion No. 184.*[Translation]***Mr. Duceppe:** Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois support this motion.*[English]***Mr. Silye:** Reform Party members vote yea, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

NAYS

Members

Adams
Allmand
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Bodnar
Boudria
Bryden
Belanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain

Alcock
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellemare
Bethel
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan

Government Orders

Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Wood	Zed—146

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would seek unanimous consent to apply the same vote to the following motions: Motions 35, 165, 239, 16, 30 and 155.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 265*]

The Deputy Speaker: Motions Nos. 35, 165, 239, 16, 30, and 155 are negatived.

The next question is on Motion No. 182.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it I believe you would find agreement that those who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the present motion.

Liberal MPs will be voting yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote nay.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, members of the Reform Party vote yea, except for those who wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats would vote yea on report stage Motion No. 182.

(The House divided on Motion No. 182, which was agreed to on the following division.)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guirail
Deshais	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(*Division No. 266*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare

Benoit
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brushett
Bélair
Caccia
Cannis
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
DeVillers
Discepola
Duhamel
Eggleton
Epp
Finestone
Fontana
Frazier
Gagliano
Galloway
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoepfner
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keys
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Loney
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McTeague
Miffin
Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell
Murphy
Nault
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pillitteri
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rompkey
Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan
Skoke
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Taylor
Terrana
Thompson

Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Bryden
Bélanger
Campbell
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
de Jong
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guamieri
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirkby
Kraft Sloan
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lincoln
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon
McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Ramsay
Regan
Rideout
Ringma
Robillard
Rock
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin

Torsney
Vanclief
Volpe
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—195

Government Orders

Valeri
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood

NAYS

Members

Bernier (Gaspé)
Brien
Caron
Debien
Duceppe
Fillion
Guay
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Ménard
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Venne—28

PAIRED MEMBERS

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Gural
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringette—Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 182 agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 183.

Before calling on the government whip, an affirmative vote on Motion No. 183 obviates the necessity of putting the question on Motions 187, 189 and 191. A negative vote on Motion No. 183 necessitates the question being put on Motions 187, 189 and 191.

(2205)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek it, I believe you could find unanimous consent to record the votes in the following way: Liberal members will be voting nay on this motion.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to record that I will be voting in favour of that amendment.

Mr. Murphy: Yea, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, we will vote nay on Motion No. 183.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will probably vote no except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats vote nay.

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 183, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 267)

YEAS

Members

Murphy—2

NAYS

Members

Mitchell

Abbott
Adams
Allmand
Anawak
Arseneault
Assadourian
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bellemare
Bernier (Gaspé)
Bethel
Blaikie
Bodnar
Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Brushett
Bélair
Bélisle
Campbell
Caron
Cauchon
Chan
Clancy
Collenette
Cowling
Cummins
Debien
de Savoye
Dhaliwal
Dromisky
Duhamel
Duncan
English
Fewchuk
Finestone
Fontana
Frazer
Gagliano
Galloway
Gerrard
Godfrey
Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)
Guarnieri
Hanger
Harb
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Harvard
Hickey
Hoepfner
Hubbard
Jackson
Johnston
Karygiannis
Keyes
Knutson
Lastewka
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loney
MacAulay
MacLaren
Maheu
Maloney
Manning
Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mayfield
McCormick
McKinnon

Ablonczy
Alcock
Althouse
Anderson
Assad
Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Barnes
Bellehumeur
Benoit
Bertrand
Bevilacqua
Blondin—Andrew
Bonin
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien
Bryden
Bélangier
Caccia
Cannis
Catterall
Chamberlain
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Cohen
Comuzzi
Culbert
Daviault
de Jong
DeVillers
Discepola
Duceppe
Dumas
Eggleton
Epp
Fillion
Flis
Forseth
Fry
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour
Goodale
Graham
Grubel
Guay
Hanrahan
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hermanson
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hopkins
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Kerpan
Kirby
Kraft Sloan
Laurin
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee
Lincoln
Loubier
MacDonald
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Malhi
Manley
Marchi
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
McGuire
McTeague

McWhinney
Milliken
Minna
Murray
Nault
Nunziata
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Payne
Peric
Peterson
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Ramsay
Regan
Rideout
Ringma
Robillard
Rocheleau
Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Shepherd
Silye
Solberg
Speller
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
Szabo
Telegdi
Thalheimer
Tobin
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valeri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)
Zed—221

Mifflin
Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison
Ménard
Nunez
O'Brien
Paradis
Patry
Penson
Peters
Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pomerleau
Reed
Richardson
Riis
Robichaud
Robinson
Rock
Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan
Skoke
Speaker
St. Denis
Stewart (Northumberland)
Strahl
Taylor
Terrana
Thompson
Torsney
Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Wood

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringette—Maltais
Walker
Young

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 183 negated.

The next question is on Motion No. 186.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, if you would ask it, I believe you would find there is unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as voting as follows on the motion now before the House: Liberal members will vote yea.

Again, if you were to ask it, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the same result to Motions Nos. 188, 190, 185 and 159.

Mr. Duceppe: Bloc members will vote nay on all these motions.

[English]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, we agree to apply, and the Reform Party members vote no.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats agree and we would vote yea.

(The House divided on Motion No. 186, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 268)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
de Jong	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duhamel
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Finestone
Flys	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles—de—la—Madeleine)	Galloway
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keys	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Rompkey
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Skoke
Speller	St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)

Szabo	Taylor
Telegdi	Terrana
Thalheimer	Tobin
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
Wood	Zed—152

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bouchard
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brien
Bélisle	Caron
Cummins	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazier	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guay	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Ménard
Nunez	Penson
Picard (Drummond)	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Solberg	Speaker
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne
White (Fraser Valley West)—71	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphonf—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

Government Orders

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 186 carried. Therefore, Motions Nos. 188, 190, 185, and 159 are also carried.

(2210)

The next question is on Motion No. 201.

[English]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent to apply the result in reverse taken to Motion No. 182 to the vote now before the House.

I think you would find unanimous consent as well to apply the same results to Motion No. 230 and Motion No. 84.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion proposed. Is that agreed?

Mr. Duceppe: D'accord.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Agreed, with unanimous consent.

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

*(Division No. 269)***YEAS**

Members

Bellehumeur	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard	Brien
Bélisle	Caron
Davialt	Debien
de Savoye	Duceppe
Dumas	Fillion
Gauthier (Roberval)	Guay
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	Ménard
Nunez	Picard (Drummond)
Pomerleau	Rocheleau
Sauvageau	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Venne—28

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellemare
Benoit	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Boudria	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman

Brushett	Bryden
Bélaire	Bélanger
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
Cummins	de Jong
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duhamel	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Finestone	Flis
Fontana	Forseth
Frazer	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Guarnieri
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Harvard	Hermanson
Hickey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Hubbard	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Karygiannis	Kerpan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutsen	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Lee	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Murphy	Murray
Nault	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Ramsay
Reed	Regan
Richardson	Rideout
Riis	Ringma
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Scott (Skeena)	Shepherd
Sheridan	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Valeri
Vanclief	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wells
White (Fraser Valley West)	Wood
Zed—195	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphoné-Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
East	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette-Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

[*English*]

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting yea on Motion No. 230.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 201 negatived. Consequently Motions Nos. 84 and 230 are negatived. The vote on Motion No. 230 applies to Motions Nos. 232, 234, 236, 238, 242, 245, 248, 251 and 254.

The next question is on Motion No. 179. A vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 259.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find there is unanimous consent for members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as voting as follows: Liberal members will vote nay on this motion.

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote nay. I believe the results of this vote could also be applied to Motion No. 208.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Reform Party members vote yea except for those members who wish to vote otherwise on both motions.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats would vote no to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 179, which was negatived on the following division:)

(*Division No. 270*)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)

Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)—43

Morrison
Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson

NAYS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brushett	Bryden
Belair	Bélanger
Belisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
Daviault	Debien
de Jong	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaltwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Guarmieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Hubbard
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Mitchell	Murphy
Murray	Ménard
Nault	Nunez
Nunziata	O'Brien
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Payne	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson

Government Orders

Rideout	Riis	Assadourian	Augustine
Robichaud	Robillard	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Robinson	Rocheleau	Bakopanos	Barnes
Rock	Rompkey	Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Shepherd	Sheridan	Bertrand	Bethel
Skoke	Speller	Bevilacqua	Blaikie
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)	Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo	Bonin	Bouchard
Taylor	Telegdi	Boudria	Brien
Terrana	Thalheimer	Brushett	Bryden
Tobin	Torsney	Bélair	Bélangier
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)	Bélisle	Caccia
Valeri	Vanclief	Campbell	Cannis
Venne	Verran	Caron	Catterall
Volpe	Walker	Cauchon	Chamberlain
Wappel	Wells	Chan	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
Wood	Zed—180	Clancy	Cohen

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand	Assadourian	Augustine
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Calder	Canuel	Bakopanos	Barnes
Copps	Crawford	Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral	Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Deshaies	Discepola	Bertrand	Bethel
Dubé	Dupuy	Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Easter	Godin	Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)	Bonin	Bouchard
Irwin	Lalonde	Boudria	Brien
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand	Brushett	Bryden
Mercier	O'Reilly	Bélair	Bélangier
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais	Bélisle	Caccia
Simmons	Walker	Campbell	Cannis
Whelan	Young	Caron	Catterall
		Cauchon	Chamberlain
		Chan	Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)
		Clancy	Cohen
		Collenette	Comuzzi
		Cowling	Culbert
		Daviault	Debien
		de Jong	de Savoye
		DeVillers	Dhaliwal
		Discepola	Dromisky
		Duceppe	Duhamel
		Dumas	Eggleton
		English	Fewchuk
		Fillion	Finestone
		Fiis	Fontana
		Fry	Gagliano
		Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
		Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
		Godfrey	Goodale
		Graham	Guarnieri
		Guay	Harb
		Harvard	Hickey
		Hopkins	Hubbard
		Ianno	Jackson
		Jordan	Karygiannis
		Keyes	Kirkby
		Knutson	Kraft Sloan
		Lastewka	Laurin
		Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
		Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
		Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
		Loney	Loubier
		MacAulay	MacDonald
		MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
		Maheu	Malhi
		Maloney	Manley
		Marchi	Marleau
		Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
		McCormick	McGuire
		McKinnon	McTeague
		McWhinney	Mifflin
		Milliken	Minna
		Mitchell	Murphy
		Murray	Ménard
		Nault	Nunez
		Nunziata	O'Brien
		Pagtakhan	Paradis
		Parrish	Patry
		Payne	Peric
		Peters	Peterson
		Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
		Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
		Pomerleau	Reed
		Regan	Richardson
		Rideout	Riis
		Robichaud	Robillard
		Robinson	Rocheleau
		Rock	Rompkey
		Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
		Shepherd	Sheridan
		Skoke	Speller
		St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
		Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
		Taylor	Telegdi
		Terrana	Thalheimer
		Tobin	Torsney

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 179 negatived. Therefore Motion No. 259 is also negatived.

(2215)

[*Translation*]

The next question is on Motion No. 18.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, before putting the question on the motion you just mentioned, could you seek unanimous consent to apply the vote just completed on Motion No. 179, but in reverse, to Motion No. 220?

Mr. Duceppe: Agreed.

Mr. Silye: Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: By unanimous consent it is so ordered.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 271*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad

Government Orders

Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Valéri
Venne
Volpe
Wappel
Wood

Tremblay (Rosemont)
Vanclief
Verran
Walker
Wells
Zed—180

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Cummins
Epp
Frazier
Gouk
Grubel
Hanrahan
Harper (Simcoe Centre)
Hermanson
Hoepfner
Johnston
Manning
Mayfield
Mills (Red Deer)
Penson
Ringma
Silye
Speaker
Strahl
White (Fraser Valley West)—43

Ablonczy
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bridgman
Duncan
Forseth
Gilmour
Grey (Beaver River)
Hanger
Harper (Calgary West)
Harris
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jennings
Kerpan
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Morrison
Ramsay
Scott (Skeena)
Solberg
Stinson
Thompson

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
Bergeron
Calder
Copps
Crête
Deshaies
Dubé
Easter
Guimond
Irwin
Leroux (Shefford)
Mercier
Proud
Simmons
Whelan

Bachand
Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Canuel
Crawford
Dalphond—Guiral
Discepola
Dupuy
Godin
Harper (Churchill)
Lalonde
Marchand
O'Reilly
Ringuette—Maltais
Walker
Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on Motion No. 18, if you were to seek unanimous consent I think you would find that the Liberal members will be recorded as voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Members of the Bloc Québécois will vote nay on this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yes, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats would vote yea.

The Deputy Speaker: With respect to Motion No. 18 by unanimous consent it is so ordered, as was indicated by the whips.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 266*]

The Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 21. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 22, 33, 34, 36, 47, 57, 72, 74, 80, 89, 90, 171, 172, 227 and 261.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Chair to determine whether five members wish to rise and ask for a recorded division. In other words, if the Chair would seek the yeas and nays, the Speaker might find that members do not wish a recorded vote on this motion for the same reason as the other item earlier today.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

(2220)

Mr. Wappel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of clarification. These are all government amendments. I am in favour of them all except Motion No. 227 which would have the affect of overturning an amendment carried at committee. If I vote in favour of Motion No. 21 can I still vote against Motion No. 227, or am I precluded from doing so?

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to permit the hon. member to vote as he has just outlined?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Speller: Mr. Speaker, I too want to be noted as voting against Motion No. 227.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I would also like it to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227.

Mr. Nault: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227.

Mr. Lee: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227 as well.

Mr. St. Denis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recorded as voting against Motion No. 227. Could I also record that I am in favour of Motion No. 102?

The Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, I would like to record likewise with regard to Motion No. 227, that I would vote against it.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, I would like clarification on the motion. We cannot find it and we do not know what it is. We would like it to be read, please.

Government Orders

The Deputy Speaker: It is Motion No. 21 in Group No 7. Mr. Rock, seconded by Mrs. Marleau, moved:

That clause 9 of Bill C-68 be amended by striking out lines 14 to 21 on page 10 and substituting the following:

"holder to acquire restricted firearms.

Does the hon. whip of the Reform Party want Motion No. 227 read out as well?

Mr. Silye: Yes.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I understood the House to be voting on report stage Motion No. 21. Perhaps the Chair could just ask for the vote on Motion No. 21 and we will deal with it accordingly. The other motion is not even before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. whip of the Reform Party was going to consult. Does he have a further point he wishes to make?

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party is in favour of Motion No. 21 but we are against Motion No. 227 and I do not know why you have Motion No. 227 grouped with Motion No. 21.

The Deputy Speaker: It is a consequential ruling by the Chair that the vote would apply to Motion No. 227 as well, along with a number of others.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of efficiency here I would like to clarify that the Reform Party members will vote yea on Motion No. 21 and nay on Motion No. 227.

(2225)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: The Bloc members will vote in favour of Motion No. 21, but against Motion No. 227.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: Are there any other permutations or combinations?

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, on Motion No. 21 New Democrats would vote yea, but I believe the whip of the government should be informing the House on why Motion No. 227 is not before the House.

The Deputy Speaker: The table officers who have been terrific will try to figure all that out and give us the count on Motions Nos. 21 and 227.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Could you clarify whether we are also voting on Motion No. 227? If that is the case I should like to be recorded as being opposed to Motion No. 227.

The Deputy Speaker: I gather there is no consent to do what we have been trying to do for the last 15 minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, if there is no consent to function as logically as we have just done, I would propose that the whips of each party indicate how the members of their respective parties will vote on Motion No. 21 and the subsequent motions and that the party whips be asked to indicate how their party will vote on Motion No. 227, more specifically.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: The problem has been caused by the fact that in the confusion we were voting on Motion No. 21. The vote on Motion No. 21 also applies to about 15 other motions including Motion No. 227.

Apparently the Table can figure out how we have all voted if the government and all the other party whips will permit us to do the calculation and come back with an answer. Is that acceptable?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, there is some difficulty with what is happening at this point.

We were told that we were voting on report stage Motion No. 21. I believe, if you were to seek it, you would find the respective whips would indicate that probably everyone is voting for that motion.

However the difficulty is the following one. I believe the Chair is seeking, at the request of one member, to split the decision already taken by the Chair earlier today, which would have the effect of voting separately on Motion No. 227 and then on all the other motions grouped in that list of some 10 or 15 motions indicated earlier by Mr. Speaker.

I never understood that we could split a decision made by the Chair. If the Chair could explain that to us we could proceed.

The Deputy Speaker: The point is one that I think can be accepted. The Chair has made a ruling that the vote on Motion No. 21 will apply to all the other ones.

As the whip indicated, the hon. member for Scarborough West wished in effect to vote differently. However we are bound by the ruling of Mr. Speaker and therefore we will have to take a vote, I suppose on Motion No. 21, and it will be applied to all the others as indicated by the ruling of the Chair.

(2230)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, we could certainly quite reasonably follow a logic that does not stand up in order to follow procedure, because we support Motion No. 21 and the subsequent motions, except Motion No. 227. We could, therefore, battle over procedure, and all those watching us this evening would conclude that we are procedural experts rather than people who vote responsibly.

I therefore suggest that the House decide unanimously to vote on Motion No. 21 and the others and to vote on Motion No. 227

separately so we can do this a bit logically and so that people understand what we are doing here tonight.

The Deputy Speaker: Dear colleagues, is there unanimous consent to vote on Motion No. 227 separately?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Deputy Speaker: So we will vote on this motion separately.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, now that we have separated the two matters, I think you could ask the House whether five members wish to rise and ask for a recorded vote on the group of motions you have listed, with the exception of Motion No. 227, which we will vote on shortly.

The Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the motion of the government whip. Do five members wish to rise as indicated?

Some hon. members: No.

[English]

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

As there are no nays, Motion No. 21 is adopted. Accordingly Motions Nos. 22, 33, 34, 36, 47, 57, 72, 74, 80, 89, 90, 171, 172 and 261 are agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 227.

(The House divided on Motion No. 227, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(Division No. 272)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Bellemare
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Boudria
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	de Jong
De Villers	Dhaliwal
Discepolo	Dromisky
Duhamel	Eggleton
English	Fewchuk
Finestone	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Galloway	Gerrard
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hubbard	Jackson

Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Lincoln
Loney	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Minna
Murphy	Murray
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Phinney	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Rompkey	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
Sheridan	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Valeri	Vanclief
Verran	Walker—132

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Arseneault	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bouchard	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Brien	Bélisle
Caron	Culbert
Cummins	Daviault
Debien	de Savoye
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Epp
Fillion	Forseth
Frazier	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gilmour	Gouk
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guay	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Hopkins
Jennings	Johnston
Kerpan	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Loubier	Manning
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	Mills (Red Deer)
Mitchell	Morrison
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	Nunziata
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Ringma
Rocheleau	Sauvageau
Scott (Skeena)	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Speller
St. Denis	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Venne	Wappel
Wells	White (Fraser Valley West)
Wood—85	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphoné—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(2240)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 227 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 26, but there may be some confusion. Do any of the whips wish to make representations?

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, on further consideration, I think the Chair will have to seek the vote directly from the floor.

(The House divided on Motion No. 26, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 273)

YEAS

Members

Hopkins	Mitchell
Murphy	Nault
Shepherd	Speller
St. Denis	Wood—8

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Aithouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Benoit
Bernier (Gaspé)	Bertrand
Bethel	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Bouchard	Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Bridgman	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Cummins

Daviault	Debieu
de Jong	de Savoye
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Discepola	Dromisky
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Eggleton	English
Epp	Fewchuk
Fillion	Finestone
Flis	Fontana
Forseth	Frazer
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	Galloway
Gauthier (Roberval)	Gerrard
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goodale	Gouk
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grey (Beaver River)	Grubel
Guarnieri	Guay
Hanger	Hanrahan
Harb	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Harvard	Hermanson
Hickey	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Ianno
Jackson	Jennings
Johnston	Jordan
Kerpan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Mayfield
McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)	McGuire
McKinnon	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Red Deer)
Minna	Morrison
Murray	Ménard
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Penson	Peric
Peters	Peterson
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Essex—Kent)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pomerleau
Ramsay	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Ringma	Robichaud
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Rompkey	Sauvageau
Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)	Scott (Skeena)
Sheridan	Silye
Skoke	Solberg
Speaker	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
Strahl	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Thompson	Tobin
Torsney	Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
Tremblay (Rosemont)	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Verran	Volpe
Walker	Wappel
White (Fraser Valley West)—213	

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphonde—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

(2250)

Mr. Arseneault: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be registered as voting nay on this motion.

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 26 lost. Consequently Motions Nos. 37, 44, 46, 86, 94 and 96 are also lost.

Perhaps the government whip might indicate whether he thinks Motion No. 32 has been voted on. It appears it has not.

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, in the essence of time and co-operation I believe there would be a disposition to apply the result of the vote just taken on the following motions proposed by the same hon. member: Motions Nos. 32, 48 and 62.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Editor's note: See list under Division No. 273*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 32, 48 and 62 rejected.

The final question is on Motion No. 75. The vote on this motion also applies to Motion No. 83.

(2255)

Mr. Boudria: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who have just voted be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House. Liberal members will be voting yea.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote in favour of this motion.

Mr. Silye: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members vote nay, except for those members who wish to vote otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will vote yea.

The Deputy Speaker: By unanimous consent all those votes are cast as indicated.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 75, which was agreed to on the following division:)

(*Division No. 274*)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Althouse
Anawak	Anderson
Arseneault	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin—Andrew	Bodnar
Bonin	Bouchard
Boudria	Brien
Brown (Oakville—Milton)	Brushett
Bryden	Bélair
Bélanger	Bélisle
Caccia	Campbell
Cannis	Caron
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	Clancy
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Cowling
Culbert	Davault
Debien	de Jong
de Savoye	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Hopkins	Ianno
Jackson	Jordan
Keyes	Kirkby
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)	LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)
Leblanc (Longueuil)	Lee
Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)	Lincoln
Loney	Loubier
MacAulay	MacDonald
MacLaren	MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)
Maheu	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Payne
Peric	Peters
Peterson	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Essex—Kent)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pomerleau	Reed
Regan	Richardson
Rideout	Riis
Robichaud	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Rompkey
Sauvageau	Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)

Government Orders

Shepherd	Sheridan
Skoke	Speller
St. Denis	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Szabo
Taylor	Telegdi
Terrana	Thalheimer
Tobin	Torsney
Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	Tremblay (Rosemont)
Valeri	Vanclicf
Venne	Verran
Volpe	Walker
Wappel	Wood—178

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Ablonczy
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Bridgman
Cummins	Duncan
Epp	Forseth
Frazer	Gilmour
Gouk	Grey (Beaver River)
Grubel	Hanger
Hanrahan	Harper (Calgary West)
Harper (Simcoe Centre)	Harris
Hermanson	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hoepfner	Jennings
Johnston	Kerpan
Manning	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Penson	Ramsay
Ringma	Scott (Skeena)
Silye	Solberg
Speaker	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson
White (Fraser Valley West)—43	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Bachand
Bergeron	Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
Calder	Canuel
Copps	Crawford
Crête	Dalphond—Guiral
Deshaies	Discepola
Dubé	Dupuy
Easter	Godin
Guimond	Harper (Churchill)
Irwin	Lalonde
Leroux (Shefford)	Marchand
Mercier	O'Reilly
Proud	Ringuette—Maltais
Simmons	Walker
Whelan	Young

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 75 agreed to. Consequently Motion No. 83 is also agreed to.

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

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

Some hon. members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

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

(Division No. 275)

YEAS

Members

Adams	Alcock
Allmand	Anawak
Anderson	Arseneault
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bernier (Gaspé)
Bertrand	Bethel
Bevilacqua	Blondin—Andrew
Bodnar	Bonin
Bouchard	Boudria
Brien	Brown (Oakville—Milton)
Brushett	Bryden
Bélair	Bélangier
Bélisle	Caccia
Campbell	Cannis
Caron	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clancy	Cohen
Collenette	Comuzzi
Cowling	Culbert
Daviault	Debien
de Savoye	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Discepola
Dromisky	Duceppe
Duhamel	Dumas
Eggleton	English
Fewchuk	Fillion
Finestone	Flis
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)
Gallaway	Gauthier (Roberval)
Gerrard	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Guay	Harb
Harvard	Hickey
Ianno	Jackson
Jordan	Keyes
Kirkby	Knudson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne (Beauharnois—Salaberry)
LeBlanc (Cape/Cap-Breton Highlands—Canso)	Leblanc (Longueuil)
Lee	Leroux (Richmond—Wolfe)
Lincoln	Loney
Loubier	MacAulay
MacDonald	MacLaren
MacLellan (Cape/Cap-Breton—The Sydneys)	Maheu
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKinnon
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Minna	Mitchell
Murphy	Murray
Ménard	Nault
Nunez	Nunziata
O'Brien	Pagtakhan

Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Peterson
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Reed
 Richardson
 Robichaud
 Robison
 Rock
 Sauvageau
 Sheridan
 Speller
 Stewart (Brant)
 Szabo
 Terrana
 Tobin
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)
 Valeri
 Venne
 Volpe
 Wappel

Parrish
 Payne
 Peters
 Phinney
 Pickard (Essex—Kent)
 Pomerleau
 Regan
 Rideout
 Robillard
 Rocheleau
 Rompkey
 Scott (Fredericton—York—Sunbury)
 Skoke
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Telegdi
 Thalheimer
 Torsney
 Tremblay (Rosemont)
 Vanclief
 Verran
 Walker
 Wells—170

NAYS

Members

Abbott
 Althouse
 Benoit
 Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)
 Bridgman
 Cummins
 Duncan
 Forseth
 Gilmour
 Grey (Beaver River)
 Hanger
 Harper (Calgary West)
 Harris
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hopkins
 Jennings
 Kerpan
 Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
 McClelland (Edmonton Southwest)
 Morrison
 Plamondon
 Riis
 Scott (Skeena)
 Shepherd
 Solberg
 Steckle
 Strahl
 Thompson
 White (Fraser Valley West)

Ablonczy
 Axworthy (Saskatoon—Clark's Crossing)
 Blaikie
 Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Collins
 de Jong
 Epp
 Frazer
 Gouk
 Grubel
 Hanrahan
 Harper (Simcoe Centre)
 Hermanson
 Hoepfner
 Hubbard
 Johnston
 Manning
 Mayfield
 Mills (Red Deer)
 Penson
 Ramsay
 Ringma
 Serré
 Silye
 Speaker
 Stinson
 Taylor
 Ur
 Wood—58

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin
 Bergeron
 Calder
 Copps
 Crête
 Deshaies
 Dubé
 Easter
 Guimond
 Irwin
 Leroux (Shefford)
 Mercier
 Proud
 Simmons
 Whelan

Bachand
 Bernier (Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead)
 Canuel
 Crawford
 Dalphond—Guiral
 Discepolo
 Dupuy
 Godin
 Harper (Churchill)
 Lalonde
 Marchand
 O'Reilly
 Ringuette—Maltais
 Walker
 Young

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

[*English*]

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That this House do now adjourn.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Monday, June 12, 1995

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Firefighters

Mr. Blaikie	13559
Mr. Duhamel	13561
Mr. Laurin	13562
Ms. Bridgman	13563
Mr. Bevilacqua	13565
Mr. Dromisky	13566
Mr. Riis	13567

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Firearms Act

Bill C-68. Report stage	13568
-------------------------------	-------

Speaker's Ruling

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kilger)	13568
---------------------------------------	-------

Motions in amendment

Mr. St. Denis	13568
Motions Nos. 1, 10 and 158	13568
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	13568
Motion No. 167	13568
Mr. Riis	13569
Motion No. 266	13569
Mr. Mitchell	13569
Motion No. 267	13569
Mr. St. Denis	13569
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	13570

Mr. Riis	13572
Mr. Mitchell	13573
Mr. MacLellan	13574
Mrs. Venne	13575
Mr. Speller	13576
Mr. Ramsay	13578
Mr. Bellehumeur	13579
Motions Nos. 5 and 145	13581
Mr. Rock	13581
Mr. MacLellan	13581
Mr. Anawak	13582
Division on motions in Group No. 2 deferred	13582
Mr. Murphy	13582
Motion No. 4.	13582
Mr. Mitchell	13582
Motion No. 6	13582
Mr. Rock	13582
Motion No. 23	13582
Mr. Ramsay	13583
Motions Nos. 24, 28, 29, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 50, 51 and 52	13583
Mr. Rock	13583
Motion No. 54	13583
Mr. Ramsay	13583
Motions Nos. 56, 60, 69, 70, 71 and 73	13583
Mr. Murphy	13584
Motion No. 76	13584
Mr. Ramsay	13584
Motion No. 77	13584
Mr. Rock	13584
Motion No. 78	13584
Mr. Ramsay	13584
Motions Nos. 79, 81, 82, 85, 87, 88 and 91	13584
Mr. Murphy	13584
Motion No. 92	13584
Mr. Ramsay	13584
Motions Nos. 95, 97, 98, 99, 100 and 101	13584
Mr. Rock	13585

Motion No. 103	13585
Mr. Ramsay	13585
Motions Nos. 104, 105, 106 and 108.	13585
Mr. Rock	13585
Motion No. 109	13585
Mr. Ramsay	13585
Motion No. 110	13585
Mr. Rock	13585
Motion No. 111	13585
Mr. Ramsay	13585
Motions Nos. 112 and 113	13585
Mr. Murphy	13585
Motion No. 154	13585
Mr. Ramsay	13585
Motions Nos. 170, 207, 215, 216, 218, 224 and 225	13585
Mr. Murphy	13586
Mr. Mitchell	13587

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Public Service Awards of Excellence

Mr. Murphy	13587
------------------	-------

Canadian Occupational Health and Safety Week

Mr. Landry	13588
------------------	-------

Robert Paul Thompson

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	13588
--------------------------------------	-------

Robert Sherren

Mr. Pillitteri	13588
----------------------	-------

George P. Morrison

Mr. Wells	13588
-----------------	-------

Scott Edward Goodridge

Mrs. Payne	13588
------------------	-------

Status of Women

Mrs. Gagnon (Québec) 13589

Floods

Mr. Solberg 13589

Transport Canada

Mr. Blaikie 13589

The Environment

Ms. Augustine 13589

The Philippines

Mr. Pagtakhan 13590

National Public Service Week

Mr. English 13590

Quebec Sovereignty

Mr. de Savoye 13590

Liberal Party of Canada

Mr. Hermanson 13590

Gun Control

Ms. Bethel 13591

Nigeria

Mr. Flis 13591

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Unemployment Insurance**

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) 13591

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 13591

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval) 13591

Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice) 13591

Mr. Gauthier (Roberval)	13591
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13592
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	13592
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13592
Mrs. Gagnon (Québec)	13592
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13592

Code of Ethics

Mr. Manning	13592
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13592
Mr. Manning	13593
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13593
Mr. Manning	13593
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13593

Unemployment Insurance

Mr. Caron	13593
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13594
Mr. Caron	13594
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13594

Minister of Canadian Heritage

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	13594
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13594
Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast)	13594
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13594

Human Rights

Mrs. Debien	13594
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13595
Mrs. Debien	13595
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	13595

Pensions

Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	13595
Mr. Eggleton	13595
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	13595
Mr. Eggleton	13595

Job Creation

Mr. Fillion	13595
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13596
Mr. Fillion	13596
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13596

Income Tax

Mr. Shepherd	13596
Mr. Anderson	13596

The Economy

Mr. Grubel	13596
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13596
Mr. Grubel	13597
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	13597

Bovine Somatotropin

Mrs. Picard	13597
Ms. Marleau	13597
Mrs. Picard	13597
Ms. Marleau	13597

Unemployment Insurance

Mrs. Ablonczy	13597
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13597
Mrs. Ablonczy	13597
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	13597

Fisheries

Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	13598
Mr. Tobin	13598

Bosnia

Mr. Jacob	13598
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	13598

Indonesia

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	13598
---	-------

Mr. Ouellet 13598

Indian Affairs

Mr. Riis 13598

Mr. Anawak 13599

Law of the Sea Convention

Mr. Caccia 13599

Mr. Ouellet 13599

Presence in Gallery

The Speaker 13599

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Committees of the House

Public Accounts

Mr. Bélisle 13599

Petitions

Parole

Ms. Meredith 13599

Parole

Mrs. Brown (Calgary Southeast) 13599

Census

Mr. Silye 13600

Gun control

Mr. Ramsay 13600

Landed immigrants

Mr. Caccia 13600

Human rights

Mr. Harb 13600

Human Rights

Mr. MacDonald 13600

Assisted suicide

Mr. Hubbard 13600

Gun control

Ms. Skoke 13600

Rights of the unborn

Ms. Skoke 13600

Criminal Code

Ms. Skoke 13600

Parole

Mr. Riis 13600

Detention orders

Mr. Abbott 13601

Questions Passed as Orders for Return

Mr. Milliken 13601

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Firearms Act

Bill C-68. Consideration resumed of report stage and on Motions Nos. 4, 6, 23, 24, 28, 29, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 60, 69, 70, 71, 73, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 85, 87, 88, 91, 92, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 154, 170, 207, 215, 216, 218, 224, 225, 13602

Mr. Mitchell 13602

Mr. MacLellan 13602

Mr. Ramsay 13604

Mr. Anawak 13605

Mr. Thompson 13606

Mr. Szabo 13607

Divisions on Group No. 3 motions deferred	13609
Motion No. 7	13609
Mr. Bellehumeur	13609
Motions Nos. 8, 9, 11, 12 and 35	13609
Mr. Ramsay	13609
Motion No. 133	13609
Mr. Bellehumeur	13609
Motions Nos. 134, 136 through 144, 146, 147, 163, 164, 165 and 166	13610
Mr. Ramsay	13610
Motion No. 173	13613
Mr. Bellehumeur	13613
Motions Nos. 174 and 175	13613
Mr. Ramsay	13613
Motions Nos. 176, 177 and 178	13613
Ms. Meredith	13613
Motion No. 179	13613
Mr. Ramsay	13613
Motion No. 180	13613
Ms. Meredith	13613
Motion No. 181	13613
Mr. Bellehumeur	13613
Motion No. 182	13613
Mr. Rock	13613
Motion No. 183	13614
Mr. Murphy	13614
Motion No. 184	13614
Mr. Ramsay	13614
Motions Nos. 185 and 186	13614
Mr. Rock	13614
Motion No. 187	13614
Mr. Ramsay	13614
Motion No. 188	13614
Mr. Rock	13614
Motion No. 189	13614
Mr. Ramsay	13614
Motion No. 190	13614
Mr. Rock	13614

Motions Nos. 191 and 192	13614
Mr. Ramsay	13614
Motion No. 193	13614
Mr. Rock	13614
Motions Nos. 194 and 195	13615
Ms. Meredith	13615
Motions Nos. 196 and 197	13615
Mr. Ramsay	13615
Motion No. 198	13615
Mr. Bellehumeur	13615
Motion No. 199	13615
Mr. Ramsay	13615
Motion No. 200	13615
Mr. Bellehumeur	13615
Motion No. 201	13615
Mrs. Venne	13615
Motions Nos. 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 208, 210, 212, 213 and 214	13615
Mr. Ramsay	13615
Motions Nos. 220 and 221	13615
Mr. Rock	13615
Motion No. 222	13616
Mr. Bellehumeur	13616
Motion No. 223	13616
Mr. Ramsay	13616
Motion No. 228	13616
Mr. Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	13616
Motion No. 230	13616
Mrs. Venne	13616
Motion No. 231	13616
Ms. Meredith	13616
Motion No. 232	13616
Mrs. Venne	13616
Motion No. 233	13616
Ms. Meredith	13616
Motion No. 234	13617
Mrs. Venne	13617
Motion No. 235	13617

Ms. Meredith	13617
Motion No. 236	13617
Mrs. Venne	13617
Motion No. 237	13617
Ms. Meredith	13617
Motion No. 238	13617
Mrs. Venne	13617
Motions Nos. 239, 240 and 241	13617
Ms. Meredith	13617
Motion No. 242	13617
Mrs. Venne	13617
Motions Nos. 243 and 244	13617
Ms. Meredith	13617
Motion No. 245	13617
Mrs. Venne	13617
Motions Nos. 246 and 247	13617
Ms. Meredith	13617
Motion No. 248	13617
Mrs. Venne	13617
Motions Nos. 249 and 250	13617
Ms. Meredith	13617
Motion No. 251	13617
Mrs. Venne	13617
Motions Nos. 252 and 253	13617
Ms. Meredith	13617
Motion No. 254	13618
Mrs. Venne	13618
Motions Nos. 255 and 256	13618
Ms. Meredith	13618
Motions Nos. 259, 264 and 265	13618
Mr. Ramsay	13618
Mr. Bellehumeur	13618
Mr. Ramsay	13619
Ms. Meredith	13620
Mr. MacLellan	13621
Mrs. Venne	13622
Mr. Brien	13624

Mr. Abbott	13625
Mr. Fillion	13626
Mr. Hanrahan	13627
Mr. Laurin	13629
Mr. Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)	13629
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	13631
Mr. Nunez	13632
Mr. Speaker (Lethbridge)	13633
Mr. Szabo	13634
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	13636

Business of the House

The House resumed consideration of the motion.	13636
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 174; Nays, 48	13636

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Firearms Act

Bill C-68. Consideration resumed of report stage; and of the motions in Group No. 4.	13637
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	13637
Mrs. Jennings	13638
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	13640
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	13641
Mr. Boudria	13642
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	13644
Divisions on Group No. 4 motions deferred	13644
Mr. Ramsay	13644
Motions Nos. 13, 14, 38, 209, 211, 217, 219, 258, 260 and 262	13644
Divisions on Group No. 5 motions deferred	13644
Mr. Ramsay	13645
Motion No. 15	13645
Mrs. Venne	13645
Motion No. 16	13645
Mr. Ramsay	13645
Motion No. 17	13645

Mr. Rock	13645
Motion No. 18	13645
Mr. Hubbard	13645
Motion No. 93	13645
Mr. St. Denis	13645
Motion No. 102	13645
Divisions on Group No. 6 motions deferred	13645
Mr. Rock	13645
Motions Nos. 21, 22, 33, 34, 36, 47, 57, 72, 74, 80, 89, 90, 171, 172, 227 and 261	13645
Divisions on Group No. 7 motions deferred	13646
Mr. Ramsay	13646
Motion No. 25	13646
Mr. St. Denis	13646
Motion No. 27	13646
Mr. Rock	13646
Motion No. 159	13646
Mr. Ramsay	13647
Motions Nos. 160 and 168	13647
Mr. Rock	13647
Motion No. 169	13647
Mr. Ramsay	13647
Motion No. 226	13647
Divisions on Group No. 8 motions deferred	13647
Mr. St. Denis	13647
Motions Nos. 26, 37, 44, 46, 86, 94 and 96	13647
Divisions on Group No. 9 motions deferred	13647
Mr. Ramsay	13647
Motions Nos. 30 and 31.	13647
Mr. St. Denis	13648
Motion No. 32	13648
Mr. Ramsay	13648
Motions Nos. 114 to 132	13648
Mr. St. Denis	13648
Motion No. 148	13648
Mr. Brien	13648
Motion No. 149	13648
Mr. Crête	13648

Motion No. 150	13648
Mr. Ramsay	13648
Motion No. 151	13648
Mr. Crête	13648
Motion No. 152	13648
Mr. St. Denis	13648
Motion No. 153	13648
Mr. Ramsay	13649
Motions Nos. 155, 156, 157, 161, 162 and 263	13649
Divisions on Group No. 10 motions deferred	13649
Mr. St. Denis	13649
Motion No. 48	13649
Mr. Ramsay	13649
Motions Nos. 53 and 61	13649
Mr. Murphy	13649
Motion No. 62	13649
Mr. Ramsay	13649
Motions Nos. 63 and 64	13649
Mr. Murphy	13649
Motion No. 65	13649
Mr. Ramsay	13649
Motion No. 66	13649
Mr. Murphy	13649
Motions Nos. 67 and 68	13649
Mr. Rock	13650
Motions Nos. 75 and 83	13650
Mrs. Venne	13650
Motions Nos. 84 and 135	13650
Mr. Ramsay	13650
Motions Nos. 229 and 257	13650
Divisions on Group No. 11 motions deferred	13650
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 96; Nays, 123.	13651
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 17; Nays, 209	13652
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 39; Nays, 187	13654
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 50; Nays, 177	13655
Motion No. 167 negated on division: Yeas, 50; Nays, 175	13656
Motion negated on division: Yeas, 86; Nays, 137	13657

Motion No. 5 agreed on division: Yeas, 152; Nays, 74	13658
Motion No. 145 agreed to on division: Yeas, 153; Nays, 71.	13659
Motion Nos. 4, 6 and 154 negatived on division: Yeas, 60; Nays, 163	13660
(Motion No. 23 agreed to.)	13661
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 49; Nays, 173	13662
Motions Nos. 50, 41, 42, 45, 87, 88, 8, 174, 187, 189, 191, 197, 199, 223, 134, 136, 146, 147, 164, 166, 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 196, 202, 228, 231, 240, 13, 15, 17, 93, 102, 25, 27, 160, 31, 161, 53, 61, 66,	13662
Motion No. 78 agreed to on division: Yeas, 173; Nays,49	13663
Motions Nos. 109, 111 and 169 agreed to.	13664
Motion No. 54 agreed to on division: Yeas, 180; Nays,42	13664
Motion No. 103 agreed to	13666
Motions Nos. 220 and 75 agreed to	13666
Motion No. 7 negatived on division: Yeas, 34; Nays, 189	13666
Motion No. 200, 148, 149 and 150 negatived	13667
Motion No. 184 negatived on division: Yeas, 77; Nays, 146	13667
Motions Nos. 35, 165, 239, 16, 30, and 155 negatived	13668
Motion No. 182 agreed to on division: Yeas, 195; nays, 28	13668
Motion negatived on division: Yeas, 2; Nays, 220	13670
Motion No. 186 agreed to on division: Yeas, 152; Nays, 71	13671
Motions Nos. 20 negatived on division: Yeas, 28; Nays, 195	13672
Motion No. 179 negatived on division: Yeas, 43; Nays, 180	13673
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 180; Nays, 43	13674
Motion No. 18 agreed to.	13674
Motion No. 21 agreed to.	13677
Motion No. 227 agreed to on division: Yeas, 132; Nays, 85	13677
Motion No. 26 negatived on division: Yeas, 8; Nays, 213.	13678
Motions Nos. 32, 48 and 62 negatived	13679
Motion No. 75 agreed to on division: Yeas, 178; Nays, 43	13679
Motion for concurrence	13680
Mr. Rock	13680
Motion agreed to on division: Yeas, 170; Nays, 58	13680

(Motion agreed to.) 13681

Motion to Adjourn

Mr. Gray 13681