



CANADA

# House of Commons Debates

---

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 041 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

---

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

**Monday, December 1, 1997**

**Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent**

## CONTENTS

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

All parliamentary publications are available on the  
“Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire” at the following address:

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

# HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, December 1, 1997

The House met at 11 a.m.

---

*Prayers*

---

• (1100)

[*English*]

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House at this time to move the following motion:

• (1105)

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of this House, the bill in the name of the Minister of Labour, entitled an act to provide for the resumption of continuation of postal services, shall be disposed as follows:

1. Commencing when this order is adopted and concluding when the said bill is read a third time, the House shall not adjourn except pursuant to a motion by a minister of the crown and no Private Members' Business shall be taken up;
2. The bill may be read twice or thrice in the same sitting;
3. After being read a second time, the said bill shall be referred to a committee of the whole;
4. During the consideration of the said bill no division may be deferred.

**The Speaker:** Does the hon. minister have the unanimous consent of the House to move the motion?

**Some hon. members:** No.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[*English*]

### ACCESS TO INFORMATION ACT

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.)** moved that Bill C-216, an act to amend the Access to Information Act (crown corporations), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my private member's bill has a very simple concept. Crown corporations are split; some crown corporations are subject to access to information and others are not. That is basically the crux of the bill.

The Access to Information Act was passed in 1983 and gives Canadians broad legal rights to get information from crown corporations and federal government institutions. The institutions then have 30 days to respond to those requests.

However, many crown corporations are exempt from the Access to Information Act. I will list a number of them. The Canadian Development Investment Corporation and Canada Lands Company are both exempt. Canada Lands Company is the federal arm that sells federal real estate. Why should it be exempt from access to information? This does not make any sense. It is selling Canadian assets.

Canada Post Corporation is also exempt. Why should it be exempt? I had a letter from André Ouellet, the head of Canada Post, objecting to my bill, saying that Canada Post is open and accessible in front of committees. I happened to be the Reform member on the public works committee in the last Parliament and we had members of Canada Post Corporation in front of us. They were anything but open. We were trying to get the subsidy on the 45 cent stamp whether it was going over to Purolator. We just wanted the straight facts on how much of the 45 cent stamp goes to Purolator. Canada Post simply refused to answer. However, the letter I received from the head stated it was very open.

I have introduced this bill because it would open up Canada Post to the Access to Information Act.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is another one. Why should CBC not be subject to access to information? It should have its books opened up. The Canadian National Railway is also exempt. The Canadian Wheat Board is an interesting one because there is legislation before the House now that would take the wheat board out of the exemption status and put it into the area where Canadians can get information.

The Cape Breton Development Corporation, Enterprise Cape Breton Corporation, Halifax Port Corporation and Montreal Port Corporation are also exempt.

*Private Members' Business*

• (1110)

This is interesting. Why would Montreal and Halifax be exempt, and yet there are a number of other ports where there is access? This whole area is a dog's breakfast because some are open and some are not.

All my bill would do is make all crown corporations subject to access to information. There are a number of other members in this House who have different access to information private members' bills in, two on the government side and two on the opposition side that I am aware of.

This shows Canadians' interest in having the government accountable, government corporations, the federal departments open so that Canadians can access them, can find out what is going on inside.

This is not a closed club. This is just Canadians' money, Canadians wanting to know what is going on. My bill is votable. I am looking forward to the day when we can all stand up in this House and vote for it because I think it is a bill that has broad acceptance right across the floor, right around this House.

The reason this bill is put forward is to enhance public confidence in our government. Confidence in government institutions is dwindling.

In the last session of Parliament the auditor general published a scathing report on the operation of crown corporations on October 5, 1995. The auditor general is saying that crown corporations need to clean up their act.

Their problems were either in corporate and strategic planning or performance in measurement and reporting. Crown corporations need to be brought up. They need to be enhanced so they are accountable to the public.

I mentioned Canada Post. The government refused to put Canada Post forward for access to information in the last Parliament. Yet the Radwanski report, the report that did a detailed study of Canada Post, recommended that in fact Canada Post be open to access. The government failed to take that advice.

It is taxpayer money in these corporations that we are talking about. It is not some business or whatever. There would also have to be, in my mind, some cushions. For example, if there is a crown corporation that is in the open market, there would have to be some cushion that would allow that corporation to not divulge all its information if it is competing with a private enterprise because it has to be a level playing field.

It could not be allowed to open everything up so that the other corporation is private but then get into its market. There are some stumbling blocks. They are not stumbling blocks but little bumps on the road that need to be ironed out.

I would like to go over some of the corporations that I was talking about before. These corporations are already open. The Bank of Canada is open to access. CMHC and Canada Ports are open.

As I was saying earlier, Canada Ports is free for access, yet the Halifax port is not. It is just all over the place so that if we go through the list it makes absolutely no sense why one corporation, a port particularly, is not available and yet another one is.

**An hon. member:** You have my support.

**Mr. Bill Gilmour:** This member says that I have support. That is two votes. We are really adding up here. The clock is just ticking ahead and we are very early in the game.

**An hon. member:** Three.

**Mr. Bill Gilmour:** Do I hear four? This is moving ahead very quickly. I am not going to elaborate greatly on this because the bill is so simple. In fact, there are about five words in the whole bill that basically change crown corporations from being split the way they are, some accessible, access to information, and others not.

My bill simply makes all crown corporations open to access. I think it is a good bill. I think it is a bill that will be supported broadly across this House. I hope, particularly, that the government side sees this as the way to go.

**Mr. Ovid L. Jackson (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak today on the bill by the hon. member.

First of all, I would like to thank the members of my riding of Bruce—Grey for returning me to Parliament. I came to this country in 1966 with my family, my wife Verona, my daughter Sonja, who was six months old at the time, and my son Andrew. I knew it was one of the best countries in the world. It has certainly proven itself to be so.

• (1115)

I was a high school teacher and in 1968 I moved to Owen Sound and entered public life. I did so because I wanted to make a difference, to make the community better. I became a Liberal member because of the programs of the Liberal Party of caring for the aged, the young, health care and education.

There is no question that sometimes when I am sitting in the House I am reminded of my old classroom days. I taught auto mechanics to a young man named John Garvey who is now one of the best mechanics we have in our city. I had many conversations with him about his future and his career. I had conversations with many young men in the locker room after a basketball game, such as Kevin Belbeck who is now a veterinarian and has a good life.

*Private Members' Business*

On June 2, I was reminded by the arrival of my grand-daughter, Haley Jackson Bruin, a member of the next generation of the Jackson family of this great country of ours. I know her future will be sustained because we in the House, the highest court in the land, do a good job with our human and material resources.

Bill C-216 tabled by the hon. member for Nanaimo—Alberni is one that I cannot support. The hon. member's bill will redefine the current definition of government institution in section 3 of the Access to Information Act to mean any department or ministry of state of the Government of Canada listed on schedule I, any body or office listed on schedule I, or any crown corporation as defined in the Financial Administration Act.

In effect the bill would redefine government institution in the Access to Information Act to include all crown corporations. A weighty proposal, indeed, and one which warrants thorough examination.

Passed in 1983, the act gave Canadians a broad legal right to information recorded in any form under the control of most federal institutions. Access rights are not absolute. They are subject to specific and limited exemptions, balancing the freedom of information against individual privacy, commercial confidentiality and national security. The hon. member's bill would alter that balance.

Some 27 crown corporations are already subject to the act. We recognize in principle that crown corporations can be subject to the act. For example, the Bank of Canada and Canada Post are subject to the act, while Atomic Energy of Canada Limited is not.

Bill C-216 would snare all crown corporations under the Access to Information Act. It assumes no difference in purpose among crown corporations. It does not consider the different environments in which they operate and it makes no allowances for the different demands placed upon crown corporations.

Canada's crown corporations operate at arm's length from the government in providing services to Canadians. They do so within the market in competition with private interests as the sole actor in a given area. Therefore not all crown corporations operate in the same environment or under the same conditions.

Those crown corporations that operate within the market do so in a competitive setting. The market is useful in allocating certain goods and services, but it is not perfect. A public presence helps ensure the delivery of goods and services to Canadians where delivery through private sector alone is found wanting.

We must ask ourselves how Bill C-216 would affect crown corporations operating in the market. By placing all crown corporations without exception under the Access to Information Act, the

bill would put requirements on crown corporations that are not placed on private sector competitors.

• (1120 )

Bill C-216 will place crown corporations at a competitive disadvantage. The Access to Information Act requires that government institutions respond to access to information requests within 30 days. Time, personnel and other resources will be devoted in order to comply. This is understood. However the free market operates within a slim market for its expenses. Bill C-216 would force crown corporations to spend time, money and energy answering questions that their competitors are not required to answer.

Canadians want crown corporations to compete under fair and equitable conditions. Under the bill a competitor could bind a crown corporation in endless requests for information, putting a drain on time, people and finances that no private competitor would have to endure. Under Bill C-216 a competitor could obtain vital business information about a crown corporation with no obligation to reciprocate by disclosing similar material in return.

Atomic Energy of Canada Limited is an example of a crown corporation that operates in a highly competitive environment. It competes on a commercial basis in the marketplace and should be treated the same as its competitors. AECL is thus able to protect its sensitive commercial information as well as commercial information received from global customers and partner companies. If AECL or Canada Post were unable to protect confidential commercial information from competitors, its ability to compete could be seriously affected.

The hon. member's Bill C-216 would jeopardize equal treatment in the marketplace for AECL, Canada Post and other crown corporations. Has the hon. member consulted crown corporations on the bill? Does he not believe in fair and equal treatment in the marketplace, or would he prefer that all crown corporations simply withdraw altogether from the market?

Those who speak on behalf of Bill C-216 may use the language of accountability and transparency, but by putting conditions on crown corporations that are not placed on private companies they show disdain for or at least misunderstanding of the idea of a public presence in the marketplace.

This is a great House where we can debate and discuss ideas. The hon. member must have felt some things could be changed when he drafted the bill. These things could happen if the government wanted to do so. However, as I have explained, his bill would jeopardize a lot of the business the Government of Canada is trying to do for people. We already have built-in mechanisms and ministers report to the House on these matters.

*Private Members' Business*

[Translation]

**Ms. Jocelyne Girard-Bujold (Jonquière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honour for me to represent the people of Jonquière, who elected me in the last election and expect greater transparency in their government institutions.

I am pleased, therefore, to inform you that the Bloc Québécois is in favour of Bill C-216, an Act to amend the Access to Information Act, presented by my colleague for Nanaimo—Alberni.

This bill is aimed at broadening application of the Access to Information Act to include crown corporations as defined by the Financial Administration Act, making them more accessible to the people of Quebec and of Canada, and requiring them to be answerable for their administration.

The Bloc Québécois cannot do otherwise than to approve this bill, in the name of democratic principles, the taxpayer's right to know, and our desire to see greater transparency in the administration of public affairs.

I will remind my colleagues in this House that the Access to Information Act was passed in 1982 and implemented the following year. This act obliged governmental institutions to give access to their documents.

• (1125)

I will pass over the exceptions to access to information in order to address our primary concern, which is the fact that a number of crown corporations are not subject to this act. On numerous occasions during the 35th Parliament, the Bloc Québécois has spoken out on having the Access to Information Act apply to all publicly funded government institutions.

For those of you who were in this House during the previous Parliament, I will remind you that the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques tabled a motion, Motion No. 260 to be precise, which read as follows:

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

That motion was passed unanimously on April 15, 1997.

I would remind you, to guide us in our reflection on Bill C-216, that all of the arguments around Motion No. 260 focused on broadening the scope of the Privacy Act and the Access to Information Act.

Each of us can take the statement of principle adopted by the House as an invitation to move to another stage in amending the Access to Information Act. The Bloc Québécois is not the only one to argue for broadening of the Access to Information Act. We can go back as far as 1987, when the Standing Committee on Justice

and the Solicitor General recommended that crown corporations be more accountable.

The committee recommended that the Access to Information Act and the Privacy Act be extended to include crown corporations and wholly owned subsidiaries that appear in the Treasury Board's annual report to Parliament on crown corporations and joint ventures.

In principle, the committee wanted the Access to Information Act to be applied to crown corporations in which the government had controlling interest and which provided the public with goods and services on a commercial or semi-commercial basis.

The committee's recommendations are unequivocal. The commercial nature of certain corporations is no reason to exclude them from the provisions of the bill before us. In fact, the Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General felt that the legitimate secrets of these corporations would be properly protected by the various exceptions provided by the Access to Information Act.

In this regard, sections 18 and 20, which concern issues relating to Canada's economic interests and disclosure of trade secrets, provide for such exceptions. I do not agree with the viewpoint we will no doubt hear expressed on this sort of argument, which I consider without merit.

We will recall that John Grace, the commissioner of information in 1993-94, recommended extending the Access to Information Act to cover all federal institutions, including crown corporations.

What is more, the crown corporations are covered by the Official Languages Act since its enactment in 1969. In addition, subsidiaries established under federal law, which are the exclusive property of crown corporations, come under the Financial Administration Act since its amendment in 1984. So, there are precedents for Bill C-216.

A number of questions have been raised regarding the Canada Post Corporation's operations and its funding. There is a flagrant lack of transparency. Many Canadians and Quebeckers think that the government should be more actively involved in supervising Canada Post in the public interest.

• (1130)

Extending the Access to Information Act to Canada Post would allow us, parliamentarians, to make the corporation accountable for its overall administration, about which we hardly know anything. And this is but one instance where parliamentarians have very little information to work from in answering the numerous inquiries from their constituents.

All in all, 15 years after its coming into effect, it is high time for the government to broaden the scope of the Access to Information Act as provided for in Bill C-216.

Many taxpayers wonder about the enormous salaries paid to crown corporation executives, as social programs are being slashed. No wonder they are sceptical.

Too many Quebeckers and Canadians are disillusioned by federal institutions, public administration and politicians. The time has come to change tack and show our commitment to the democratic values of our society. A relationship of trust must be restored between governments and the public, and I sincerely believe that passing the bill before us would be a positive step in this direction.

I therefore ask my hon. colleagues in the House of Commons to carefully consider the merits of the proposed amendments and support this bill aimed at broadening the Access to Information Act to include crown corporations.

[English]

**Mr. John Bryden (Wentworth—Burlington, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to get this debate on track immediately.

I obviously support Bill C-216. I think it is an excellent bill in every way, and very important right now. However, this morning when I arrived at my office, the effect of Bill C-216 was clearly felt because on my desk were representations by letter from the CBC and Atomic Energy of Canada Limited complaining that this bill, if passed into law, would be a serious threat to their competitive position and other things.

Let's just get it straight for everyone. Section 18 of the existing Access to Information Act fully protects the competitive position of any government institution. I will read a section from that. Section 18 states: "The head of a government institution", which could be CBC or AECL "can refuse to disclose any record requested under the act that contains trade secrets or financial, commercial, scientific or technical information that belongs to a government institution and has substantial value".

Furthermore, in subsection (b) of section 18 it states that the "government institution can refuse to disclose information that can be reasonably expected to prejudice the competitive position of a government institution".

I have the greatest respect for the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, the hon. member for Bruce—Grey, but the reality is that the current Access to Information Act fully protects an institution's competitive position.

If you go further through section 18 you will find other provisions. In fact, it is too broad because it does not put a monetary value on the commercial information that belongs to the government institution. It should, and I think an amendment is in order there. Let's get it straight from the outset that there is no problem with respect to the competitive position of Canada Post or

anyone else. That is a red herring. It is a red herring that has been around for years and it is time we were done with it.

Second, I received a letter from the CBC and it raised an additional concern, that we should hesitate with regard to applying the Access to Information Act to an organization like the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. It brought up the question of journalistic integrity.

I have been a journalist for a long time, both as a reporter and as an editor, and I cannot say that I can remember a single instance in which I received or sent a note that I was not willing to let the public see. Journalists are like politicians.

● (1135 )

The reality is that neither journalists nor politicians want to do anything that is improper. When we talk about journalistic integrity, we mean not only what is open and public but also what is not open and public. There should be nothing in journalism that should not be available to the public to read. There may be some things that would cause embarrassment, but that is another case entirely.

I cannot see the problem of opening up the CBC to the Access to Information Act. There may be an argument that the journalists receive all kinds of information in confidence from the people they talk to. Indeed, editors and reporters do discuss with individuals in confidence when they are preparing stories.

Section 19 of the current Access to Information Act covers that as well. It says that a government institution may refuse to disclose any information which is considered personal information under section 3 of the Privacy Act.

I happen to have that section 3 of the Privacy Act. I will not read all of the types of personal information protected by the Privacy Act and consequently would be protected under the Access to Information Act, but section (b) says it would be information relating to the medical, criminal or employment history of an individual. Another section says correspondence sent to a government institution by the individual is implicitly confidential and the views and opinions of another individual about the individual.

When we examine that section of the Privacy Act which is covered by the Access to Information Act, we realize that a journalist and an MP for that matter in dealing in a confidential manner with the public, those confidential dealings would be excluded under the Access to Information Act.

The CBC has no case for exclusions under the act because the act already provides for the type of concerns the CBC might raise. On the other hand, what would we get if the Access to Information Act did apply to the CBC or AECL? What would we get access to? We might get access to records that deal with mismanagement. We might get access to records that deal with nepotism. I understand

*Private Members' Business*

from some of my sources that nepotism is a little bit of a problem in the CBC. We might get access to records that deal with laziness or political correctness. I bet the CBC has a problem with political correctness.

Would we not as parliamentarians and the public love to see documents pertaining to political correctness. What it boils down to is this. We cannot regulate institutions whether they are for profit government institutions or whatever unless we have transparency. We cannot have accountability without transparency. We must have a certain level of confidentiality.

In the Access to Information Act there is plenty of provision for that and maybe too much. The important thing is for open government. An institution that proclaims itself to be an institution of integrity should be willing to have much of its documents open to the public so that we the taxpayer, the MPs who are actually paying the salary of the CBC, can see whether its is running as efficiently as it should.

I support Bill C-216. I think every member of this House should get inside.

**Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in this House today to speak on private members Bill C-216, an act to amend the Access to Information Act with respect to crown corporations.

My party has always favoured more openness and transparency in government. It is important for taxpayers to know how their government is spending their money. It is important for Canadians to understand what are the priorities of their parliament and how the bureaucracy is implementing the government's agenda.

This bill raises a new issue. Should the Access to Information Act be extended to include crown corporations as defined under the Financial Administration Act? Some crown corporations are already subject to the Access to Information Act such as Canada Mortgage and House Corporation. Others such as Canada Post and Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. are not. The argument made most often by these companies is that because they are subject to competitive pressures of the marketplace, they should be exempt from the access act. Their legitimate fear is their competitors will use the act to obtain sensitive competitive information which could be used to undermine the corporation's competitive advantage.

• (1140)

I phoned the information commissioner's office not long ago to try to resolve these competing interests. What I learned is that under section 18 of the Access to Information Act government institutions can exempt competitively sensitive information. Here

is what the act says: "The head of a government institution may refuse to disclose any record requested under this act that contains (a) trade secrets or financial, commercial, scientific or technical information that belongs to the Government of Canada or a government institution and has substantial value or is reasonably likely to have substantial value; (b) information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to prejudice the competitive position of a government institution".

It goes on to also exclude "information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to be materially injurious to the financial interests of the Government of Canada".

Section 18 then may offer exemptions significant enough under the act that crown corporations would be able to comply with the act without having to disclose sensitive competitive information.

These are issues which must be resolved before a change to the Access to Information Act can be contemplated. In principle we support this bill subject to some changes which I foresee as necessary to protect the integrity of the crown corporations.

**Mr. Jerry Pickard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the bill before us in the House seeks to make all crown corporations subject to the Access to Information Act.

When the hon. member introduced his bill he mentioned that crown corporations such as Canada Post, among others, should be subject to the Access to Information Act in order to make them accountable. He also mentioned that crown corporations are exempt from the act even though they are subsidized by the taxpayers of Canada.

I found his comments very interesting because I have a special interest in Canada Post as the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works and Government Services who happens to hold the responsibility for Canada Post.

I would therefore like to concentrate my remarks on the impact the proposed amendments would have on Canada Post Corporation. First, let me put to rest a fundamental misconception. I am happy to inform the hon. member that since 1988 Canada Post Corporation has not received a single cent of taxpayers' support.

How did it accomplish this impressive feat? It did it because of the direction provided by the Liberal government that created Canada Post Corporation back in 1981. I mentioned before in 1981 Canada Post was incorporated for the purpose of operating on a self-sustaining financial basis. As one of the few crown corporations under the Financial Administration Act, it is recognized that Canada Post operates in a competitive environment. It also is

recognized by members on this side of the House that it is not dependent on the appropriations of the Canadian government.

The hon. member said that Canada Post Corporation needs to be open and accountable and I have to say that it is entirely that position this government supports. However, if one looks at the facts, one sees that it is already the case at Canada Post. One only has to read Canada Post's annual statement this year to see that the crown corporation is committed to these principles in both its operation and financial reporting.

Actually the front page of the report says "A Look Inside Our Business". If the hon. member had taken time to read the report he would have noticed that Canada Post Corporation has its results on a segmented basis and includes an opinion from an independent auditor confirming Canada Post does not cross-subsidize competitive services with revenues from basic letter service.

• (1145)

The report also provides a detailed discussion of the financial results to the highest standard, that required of publicly listed companies. Canada Post is in fact far more open to public scrutiny than its competitors and that is because of this government's commitment to openness.

Since October 1, 1997 Canadians can count on an additional level of accountability at Canada Post with the appointment of a Canada Post ombudsman who will provide an independent avenue for customers whose issues or problems cannot be resolved through normal channels.

As I mentioned earlier, Canada Post has a commercial mandate. This mandate was reconfirmed recently when Canada Post underwent a review of its mandate. In its final response to the Canada Post mandate review, the government confirmed that the corporation requires a commercial mandate in order to ensure that Canadians enjoy a universal postal service.

The private sector competes with many of the services offered by Canada Post. Having financial objectives comparable to that of the private sector, Canada Post cannot successfully continue to meet its mandate if it cannot compete on a level playing field with its competitors.

A Federal Express spokesman appearing before a Canada Post mandate review committee in 1996 highlighted the concern that all companies operating in competitive markets have in regard to access to proprietary information. He said, "I would obviously love to see Canada Post's detailed financial information but I do not think it is fair because, should I see it, then our competitors ought to see mine". I am in favour of fairness, but what the hon. member is proposing is obviously not fair. Even the Federal Express employee recognized this.

### *Private Members' Business*

The government must have regard to public interest. In many of the markets in which Canada Post participates, it faces vigorous competition including that posed by large, well financed multinationals such as United Parcel Service and FedEx.

The requirement that Canada Post disclose costs, revenue, operational and consumer information would certainly create a very uneven playing field. Although I do not dispute the merits of accountability and openness in the sectors of the federal government, one must consider the impact of applying across the board disclosure rules to commercial crown corporations.

In this case Canada Post would be placed at a very obvious disadvantage with its competitors unable to collect information themselves but their competitors know all the competitive strategies enlisted by Canada Post. Under the disclosure environment being proposed, these competitors would be under no obligation to release their operational figures to Canada Post.

The reduced competitiveness of Canada Post resulting from compliance with the Access to Information Act would impact on Canada Post's ability to require self-sufficiency. This may in turn reduce the level of postal service to Canadians at a much higher cost to postal services.

Canadians deserve an affordable universal postal service. Despite the challenges posed by this country's size, low population density and extreme weather conditions, Canada Post has been able to provide a postal rate that continues to be among the lowest in the world. That is very good for Canadians and something we all should be proud of.

In conclusion, this government is committed to openness. The government is committed to accountability. However, the legislation before us would cause more harm to Canadians than good. It is not in the public interest and that is why I cannot support it.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, when I came into the House today I did not intend to speak on this particular matter. However it is an important bill and I feel compelled to stand and rebut some of the things my colleagues across the way are saying.

I would first point out to my hon. friend that Canada Post is a monopoly. That is its biggest competitive advantage. I do not think any of the competitors of Canada Post are going to be able to succeed in somehow imperilling the ability of Canada Post to get by when it is a monopoly. In fact the hon. member said it would reduce service. Well I point out that we have no service today. We have a postal strike and that is because there is a monopoly in Canada Post. I thought it was important to point that out.

I want to speak to Bill C-216 from the perspective of a westerner. I note that one of the things Bill C-216 would do would be to open

*Private Members' Business*

up the Canadian Wheat Board to an access to information request. I cannot say how important that is to western producers today.

• (1150)

As members and many Canadians across the country know, right now in western Canada there is great dissatisfaction with the Canadian Wheat Board on a number of fronts. One of the ones that is most important is that producers in the west do not know for sure that they are getting the best possible price for their grain. Yesterday when I was in my hometown I saw a bumper sticker on a truck which read "We want the Canadian Wheat Board to be subject to access to information requests". That is very reasonable.

What we need to point out here is that farmers who grow their own wheat do not have the ability ultimately to find out how much the wheat board is selling that grain for, whether or not it is getting the best possible price. It is impossible for them to determine that. I would argue that when we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars, when we are talking about the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of people, they should as a basic right know what is going on with their grain and what is happening in terms of the price they are getting for it.

I strongly support this legislation, Bill C-216. I urge all members to consider supporting it. It does after all bring accountability to crown corporations at a time when, I would argue, unfortunately politicians are held in fairly low regard partially because it seems as if we try to protect our own interests.

One way to ensure that we do not do that is to open all the crown corporations up to access to information legislation so that Canadians can scrutinize these things. The auditor general can scrutinize them. Right now he does not have the ability to do that in some cases. Then we could ensure that money that is being spent on behalf of Canadians is being spent wisely and in their interests.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Bill C-216 which seeks to have the Access to Information Act apply to crown corporations.

I want to say at the outset that I have a great deal of respect for the private members' bill process. It is one of the few ways in which members have an opportunity to come forward with various legislative initiatives, hopefully to make sure that our government and its operations are working well and that the best interests of our constituents are well represented in this place.

It is very relevant for me to speak on this bill because the Candu division of AECL is in my riding, in fact within a couple of hundred yards of my home. I have had communications from them. I wanted to rise because they are constituents. I want to speak on behalf of the Candu group of AECL.

It is very important that whenever we have legislation and although there may be some emotional reasons and there may be some specific very good reasons why certain bills should be in place, from time to time we have to be very vigilant that there would not be unintended consequences. It is extremely important. We have to be very, very careful of there not being unintended consequences.

When one of the previous speakers addressed the bill, he tried to articulate what reasons one may have for having the Access to Information Act extended to crown corporations. In general, accountability and transparency are very important. The member articulated four specific reasons and I would like to repeat them because they characterize what the possible intent and perhaps misguided position may be with regard to this bill.

The first reason was to identify mismanagement in a crown corporation. The auditor general is responsible for the audits of crown corporations. He has available to him all of the necessary expertise to deal with that. In fact the auditor general does report.

• (1155)

I cannot for a moment believe that some individual—not necessarily a member of Parliament as we must keep in mind that we are talking about the public at large—would obtain information through the Access to Information Act which would somehow expose mismanagement. This is suggesting that somehow uninformed communications or broad questions may impale some crown corporation.

These kinds of things are the responsibility of the auditor general and are done very well by the auditor general. I do not believe for a moment that mismanagement is a valid reason to expose crown corporations which may or may not be involved in commercial activity. I do not believe that would be a compelling reason to have this bill pass and have crown corporation information subject to the Access to Information Act.

There were three other reasons given and I want to group them. As a group they substantiate the fact that there is a more frivolous intent here. There were four reasons given. The first was mismanagement. The other three were to expose laziness, nepotism and political incorrectness.

Those were the four reasons given by someone who has been a champion of getting underneath charitable institutions and crown corporations. However to start having witch hunts on laziness, nepotism and political incorrectness seems to be a very unsubstantial line of thinking as to why we might need this kind of legislation.

It is important to get back to the real issue. The real issue is whether or not there are unintended consequences as a result of

changes, such as making crown corporations subject to the Access to Information Act.

I want to deal specifically with the case of AECL. I want members to know that the main commercial business of AECL, which is the export of Candu reactors, is not supported in any way by taxpayers' dollars. I want to repeat that. AECL's main commercial business, the export of Candu reactors, is not supported in any way by tax dollars. There is no public subsidy on the export of Candu reactors.

Canada has never lost a cent on the Candu export deals. Money loaned by Canada stays in Canada to pay for sophisticated equipment manufactured in Canadian factories and technical project services.

Since AECL competes against some of the world's largest multinationals, it has to operate like a business and protect its commercial information.

There is also the flip side. AECL in its commercial activity deals with literally hundreds of suppliers and service vendors. Information concerning those other companies which employ tens of thousands of people is also in the records of AECL. To the extent that AECL would be subject to the Access to Information Act, not only would we be talking about the commercial activities of AECL, we would also be talking about the activities of all of those companies which deal with AECL.

I want to raise this point as it is an important one. No matter where legislation comes from, whether it be government bills or private members' bills, we have to be vigilant about the risk of unintended consequences. I believe that the AECL example is a good one. Its commercial activity is not subsidized by the government which may present a problem or a risk to AECL as well as to hundreds of other businesses which deal with AECL and which employ hundreds of Canadians.

• (1200)

**Mr. Inky Mark:** Mr. Speaker, since time is a priceless commodity I will say that I am very pleased to be able to speak to the bill. As has been mentioned—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** If the hon. member for Dauphin—Swan River would forgive me, we have to interrupt because Private Members' Business has concluded. Perhaps he could start from the beginning when the bill comes to the House again.

The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the order paper.

*Government Orders*

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

[English]

**CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD ACT**

BILL C-2—TIME ALLOCATION MOTION

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** On a point of order, the government House leader.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.)** moved:

That in relation to Bill C-2, an act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, not more than one further sitting day shall be allotted to consideration of the report stage of the bill and one sitting day shall be allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill and, fifteen minutes before the expiry of the time ordinarily provided for government business on the day allotted to the consideration of the report stage and on the day allotted to the third reading stage of the said bill, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required for the purpose of this Order, and in turn every question necessary for the disposal of the stage of the bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

**Some hon. members:** Yea.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** All those opposed will please say nay.

**Some hon. members:** Nay.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** In my opinion the yeas have it.

*And more than five members having risen:*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Call in the members.

• (1245)

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

## Government Orders

(Division No. 33)

## YEAS

## Members

Adams  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bennett  
Bevilacqua  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Chan  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Comuzzi  
Cullen  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Drouin  
Easter  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Gagliano  
Godfrey  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Harvard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lavigne  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pillitteri  
Proud  
Redman  
Robillard  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
St. Denis  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Valeri  
Volpe  
Whelan  
Wood—137

Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Barnes  
Bélaire  
Bellemare  
Bertrand  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Calder  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chamberlain  
Charbonneau  
Coderre  
Collenette  
Coppes  
De Villers  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Duhamel  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fry  
Galloway  
Goodale  
Guarnieri  
Ianno  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lastewka  
Lee  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Mifflin  
Minna  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Reilly  
Parrish  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Saada  
Serré  
Speller  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wappel  
Willfert

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy  
Anders  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bellehumeur  
Bergeron  
Blaikie  
Brien  
Cadman  
Charest  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
Dockrill  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Dumas  
Elley  
Forseth  
Gagnon  
Girard-Bujold  
Goldring  
Grewal  
Hanger  
Harris  
Harvey  
Hilstrom  
Jaffer  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Konrad  
Lalonde  
Lebel  
Lowther  
Marchand  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McDonough  
Mercier  
Morrison  
Obhrai  
Picard (Drummond)  
Rocheleau  
Solberg  
Stinson  
Strahl  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Venne  
White (Langley—Abbotsford) —91

Alarie  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bailey  
Benoit  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Borotsik  
Brison  
Casey  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Cummins  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Doyle  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Earle  
Epp  
Fournier  
Gauthier  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Gouk  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Hart  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hoepfner  
Jones  
Kerpan  
Laliberte  
Laurin  
Lefebvre  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Mark  
Mayfield  
Ménard  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Muise  
Penson  
Ramsay  
Schmidt  
St-Hilaire  
St-Jacques  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Wasylcyia-Leis

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Duceppe  
Graham  
Guay  
Karetak-Lindell  
Marceau  
Mitchell  
Richardson  
Turp

Baker  
Eggleton  
Grose  
Hubbard  
Loubier  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Perron  
Sauvageau

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think if you would seek it you would find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

That for this day only the end of Government Orders will be deemed to be 5.30 p.m. instead of 6.30 p.m.

(Motion agreed to)

## REPORT STAGE

The House resumed from November 27 consideration of Bill C-2, an act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported (with amendment) from the committee; and of Motions Nos. 11, 13 to 19 and 22.

**Mr. Jean Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I believe what I heard was resuming debate on Group No. 7. I believe we are still on Group No. 6.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** The hon. member is quite correct. We are resuming debate on Group No. 6.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Christiane Gagnon (Québec, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the bill before us proposes major amendments to the Canada pension plan and the establishment of the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board.

The bill, which was tabled in the House on September 25, is an updated version of a previous bill that died on the Order Paper when the federal election was called, in April.

I am pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-2, particularly since this new legislation is an indirect tribute to the initiative taken by the Quebec government in the mid-sixties, when Jean Lesage's team decided to create the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec.

To better understand the fundamentals of the proposed reform, I will try to answer a few questions regarding Bill C-2. What is the objective of the bill? Who, in Quebec, will be affected by the new legislation? What are the main changes sought and what are our objections to the amendments proposed by the various parties in this House?

What is the purpose of this legislation? The bill has three main objectives. First, to preserve the Canada pension plan and strengthen its financial foundation by accelerating the increase in contribution rates.

Second, to improve the investment practices of the Canada pension plan by establishing the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board.

• (1250)

Third, to reduce costs through a more rigorous administration of certain benefits, in particular disability benefits.

For the benefit of those listening, it is important to mention that any change such as this must be approved by two-thirds of the provinces representing two-thirds of the population of Canada. This requirement was met and the proposed changes were approved. Only the provinces of British Columbia and Saskatchewan opposed this proposal.

*Government Orders*

Who will this bill affect? For those Quebecers listening, it should be mentioned that the CPP reform is of greater concern to Canadians than to Quebecers. Less than half of 1% of Quebec residents receive CPP benefits. Last August, there were 12,882 such people. Those affected must fall into one of three categories. The first category is Quebec residents who have worked all their lives in another province, and who have therefore paid CPP premiums only. For example, a resident of Hull who has worked all his life in Ottawa could be eligible.

The amendment also applies to members of the Canadian Armed Forces and the RCMP who reside in Quebec and must pay CPP premiums. Having paid only CPP premiums, they receive CPP benefits, even though they are residents of Quebec.

The amendment also affects those receiving CPP benefits who move to Quebec.

In all other cases, the QPP will apply. It should be noted, however, that the Government of Quebec is also in the process of reforming the Quebec plan, although that plan is in better financial shape.

Quebecers are indirectly affected by the present reform because the two levels of government have always harmonized the main features of the two plans, through a common desire to accommodate those who have paid into both plans.

What are the main changes intended with this bill? I will deal here briefly with the two main changes being considered: the establishment of the Canada pension plan investment board and the rate of contribution. I would like to state immediately that the Bloc Québécois agrees with these two initiatives.

The design of the Canada pension plan investment board being established by the government with this bill is closely modelled on the Quebec Caisse de dépôt et placement. However, unlike the Caisse de dépôt et placement, the federal investment board has no economic mandate; it only has the mandate to achieve the best possible rate of return.

It should be remembered that, at present, the money in the Canada pension plan is not invested in financial markets, as is the case in Quebec. By placing the management of this money in the hands of an independent organization, it will be possible to increase the performance of the Canada pension plan and also to protect taxpayers against dramatic contribution increases.

This is a proactive measure Quebec implemented a long time ago; it has produced convincing results. We should therefore point out the vision and the determination of the work carried out in this area by Jean Lesage and Jacques Parizeau, among others, who gave Quebec a tool not only to maximize the pensions of its citizens, but also to provide an instrument for economic development. We feel that, in this bill, this second component has not been given enough emphasis, with the result that the investment board's mandate is too weak.

*Government Orders*

The rate of contribution is certainly an area of the bill that has raised major concerns. It should be remembered that it had become necessary to review this rate because the plan was rapidly approaching unsustainability. The way things were going, the fund would have been empty by 2015, and the rate of contribution would have had to increase then from 6 to 14% in the case of the Canada pension plan, and from 6 to 13% in the case of the Quebec pension plan.

• (1255)

So the bill calls for a gradual increase up to a permanent ceiling of 9.9%, to be reached in 2003.

Sustainability and affordability are the main issues in this debate. We cannot put our heads in the sand and try to avoid this reality. As we know, the population of Canada is aging rapidly. Here are some numbers. There are now 3.7 million elderly people, in 2030, it is estimated there will be 8.8 million of them.

When the Canada pension plan was established in 1965, there were, for each elderly person in Canada, eight persons of working age. In 1997, the ratio is five to one, and it is estimated that it will be three to one in 2030.

As well, with all the progress in medicine, experts feel that the average length of time people will receive Canada pension plan pensions will be 20 years, as opposed to 15 when the plan was implemented.

All of this is very informative, and is the reason we are examining this bill. These are the reasons why the increase in contribution rates earlier than expected, which will result in improved funding, will reduce generational disparities by making the baby-boomers, who generally have about twenty years left to work, pay a greater portion of contributions, which is more representative of the benefits they will be receiving.

I would like to address the question of the amendments proposed by the different parties in this House.

Without reviewing all of the proposed amendments, I will if I may touch upon two of them.

With Motions Nos. 20 and 25, the NDP is calling for deletion of the clause setting penalties for fraud or false declarations.

No one can be against virtue. We understand the NDP's preference for incentives over coercive measures. We cannot, however, subscribe to such a proposal, since it is very difficult not to be severe in cases of fraud or false declarations.

As for the Reform Party, its Motion No. 10 calls for deletion of the clause permitting the retroactive increase of 1997 contributions.

This again is an amendment to which the Bloc cannot subscribe. Let us not forget that deferring any increase in contributions will

only increase the contribution rate in the long term. The problem is with us now, so deferring action that ought to have been taken long ago is irresponsible.

In conclusion, I would like to repeat that we agree with the objectives of the reform, which are to make the system more viable, affordable and equitable.

We are duty-bound to ensure the viability of the plan for the generations to come. The proposed reform ensures intergenerational equity among contributors by establishing a constant and long term contribution rate, and by doing so promptly.

I see my time is up, so I shall stop here.

[English]

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to group 6 and the motions that have been put forward regarding Bill C-2.

I think it is important to point out from the very beginning that it is no small surprise that we see so many motions that have been put forward to try and make something out of Bill C-2. In fact, the House will find that the number of motions is far above the average that we would normally see for a bill. The reason is that members opposite have seen so many flaws in Bill C-2 that we have had no option but to put forward a number of motions to try to make C-2, although it may be a sour pill to swallow, at least something that we do not choke on.

Group 6 has a number of motions to it. I will first deal with Motion No. 11.

• (1300)

This one being put forward by the fourth party basically wants to stop the government from having a golden lever that it can pull every time it needs more cash. We congratulate the fourth party on having the foresight, although we brought it up in committee. The fourth party made it into a motion.

I think it is very important that we do not let the government get away with having the option to raise contributions any time it simply wanted to. Therefore this motion would prevent that. We support Motion No. 11 put forward by the fourth party.

We also support Motion No. 13, which would basically take away the freezing of the year's basic exemption because, as members know, the Liberals snuck this one in and it could be used in fact as a form of taxation.

Without the ability to increase the YBE, as the cost of living went up, as inflation went up, the exemption on taxes that a Canadian would be able to have could not go up. Therefore they would find their disposable income shrinking even more than it has.

*Government Orders*

Let me point out that since these Liberals came to power in 1993, the average household disposable income has decreased by some \$3,000 in this country. Who needs yet another mechanism to wrench disposable income dollars out of Canadians' pockets? The Liberals felt that they did but we certainly do not feel they should have that.

Motion No. 14 we oppose. This is confusing. The fourth party put forward Motion No. 13, which we support, preventing the freezing of the YBE. Yet its members only wanted to prevent it until the year 2006.

Life does go on in this country. It is bad enough that this bill has been put forward in the first place, where it is going to raise Canada pension premiums by an astounding, obscene 73% over the next few years. Members will find nowhere in this bill that that is all they are ever going to go up.

By supporting Motion No. 14 that would mean that the ability to not freeze the YBE would only continue to the year 2006. We cannot support that because the world is going to go on a lot longer than the year 2006. We will oppose that one.

One of the things that we have to touch on in this debate, and it deals with these motions, is that this band-aid approach to fixing the Canada pension plan, this quick fix that the Liberals put through, has no more merit than the manner in which the Liberals and the Tories before them have managed the Canada pension plan since the mid-1960s when it was introduced.

It has been badly managed. It does not even do justice to the lousy job that the Liberals and the Tories have done with the Canada pension plan. It is \$600 billion in the hole in unfunded liability. To fix it, and this is not rocket science, they simply raise the premiums. That will fix everything.

By the way, they are going to build this fund and they are going to have some Liberal hacks running it unaccountable because there are clauses in here which, if they do not get changed, will make sure that the investment board of the Canada pension plan is not accountable to Parliament.

We are talking about over \$100 billion in CPP funds. It is scary to think that the Liberals could have any type of influence over that kind of money. It is really scary to think that. The way they are going to fix it really has no more merit than the way they have managed it for the last 30-some years.

• (1305)

Let us not let the Tories off the hook. They stand up in this House so indignant about this bill. They slam the Liberals about how they have not presented. They had nine years to do something under the disaster of the Mulroney government from 1984 to 1993. Back when the unfunded liability was down around \$400 billion or \$375

billion the Tories could have done something. They could have taken the bull by the horns. They knew at that time that the CPP was broke or was headed for it.

At the very time the Canada pension plan was introduced in the mid-sixties, the Liberal government of the day knew it would not work because its own financial advisers told the government that. But that did not deter the Liberals at that time from pushing ahead with this plan that was doomed for failure. They pushed ahead, and now here we are 30-some years later, \$560 billion in the hole in the CPP fund, and the Liberal answer to fixing it is to raise the premiums by 73% over the next few years. Let's get into the pockets of young Canadians who will be starting out in life to make their careers and raise their families. Let's just double their premiums and give them less when they want to retire.

I believe retirees now get about \$12 for every dollar they put into the Canada pension plan. The Liberal government must hate that. Under its plan if someone in their twenties starts paying into this plan, by the time they retire the Liberals want to give them an astounding 57 cents for every dollar they contributed. The Liberals really hate a good deal. They must hate a good deal. They would be thrown in jail if they were to handle an investment like that in the private sector.

Now the Liberals see retired Canadians getting \$12 for every \$1 they put in, and that just is not Liberal philosophy. Canadians should not be getting fair treatment, so the Liberals will change the plan so Canadians get only 57 cents. Young people will be paying into that plan for 40 years.

I hope some of these motions get put into Bill C-2. If some of these motions were to pass the government would be brought to accountability kicking and screaming and we would be there pulling it. We will support some of the motions. We have some of our own that we hope some other members will support, members from the third, fourth and fifth parties.

I stand as a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this House of Commons, this House of Parliament in the country of Canada, and I say let us not let the Liberal government get away with this odious piece of legislation. Let us fix it, as the Liberals and the Tories had a chance to—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. McClelland):** Resuming debate, the hon. member for Shefford.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Diane St-Jacques (Shefford, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to express our support for one of the amendments proposed by our colleague from Qu'Appelle last week.

This amendment proposes a sliding scale for contributions by self-employed workers.

*Government Orders*

Under this amendment, a self-employed individual earning \$25,000 would contribute less than another such individual earning \$60,000. The amendment would therefore resolve one of the most serious problems in Bill C-2 for the self-employed.

As my colleagues for Madawaska—Restigouche and Saint John pointed out last week, these workers, who represent 18% of the workforce, must bear the brunt of combined contributions. With a contribution rate of 9.9%, self-employed workers do not have myriad calculations to make. They know that they have to contribute \$9.90 for every \$100 they earn.

• (1310)

When you realize that 45% of these workers, and there were 2.5 million of them in 1997, earn less than \$20,000, you understand the importance of the amendment immediately. We are talking about over 1.1 million Canadian workers. Given the fact that the growth in self-employment is far greater among women, there is even more reason to support this amendment.

As currently worded, Bill C-2 has a significant negative effect on women. But this we should have expected from a government that has no concern about the effect of its policies on women. In fact, in the initial discussions on the proposed changes to the pension plan in 1996, nothing was said about the impact of these proposals on the income of women who would be retiring.

However, almost all the proposed changes affect women more than men. Let us look, for example, at the freeze on the annual basic exemption. It affects mostly those with low incomes, and this category of worker is made up primarily of women.

Women, therefore, generally make less than their male counterparts. For example, women working part time earn only a portion of what full time workers make, that is, between 69% and 72%. Furthermore, 28% of women, compared with 10% of men, work part time. They also tend to retire earlier, with up to 25% of women taking their retirement at an average age of 52. They also live longer. The life expectancy of women is 80.9 years, as compared to 74.6 for men. This means that they will have to make do longer with lower benefits than men.

In 1995, senior women received on average \$274 per month in benefits, while men received \$477 per month. Add to this the fact that there is a much higher risk of becoming a widow than there is of becoming a widower. Also, there are nine times more senior men than senior women who remarry.

One last point. Women are not covered as well as their male counterparts by employer sponsored pension plans. And many of these plans do not provide any survivor benefits, the survivors being mostly women as I said.

The cumulative effect of all these factors precludes women from setting funds aside for the many years of life they have remaining.

The government should not have the power to make changes to such a fundamental and important program as the Canada pension plan without first explaining their full impact to the people of Canada. Also, there is nothing in here to ensure that they will be treated fairly and equitably.

We, in the Progressive-Conservative Party, believe in equity for all. Since equity is also a major concern in the public at large, it is essential that an equitable contribution scale be provided for in Bill C-2.

This way we will be fair, at least to some extent, to those who account for more than 52% of the Canadian population: women. This is also a way to recognize the work and important contribution of the men and women who now make up 18% of the Canadian labour force, that is to say self-employed workers.

[English]

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the group 6 amendments and to the changes to the Canada pension plan and the creation of the investment board.

As a new member of the House, like many other new members of the House, it is sometimes a daunting process to go through a bill such as this and to try to make sense of what the bill is really trying to accomplish and what the impact of the changes will really be on Canadians.

Having gone through the bill and listened to debate in the House and having spoken to the member for Qu'Appelle, who is our expert on this matter, we find ourselves at report stage today with an overriding concern that Bill C-2 will endanger the security of retirement for many Canadians.

The problem with this bill is that it will create winners and losers. We have to ask ourselves who will be the winners in terms of changing the Canada pension plan.

• (1315)

When we look at the bill we see that the winner will definitely be the private sector. It will have a huge financial windfall as a result of increasing privatization. Even the business section of the *Globe and Mail* took note that the changes to the Canada pension plan were a huge financial windfall for the private sector. The privatization of the administration of the plan will create approximately \$500 million in commissions for the private sector. It is unconscionable and should not be allowed to happen.

The section question is who will be the losers as a result of the changes to the Canada pension plan. It has been very well evidenced in debate by witnesses before committee and in motions

and amendments put forward that the losers under the bill will be women, people with disabilities, widows, widowers and retirees generally. We have to be very clear and frank about the bill. It is about reducing benefits for people with disabilities, survivor benefits to widows and widowers and the ongoing privatization of the Canada pension plan.

For example, even the 16th actuarial report projects that CPP spending reduction on disability benefits by the year 2005 will be over \$1 billion. There is no getting away from that. The changes being put forward by the government in the bill are a clear attempt to reduce benefits to those with disabilities who collect Canada pension.

The reality is that those retirees will be hit disproportionately higher than any other component as a result of the Canada pension plan changes. This raises a serious question about the social equity of the plan and the fact that there will be more losers. It will also create greater hardship or inaccessibility for Canadians with disabilities.

The survivors benefit will also be reduced. The amendments of the member for Qu'Appelle address the issues and mitigate the damage that will be created if the bill goes ahead. Widows and widowers who are disabled will also have reduced combined benefits. This is a shocking state of affairs that needs to be brought to the attention of the public.

The second major concern of the New Democratic Party that our amendments speak to is that the changes in the bill will force Canadians to rely more and more on private arrangements, on privatized pension plans. We need to address the reality of working people who cannot afford to buy into private pension plans such as RRSPs. This is another giveaway to the private sector by privatizing the plan and forcing more and more people into a private arrangement.

There is a very serious concern that the bill undermines and erodes the universality and the accessibility of our public pension plan. If we talk to Canadians in our local constituencies, at community meetings or associations that represent seniors, they all tell us that one thing they have been proud of in this country is the fact that we have stood behind and strengthened our universal accessible pension plan over the years.

We now stand at a moment in history where that universality and that proud history of Canada are about to be changed forever if the bill goes ahead without the critical amendments that have been put forward.

The bottom line is that this crisis has been deliberately staged to undermine the credibility of the Canada pension plan, as we move toward more and more privatization, and to create a huge windfall for the private sector.

### *Government Orders*

The amendments of the New Democratic Party balance the scales and ensure that Canadians who pay into the Canada pension plan and rely on it for the future will not be losers.

● (1320)

The motions before the House today deserve our serious consideration if we truly and genuinely believe we want to protect, strengthen and enhance our public pension system. If that is what the bill is about these motions must be approved, but we have a great fear that what is at work here is the government's agenda to create winners and losers, to further provide privatization of the Canada pension plan, and to erode the universality of the plan.

I speak in favour of the amendments proposed by the New Democratic Party. It is an important set of amendments that will seek to mitigate the damage being created by Bill C-2.

**Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the concerns we have in government about some of the motions we think will be detrimental to the preservation and securing of the CPP as a pension plan for all of us, for future Canadians who will be retiring.

Contrary to what the previous speaker has mentioned, it is very important to understand we arrived at the changes through rather dramatic and extensive consultations across Canada. They are the result of federal-provincial statutory review which included extensive cross-Canada consultations.

Unequivocally we heard from Canadians. They asked that their governments preserve the plan by strengthening its financing, improving investment practices and moderating the growth of the benefits.

It is not rocket science to understand it is important to improve investment procedures. I would share some examples. In years gone by in various provincial legislatures and indeed in this place pension plans have been used by governments as a cheap source of financing.

For example, the government of Ontario in the 1970s consistently went to the well to borrow funds at as low as 3% interest rates at a time when marketplace interest rates were in the neighbourhood of 10% or higher. It used that money to build roads, bridges and other facilities; but in turn what happened is that the pension fund was suffering because it was not allowed to grow.

We cannot allow this to happen with the CPP. As a result of all the consultations and what Canadians have said, we must ensure if the money is borrowed and it is used as a fund that fair market value is paid. It is simply not acceptable to rob Peter to pay Paul by using pension fund money for cheap investments with a view that somehow taxpayers will save money. At the end of the day the particular pension fund will have to be shored up. In their entirety

*Government Orders*

the motions run counter to a strong fiscal policy that we believe is needed to secure the CPP.

I also share an example with which some may be familiar. Money was used from the teachers' pension fund without a proper view toward investment practices. In 1989 or so one of the teachers' pension funds in Ontario, the superannuation fund, was running at a deficit and the other one was running at a surplus. The reason for the deficit was the bad borrowing practices of previous governments. We cannot allow that to happen regardless of who is in government. The CPP funds should not be used and abused in that way. That is one very important issue.

Motion No. 11 specifically wants to delete the new contribution rate schedule. The old unsustainable rate schedule would remain in effect.

• (1325)

The member is sticking his head in the sand, I say with all due respect. If the motion were to be accepted by the government it would put financial sustainability of the CPP at risk. That is the very issue the changes address. In parliamentary terms it probably should not be allowed on the floor as it is totally contrary to the intent of the bill.

Instead of rates raising by 9.9% in the year 2003 and then levelling off, if the motion were adopted contribution rates would rise to 10.1% in year 2016. That happens to be a year when many in the baby boomer generation will be looking to drawing on their CPP fund. Therefore it makes it even more important to ensure the sustainability of the CPP. Then it would go to 14.2% in the year 2030. This would be a 140% increase over current contribution levels. I cannot imagine justifying contribution levels rising by that amount. It makes no sense and frankly the motion would be destructive.

Another problem, and we have done the financial analysis, is that the plan would be bankrupt by the year 2015. It would impose a totally unfair burden on our children and our grandchildren. They would lose the ability to collect the CPP.

When talking about the CPP bill, the amendment and all the motions, we must recognize that our main goal should be to sustain and secure the system now. We consider it to be a top priority in government. We have heard other members and other people talk in terms of it being a tax. The reality is that it makes us distinct as Canadians because we have a public pension plan that leaves no Canadian behind.

I have heard the example used about people being in a race. At the Special Olympics there was a wonderful example that my good friend, Dalton McGuinty, the leader of the provincial Liberal Party in Ontario, talks about. In a race in the Special Olympics one of the runners fell. Another runner who was competing to win that race, which presumably we all do from time to time, stopped and picked up the person and helped him finish the race. It meant the person

who stopped would not be victorious. It meant that he would not win the race. What a message it sends about Canadians and about Canada.

Yes, we will stop and help when one falls. We are all in this together. The CPP is one landmark that shows us that we as Canadians care about one another. We could ignore the problem. Some paint it as a tax grab. That is nonsense.

This plan has to be secured for future generations. The bill will do that but the motions of the hon. member will not. A key priority is to secure retirement income for all Canadians. That is why we are proposing a comprehensive plan to make the system sustainable, affordable and fair. Affordable is key.

If we want to drive rates through the roof like some of the motions are suggesting with increases in the neighbourhood of 140%, that is what we should adopt. However that will not be affordable.

I have often found a lack of realism on the part of my colleagues opposite. They think that by putting a motion forward some workers will benefit. In reality it will be unaffordable for employers. If we do not have employers we do not have jobs. If we do not have jobs we do not have CPP contributions and the plan will fail. This is all inextricably tied to the economic growth and the future of this growth.

• (1330)

With great respect for my colleague opposite, we will be opposing these motions on the grounds that they are detrimental to the security of the future of the CPP.

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, as has just been pointed out, I too think that the group 6 motions drive the cost way beyond what Canadians can bear.

I want to go back a little bit into the history of this whole thing and also use a few quotes from some of my constituents that might give a better focus on where grassroot Canadians really stand.

In 1966 government made a contract with Canadians basically stating that it would provide a pension when a person reached age 65. We believed that, went along with it and everybody dutifully paid their 3% or whatever it was and thought that government would take care of them. Obviously mismanagement and a poorly designed plan caused the situation that the government finally realized it was in last year. It found out that it had an underfunded liability and had a real problem. Obviously some of the amendments we are speaking about here would make that problem even that much worse.

I think Canadians realized this problem much sooner. They knew this plan was not working and could not work. They were not dreamers but, as often happens, the people are so much ahead of government that we are only now catching up. The only solution

*Government Orders*

that the government has put forward is a 73% increase in the premium tax which is going to be collected.

There are a lot of other ways to solve this problem and I will try to touch on some of those briefly. Basically, when you talk to the people on the street, they will tell you that this is an extremely important bill. They know what is happening. They know about it and can talk very intelligently about the changes to the Canada pension. They will tell you that it is a \$10 billion tax grab. They will tell you that they are already taxed at the highest rate in the G-7 and just cannot afford any more taxation. They will tell you that the self-employed person is just going to buckle under this sort of an increase. They will tell you that this is going to cost jobs and probably more jobs than even some of the critics of this would point out.

They are also extremely concerned about the setting up of an investment board with 12 political friends being appointed to this and the potential abuse that this could create. Remember, people do not have all that much respect for political choices in our past history.

For the young people who are looking at this plan, the message is pretty well standard. They do not believe they are really going to get any Canada pension plan. They do not really believe it is going to be there for them. In fact, if the government is going to collect an extra \$700 from them and their employer and only give them \$8,800 some 30 years from now, that is just not realistic. It will not sell and is not acceptable to the Canadian public.

They look at the other options of what they can do with that same amount of money if they were to invest it privately. I believe that this change in CPP can be equivalent to what the GST was to the PC Party. I believe this is its Achilles heel and the public will react when they find out what the politicians have done to them.

Let me give a summary of some 4,000 letters received in my riding. First, "My husband and I are very concerned about the proposed CPP hike. We are a young couple expecting our first child and we feel that it will be very difficult for us and many people of our age to pay the proposed tax increases. We also feel that it is unfair that we be forced to pay this seeing as we have no hope of ever receiving the Canada pension plan ourselves". I believe that summarizes what young people are saying.

• (1335)

The amendments that we are talking about here that say we are going to increase those premiums even more are even that much less acceptable for the Canadian public.

Middle aged people are saying "What about our children? Our children are having a tough enough time as it is". They are concerned about the killing of jobs. They are concerned about what

this means. They still feel they have time under an optional plan to that being proposed by the Liberals.

The seniors are saying "We also are concerned about our children and our grandchildren and what it might mean for them".

I believe that we have across the range of ages genuine concern about Canada pension and what the future of this is going to be. The sad part is that the government will not even look at the options. It has made no attempt to look at other countries to see what they have done.

The list is quite long but if we take a look at countries that have adopted a different kind of a pension plan, in that list we would include Chile, Australia, Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia, El Salvador, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, Uruguay, Great Britain. All of these countries have gone to a different form of Canada pension.

Surely this government owes it to Canadians to look at the other options. It should take a look, see how they work, find out what happens. When it was suggested in the committee that the committee bring the designer of the plan in Chile, who 16 years ago put their plan together, the committee was refused to have this person come and testify before it.

This is letting down Canadians. Canadians have the right to find out what all the options are and to have open discussion. Of course, the use of closure on this sort of debate also is not accepted very well by the Canadian people. Again, I remind the members on the other side that this is not going to be looked on any more kindly than was the GST.

We have a lot of misrepresentation. We have a finance minister who says "Feel good, be happy, everything is fine now". We all know that is not the case. We know that we have a \$600 billion debt. We know that we are paying \$50 billion in interest payments in a year. Just think what we could do with that \$50 billion in terms of pensions, in terms of our social services. All of those are there but they are not accessible to us because of mismanagement of the previous two governments.

In conclusion, the Liberals are taxing the soul out of Canadians. They are going too far. This Canada pension is going to be for some the final straw. It is going to drive the economy underground. It is going to cause small businesses to close. The government is going to use this as another tax increase to opt out of the system.

The Liberals are taxing our food, they are taxing our homes, they are taxing our savings, they are clawing back from senior citizens and people are losing patience with them. That is the message we have to get out.

These amendments simply go one step further in that tax and spend philosophy that seems to be so common or possibly the disease which people get when they come into this place.

*Government Orders*

It is time to say no. Canadians need to speak out and let the government know what they think about Canada pension.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate on Bill C-2, which seeks to put some order in the Canada pension plan and to modernize its structure.

I want to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague, the hon. member for Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, who does a wonderful job in leading the Bloc regarding this issue and in expressing Quebec's representations on the amendments to the Canada pension plan.

• (1340)

The Canada pension plan must undergo a thorough review. If the government does not act or is slow to act, within ten years, the fund will be empty. I am among those who have always believed that, when a government or a municipality buys or builds things, the payments should be spread out over the duration of the investment.

It would not be wise for a government to borrow each week to pay its public servants, just as it would not be wise for the hon. member for Québec to borrow every month to pay her rent. The government has now reached a deadline where it must make decisions, otherwise our children or grandchildren will have to pay so we can get our old age pension.

Last year's contribution rate of 5.6% was clearly too low. In 15 years or so, the baby-boomers—and I am one of them—will reach retirement age in very large numbers, at which point the fund would be insufficient.

So, the government, whose role is to anticipate such things, must make proposals to adjust the contribution rate, so as to meet future financial needs. The proposed rate schedule seems fair and reasonable. The rate current of 5.85% for 1997 would be increased to 6%. Premiums will go up slowly but surely over the next five years to a maximum of \$9.90, or 9.9% if you prefer, in 2003.

This 9.9% would be frozen. According to actuaries we have consulted, who corroborate the government's figures, it could be frozen until 2100, in other words, for over a century. If our forecasts are accurate, and I believe they are, this should provide us with a safety valve for those who will begin to draw a pension at age 65.

To govern means to anticipate. Certain parties in the House are going to oppose an adjustment. They apparently do not anticipate the impact of baby boomers. Those now 50 and under are going to be reaching the eligible age in very high numbers. When we begin drawing benefits, we will be contributing much less, perhaps nothing at all if we have no insurable earnings. So the fund will be rapidly depleted.

It is my sincere and honest belief that recipients must pay the cost of this pension plan. For this reason, our party will be supporting Bill C-2 generally speaking.

But we cannot vote in favour of the motions in Group No. 6 because they go directly against the premise that the plan must be self-funding.

Bill C-2 has three basic objectives. In order for the plan to be self-funding, there must be increased capitalization, and this I think will be achieved through the new premium rates over the next five years.

• (1345)

It is also necessary to increase the rate of return—and this is important—through the establishment of a Canada pension plan investment board. The role of this board is not to stash the money in a sock like my grandfather used to do; that was not only unsafe, it was also unprofitable. Inflation was not very high at that time, so he did not lose anything, but he did not gain anything either.

At present, we could say that the government has not succeeded in using wisely this large amount of money that was placed in its care. It has not been a cautious administrator of these investments, unlike what Quebec did for the Régie des rentes when it established the Caisse de dépôt et placement.

I would like to take the opportunity here to pay tribute to a great team led by Jean Lesage at the beginning of the sixties. That team included none other than Jacques Parizeau, and, of course, René Lévesque. So they set up the Caisse de dépôt et placement, which, often, produces a return of up to 20% a year. That is a very interesting annual rate of return; it is the equivalent of one fifth of the total capital that the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec is responsible for. Unfortunately, the central government failed to act and was unable to ensure a proper yield for the money in the Canada pension plan; this is rather disturbing and shameful.

Fortunately, with Bill C-2, the Canada pension plan investment board is being established, and if it is well managed, it should be able, hopefully, to equal the return obtained in Quebec.

There are now only two provinces that continue to oppose Bill C-2. But with the agreements that are now in place, as soon as there are eight provinces representing a sufficient percentage, we will be able to override the two provinces that refuse to go along with the plan.

The third objective of Bill C-2 is to tighten up the requirements for certain benefits, including disability benefits.

We must be careful not to give disability benefits to everyone who claims them. Everyone knows that, in certain regions, and especially in certain provinces I will not name here, when people lose their job, they go to see the doctor or any other person who can be of assistance to provide a disability certificate. But doing this

costs a lot of money for all the other people who are honest and who have to pay for the ones that are exploiting the system.

To conclude, the Canada pension plan investment board, again, if it is properly managed, could provide dividends, and this would be profitable for all Canadians. The member for Malpeque, in Prince Edward Island, who is listening to me closely, must know that when a potato is planted, it is subdivided into eight parts, and this can yield almost three quarters of a bag of potatoes. So he knows that in the case of potatoes, it is possible to ensure that these plants will provide a yield.

Therefore, in the case of the federal government, if they do the same thing as the member for Malpeque, they will be able to make sure that this money yields a profit.

And, finally, I am glad to see that with this bill, it will be possible to invest up to 20% outside the country, and, of course, a minimum of 80% will have to stay in the country, in Quebec or elsewhere, but it will have to stay in Canada.

[English]

**Ms. Louise Hardy (Yukon, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendments put forward by the NDP.

• (1350)

The object of the changes to the pension plan was to address the most needy of our country, our seniors and our elders, but these changes do not address that need. I will give examples of some members of my community, seniors and elders who live solely by means of their pensions. There are two of them who support a family and their eldest son is on a disability pension. He is disabled from the neck down. They must use their old age security and their GIS to support a disabled son.

The fact that the pensions are inadequate for those most needy is very clear and the changes were meant to address this need. Unfortunately \$10 a month or \$120 a year will not address the question of need. We must ask why these changes are being made. I agree with my colleagues that there are definitely winners and losers in this scene.

There will be \$2 billion taken out of our pension plan. I feel we are trying to convince Canadians that by taking out \$2 billion we will somehow be able to help them more. This just is not the case especially in our present society and circumstances where social housing is no longer available and those who need it most, seniors, will not be able to get it.

We have faced cuts to transfer payments, cuts to medicare with the federal government being the last payer at this time. We have faced a huge increase in the cost of prescriptions. These are all services our seniors desperately need. They are not working and they do not have the income to make up the difference.

### *Government Orders*

We are facing the basic problem that we do not have the level of employment to support our pensions. This is a problem the present government refuses to address. If we had strong employment we would not have to be worried at the other end about the ability of our elders and seniors to get their pensions.

I attended a finance committee meeting in which the witnesses talked about how they would see our new pension fund being used. Their major point was that it should not have such a low foreign investment ceiling, that 20% just was not enough and that if you were sophisticated enough you could get around it. They believed people would be cheating. I was quite shocked at that attitude. They claimed that investing 80% of that pension fund in Canada somehow was not a good deal for Canadians when in fact it is a good deal.

Provinces should be able to access Canadians' money for infrastructure programs, for roads, for hospitals, for schools, for jobs, because that is good for all Canadians. The more jobs we create the more we will be able to support our seniors and our elders.

The changes being proposed are unfairly targeted at women and those who are expecting a disability pension. I do take exception to my colleague from the Bloc who alluded that people with a disability pension received it fraudulently. I do not know of anyone who has done that and I do not believe they would like to be considered as Canadians who are criminals by behaving that way. They should never be labelled as criminals because they have applied for a disability pension. It does no service to our citizens and to those who are more desperate because they cannot work and their only sustenance is from their pension, and one that is drastically inadequate at that.

It would be a good idea if the money from the pension fund that we are proposing would actually go to pensioners, but it is not. Half a billion dollars a year will go from public money into private hands. None of that money will be going to those who are poorest. None will be going to those who are getting an extra \$10 a month. They will not be benefiting from those investments although I believe that is where the money should go.

The investment board should not be able to set its own standards. It should not be able to hire and fire its own auditor, set its own guidelines for ethical or unethical conduct. That should be done independent of that body. If we are going to have a board, it should be for the benefit of those in our society who are most needy.

• (1355)

**Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, there have been many amendments brought before the House over the past two days and many more to come that wish to improve this plan the government has developed to change the Canada pension plan.

*S. O. 31*

Many of the amendments that are before the House in Group No. 6 would jeopardize the Canada pension plan because they refuse to admit that there is a problem with the CPP. They refuse to see that it is in a crisis situation. The sad fact is that if we do not fix the CPP, it will not be there for our children and our grandchildren. If we spend blindly now, we will be playing with the money of future generations. This is simply not acceptable.

Young people today are already facing huge student debts and fewer job prospects. Let us not saddle them with the responsibility of paying for our retirement. I know that this is not the legacy I want to leave to my children.

Canada's population is aging rapidly. This will put great stress on seniors programs in the years ahead. Today for every person of retirement age there are five persons of working age. In 20 years there will be one person of retirement age for every four persons of working age. When today's youth retire in 40 years, the ratio will be just one to three.

The strain on the CPP results from an aging population, a lower birth rate, increased life expectancy and a sharp rise in disability claims.

The CPP was set up as a pay as you go plan in 1966. Premiums were set at a rate that provided the fund with investments equal to at least two years of benefits. There is \$40 billion in the fund. However, the cost of its promised future benefits totals \$600 billion. Under the present Canada pension plan the premiums are expected to rise to 14.2% in the year 2030.

For Progressive Conservatives the CPP is a fundamental part of the Canadian social safety net, an obligation that government must honour. Let us make it clear, the CPP is worth saving. We believe that there is an urgent need to restore public confidence in the Canada pension plan so that Canadians will continue to participate in saving for their future retirement. Many of the amendments we are debating now will not restore the public confidence in the CPP. Far from it.

The CPP contribution rates will have to rise to levels adequate to ensure the long term viability of the plan, but these increased contributions must be more than offset by substantial reductions in our taxes.

[*Translation*]

**The Speaker:** The member will have another seven minutes after Oral Question Period.

Since it is nearly 2 o'clock, we shall now proceed with Statements by Members.

**STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

[*English*]

**THE LATE JOHN SOPINKA**

**Mr. John McKay (Scarborough East, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay honour to the life of Mr. Justice John Sopinka.

I was a great admirer of his judicial reasoning. In particular Judge Sopinka resisted activist tendencies on the part of some jurists to make decisions which are properly within the purview of Parliament. He gave real meaning to the doctrine of deference to the will of Parliament in both Egan and Rodriguez decisions. In other words, he challenged Parliament to do its job and to create law in areas of moral controversy because he realized unlike many others that judge-made law in those areas was really a reflection of parliamentary failure.

He leaves a legacy of sound judicial reasoning and practical guidance to litigants and legislators alike. He will be greatly missed.

\* \* \*

**AIDS**

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, today is World AIDS Day. As the official opposition foreign affairs critic I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the serious ongoing destruction this disease has on human beings worldwide.

A United Nations report released last week states that 30 million people worldwide are infected with HIV or have AIDS itself. An alarming statistic is that 90% of these people infected live in developing countries. By the year 2000 this report predicts that 40 million people will be infected with this horrible disease.

● (1400)

The continent of Africa is home to more than half of the known HIV cases. This, however, is quickly changing as the disease is spreading rampant in the countries of Asia, especially in India where as many as 5 million HIV infected persons live.

The Reform Party and I urge all countries to work together so that we will be able to find a cure for this terrible disease.

\* \* \*

**IMPAIRED DRIVING**

**Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, drinking and driving is a national tragedy; 4.5 innocent Canadians killed by impaired drivers every 24 hours, every day of the week. Just think of it. Incredible.

Over 300 people a day are injured in Canada as a result of an alcohol related crash. Just think of it. Incredible.

Impaired drivers caused over half of Canada's 3,300 road fatalities in 1995. Just think of it. Truly incredible.

Too many Canadians have been cut down in the prime of their lives. Too many families, friends and communities have grieved unnecessarily over the loss of a loved one at the hands of an impaired driver. This carnage must stop and the time is now.

Laws to combat the problem have not changed in over 10 years. I urge this House and our justice minister to consider necessary changes to the Criminal Code. Our laws must reflect the stark realities of the epidemic of impaired driving and the seriousness of this crime.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### NAGANO OLYMPIC GAMES

**Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the composition of Canada's Olympic team is revealing. Canadian international hockey has just entered a new era on the eve of the Nagano Olympic games.

They do not start for another two months, but I think we can all be proud of Canada's Olympic team, whose members come from across the country, reflecting the diversity of all of Canada's regions.

We are going to have some exciting moments with the Canadian team. Our athletes' performance will provide fantastic inspiration for all of us and for Canada's young people.

\* \* \*

### UNITED NATIONS MISSION IN HAITI

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the United Nations mission in Haiti ended yesterday. The soldiers and police officers from Quebec and Canada taking part in this mission have begun to return home and will all be back by Christmas.

As we know, their mission was to maintain security and stability in Haiti and to support the Haitian police in its activities. They also provided humanitarian assistance by building schools and orphanages and by distributing medical and educational material.

The Bloc Quebecois would like to thank the soldiers and police for their efforts in democratizing Haiti. I would particularly like to draw attention to and express our gratitude for the work done in Haiti by the police officers from Laval.

While much remains to be done in this country ravaged by poverty, it is on the road to democracy. The international community must continue to provide help and support for Haiti's reconstruction efforts.

[English]

*S. O. 31*

### CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Winnipeg South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the father of Canadian broadcasting, Graham Spry, once said that only the state or the United States could provide Canadians with radio and television programming. Today, however, this is no longer true.

The advent of the 500 channel universe means that Canadians have a wide range of options open to them, but this has not lessened the need for the CBC. Only the CBC provides programming from a uniquely Canadian perspective. In recent years the CBC has had to adapt to audience fragmentation and changing fiscal realities.

It pleases me to note that despite this, the CBC has become more efficient and more Canadian in character. Since Canadianizing its prime time schedule, for example, CBC English television has gained more viewers than it had only a few years ago.

I would like to commend the corporation for its efforts to reflect Canada to Canadians. It is my belief that only the CBC can be to Canada in the 21st century what the CPR was in the 19th, a link that joins the country.

\* \* \*

### WAR

**Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, this week over 120 nations will come to Ottawa to sign the anti-personnel land mine ban. The success demonstrates what Canadian foreign policy can do on the international stage. Soon, though, we will have life after land mines and Canada is uniquely poised to take up the challenge of addressing the biggest challenge of all, how to prevent war.

From Bosnia to Rwanda, the world has failed to prevent these vicious internecine conflicts even when the writing was on the wall for generations. Once blood has been shed and economies destroyed the seeds for future conflicts are sown for generations to come.

● (1405)

We must move our foreign policy from a reactive one to a proactive one. We must move from conflict management to conflict prevention.

Canada is uniquely poised to do this and I hope that our 21st century can be a safer one than the 20th century.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

### WORLD AIDS DAY

**Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, "Children in a world marked by AIDS" is the theme for World AIDS Day. All the children of Canada and throughout the entire world will spend

*S. O. 31*

their entire lives dealing with the risk of infection by the virus that causes AIDS.

In Quebec, the latest figures indicate that AIDS hits children under the age of 15 hard, particularly marginalized youth. Some 3.8 million children under that age have been infected with HIV since the start of the AIDS epidemic in the early 1980s, and 2.7 million of those have probably died by now, according to the latest UN AIDS report.

[*English*]

AIDS is emerging as a leading problem for youth in Canada. The medium age of new infections dropped from age 32 in 1982 to age 23 in 1986-90.

Today's announcement by the Minister of Health to commit \$42.2 million a year over the next five years will ensure that our efforts to educate our youth to the dangers of AIDS and to provide treatment, care and support to those suffering will be maintained during this crucial time.

In a world with AIDS children are everyone's responsibility. We owe this to the next generation. We owe this to our children's future.

\* \* \*

[*Translation*]

**WORLD AIDS DAY**

**Mr. Maurice Dumas (Argenteuil—Papineau, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of World AIDS Day to honour all of the men and women engaged in the search for a cure for this dreadful disease.

I would also like us all to remember its far too numerous victims. Since 1978, 14,836 cases have been reported in Canada. To date, 10,837 people with AIDS have died. Far too many, alas.

According to the Department of Health, the AIDS epidemic could cost the Canadian economy up to \$22 billion over the next five years, if nothing is done to check it. Terry Albert and Gregory Williams, the authors of the report, conclude that "over the past seven years, Canada has lost ground in its battle against the AIDS epidemic".

Canada must regain lost ground and develop an AIDS prevention strategy that is beyond reproach, not only for economic reasons but also, and above all, for humanitarian ones.

\* \* \*

**TERRORISM**

**Ms. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, in my riding of Notre-

Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, the vice-president of the Lachine Committee for Canadian Unity, Hélène Tobin, and her family were the victims of attempted murder and arson. Someone had planted a home-made bomb in front of the door of the house. Fortunately, the bomb did not explode.

Mrs. Tobin is the latest target of the undemocratic persons who promote terrorism to advance political causes. These terrorists represent neither my Quebec nor my Canada, and I strongly condemn them.

I therefore urge all persons who call themselves democrats and who believe that our Canadian democracy and our basic rights are precious and should be preserved to distance themselves clearly from this undemocratic and pro-violence movement.

\* \* \*

[*English*]

**AVALANCHE**

**Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay respect to the families of Aimee Beddoe, David Ferrel, Mike Patry and Alexander Velev.

These Calgary youths tragically died in an avalanche while skiing in the Kananaskis over the weekend. The four teens were students at Western Canada High School in Calgary and were deeply loved by their friends and families.

Aimee, David, Mike and Alexander demonstrated a great love of life and were all active in sports and outdoor activities.

As many of us in this House are parents, I know our hearts go out to their families in this time of loss. Their children's lives were a great gift and blessing to many. They can take comfort from the joy their children gave to them.

These families can be assured that our thoughts and prayers are with them in hope that the families of Aimee, David, Mike and Alexander might find peace in this difficult time.

\* \* \*

**JACQUES PARIZEAU**

**Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my indignation over the recent comments by Jacques Parizeau. He pointed to minorities in Quebec as the cause of his failure. The real cause of his failure is his narrow vision of Quebec.

Mr. Parizeau and his colleagues are promoting prejudice and the rejection of Canada. It is time that the separatists realize the future of Quebec and indeed all of Canada is founded on diversity. The way of progress and harmony for Quebec and Canada is through diversity, not through separation.

*Oral Questions*

• (1410)

**WESTRAY**

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the sun did not rise in Nova Scotia today for Myles Gillis or Johnny Halloran. It never will. Dawn will never come for any of the 26 miners killed in the Westray mine.

Today is day 2,160 of their long night that never ends. Nothing we can do will ever change that. Nothing we do here on the surface in the sunlight will ever again let them feel dawn, a child's hug, the warmth of their wife asleep in their arms.

No report, no heartfelt apologies can ever make what happened to them all right. Killing workers can never be all right, but we can remember. We must keep their memory burning bright in our hearts and we must not squander their lives.

Regardless of party or politics, we must do all we can to make sure their fate never becomes the fate of any other woman or man who goes off to work every day. It is the least we can do for those 26 men and those who loved them. It is something to look forward to, like the dawn.

\* \* \*

*[Translation]***JACQUES PARIZEAU**

**Mr. Robert Bertrand (Pontiac—Gatineau—Labelle, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak once again about the statements made by the former Premier of Quebec, Jacques Parizeau, who said that the referendum defeat was attributable to ethnic groups.

Such a statement is unworthy of a former premier who claimed to work for every Quebecker. Therefore, I would hope, along with many of my colleagues, that every sovereignist will state loud and clear that he does not agree with such a statement, in the same way that, during the weekend, they condemned actions like those of Raymond Villeneuve, that are starting to become an embarrassment for the sovereignist cause.

I thought that the Parti Quebecois convention held last weekend would have provided them the opportunity to distance themselves from this statement. That was not the case, however, because they discussed instead the plan by militants to reinstate the sovereignty council to promote the independence of Quebec.

\* \* \*

*[English]***PORNOGRAPHY**

**Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of this House the deep concerns of many of my constituents regarding pornography.

The Saint John local chapter of the Catholic Women's League has sent me several little ribbons in recognition of White Ribbons Against Pornography or WRAP week. The CWL took part in the WRAP activities from October 19 to 26 this year.

The members of the CWL and their parishioners wore the ribbons and then they wrote their names on the back and sent them to me to show their opposition to pornography in any form. We need stronger laws to protect us from this destructive menace in our society.

Today, with the Internet, pornography is within easy reach of our children.

I commend my constituents for their efforts and I wholeheartedly agree with them. I urge this government to protect Canadians and their children and pass stronger anti-pornography laws.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[English]***CANADA POST**

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, early in November it was apparent that negotiations at the post office were going nowhere. The Reform Party then called for a legislated solution, but of course the government said no.

Then negotiations broke down and the ensuing strike has cost Canadians \$3 billion. Guess what? Now the government is going to legislate a solution, what it should have done in the first place. This has cost \$3 billion to the Canadian business community and consumers.

To whom should business people send this \$3 billion bill, to Canada Post, to the unions or to the prime minister?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what this government did was let the collective bargaining system have a fair chance.

Over 94.5% of the disputes under the federal jurisdiction are settled without loss of work. Now we have to move to legislation. I urge my colleagues to make sure this legislation moves as quick as possible.

• (1415)

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the minister is a living contradiction of his own statements. His faith in bargaining has been misplaced and now the government is going to legislate.

Even with the legislative solution, it is going to be days before the mail moves again. Some of the old style union leaders are trying to get their members to further punish the public by blocking highways, stopping traffic on bridges and even shutting down airports.

*Oral Questions*

What will the government do with these threats of illegal activity? Will the government continue to dither like it did when the mail stopped moving?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, what we are dealing with here is simply a strike. The time has come when we must move legislation. I ask my hon. colleague to support that legislation and make sure it moves through the House as quickly as possible to get the post office back to work.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Catherine Swift of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business is calling for a permanent end to the problems at Canada Post, and we agree. Either end Canada Post's monopoly on first class mail and open it up to competition or, if it is to remain a public monopoly, replace strikes and lockouts with binding arbitration.

What precisely is the government going to do to make sure that Canadians are never faced with this type of situation again?

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague is well aware that part I of the Canada Labour Code is coming to the House again. The Sims report reviewed part I of the legislation and there was no suggestion to take away the right to strike. I ask the hon. member to make sure that when the legislation comes to the House that he supports it.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, during the last month the government has had three separate positions to take to Kyoto. First, it was 1990 levels by 2010 agreed to by the provinces and the federal government. Nine days after that the Prime Minister said "Oh, no, it is not 2010, it is 2007". Today we have a new position saying "Oh, it is going to be 3% less in 2010". Three different positions in as many weeks.

If this is the latest government position, will the environmental minister tell Canadians how much this Kyoto deal is going to cost?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the Reform colleague is not correct. Until today, this government has not said what our targets and timelines are. Today we have set our targets in place. This government is committed to negotiating a target which states we will reduce by 3% below 1990 levels for the year 2010, we will reduce another 5% below that for the year 2015.

When will the Reform Party stop saying no to this issue and realize that it is serious and all Canadians need to participate?

**Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, well, golly, I think the minister just identified the problem: they did not have it until today. That is what the people wanted to know. Good Lord.

The question is, how is the government going to do it? Premier Klein is not all on side. What about the unemployment and what about the costs? Again I ask, how many jobs is this going to cost and how many dollars for the Kyoto deal?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we on this side are convinced that we have to address this issue because the cost of not addressing it will be higher than addressing it. We believe that Canadians, with their ingenuity, and our entrepreneurs will assure us that in fact we are going to create jobs in this country. We are going to experience energy efficiency. Our health costs are going to be reduced. Canada will be the big winner in this.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CANADA POST**

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, the government is about to table today a bill forcing postal workers back to work.

In light of the fact that, last week, the government seemed to favour free collective bargaining, is today's action not motivated first and foremost by the desire to collect \$200 million in dividends from the Canada Post Corporation, which would explain today's attempt to deny these workers the right to bargain freely?

• (1420)

[English]

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the government is going to put a piece of legislation in place in order to put CUPW back to work and get the post office in operation.

The Canadian people need the post office. We have given the collective bargaining system a fair period of time. Now it is time to move.

[Translation]

**Mr. Michel Gauthier (Roberval, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, how can the government explain that, in spite of all the rhetoric from the Prime Minister and his labour minister, the major stages of this postal dispute, that is to say almost no negotiations, followed by a 10-day strike, the introduction of special legislation and resumption of postal operations, are precisely the ones announced on August 6 by the minister responsible for postal services to the Canadian Direct Marketing Association?

*Oral Questions**[English]*

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, bargaining started three months before the end of the contract. We appointed a conciliation officer, a conciliation commissioner. We have given them every opportunity to come to an agreement.

Then the time comes when the government must move. That time has come. It is now.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, postal workers are finding themselves in a difficult situation today, with the government planning to take away their right to strike before they can gain any real leverage.

How can the Prime Minister justify the remarks he made last week in support of collective bargaining when the government already had a plan and the Canada Post Corporation knew it could count on the imminent introduction of special back-to-work legislation?

*[English]*

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** As I indicated previously, Mr. Speaker, there is a process to follow.

This government followed the process. Three months before the end of the contract both parties negotiated. I appointed a conciliation officer, a conciliation commissioner and even put a mediator in for a few days.

A time comes when the government must move. The time has come.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Réjean Lefebvre (Champlain, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, incidentally, as early as August 6, it was clear that the dice were loaded. Will the government admit that postal workers did not have any hope of a negotiated agreement?

*[English]*

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody in this House could indicate that I did not support the collective bargaining process. I think I gave them every opportunity to come to a collective agreement. They had all the opportunity.

Now, today, we must move.

\* \* \*

**PAY EQUITY**

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. For 13 years the government has used stall tactics to deny justice to tens of thousands of its employees seeking pay equity.

We have a former Liberal senator basking in the Mexican sun. Since 1990 he has been paid \$500,000 and \$80,000 in tax free expenses and only sat in the Senate 12 times.

If this is the government's idea of equal pay for work of equal value, these employees deserve more than they are owed.

Is this the government's idea of pay equity?

• (1425)

**The Speaker:** I am going to allow the question because it was sort of tied in, but the preamble was a bit far-ranging.

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I will of course not comment on the question relating to the Senate.

With respect to the question relating to pay equity, I am glad to have the occasion to reaffirm once more that this longstanding dispute with employees is one which we would like to settle through negotiations.

We offered \$842 million in April. We have increased that number to \$1.3 billion. That is equivalent to between \$15,000 and \$20,000 per employee.

The government has done the correct thing. It is offering pay equity. Now it is a question of the union being—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Churchill.

**Ms. Bev Desjarlais (Churchill, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the government is getting a much deserved reputation for changing the rules and lowering its standards.

Will the President of the Treasury Board settle this dispute fairly, once and for all, or is he going to signal to the public that pay equity is dead?

**Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, how much more do they want? We proclaimed pay equity in 1978. We have paid about \$1 billion in the last few years to attain it. There is clearly at present equal pay for equal work.

The problem is one of methodology on which clearly the union does not want to negotiate. We are ready to offer a settlement which makes sense, but it takes two to tango.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC):** Mr. Speaker, today Canadians are finding out that they really do not have a government. They have a process, whether it is the postal strike, whether it is pay equity or whether it is Kyoto.

I would like to ask a question of fact of the process government. It is a straightforward, simple question. Could the Liberal government tell us today which provincial or territorial governments in

*Oral Questions*

this country officially support the position which it announced today with respect to Kyoto?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the federal government has spent a lot of time talking with its provincial counterparts, territorial counterparts and with all sectors of Canadian society. They understand that Canada, as a trading nation, must be part of an international consensus and they understand that the government has to have some leeway.

Several provincial representatives and ministers will be officially accompanying our delegation to Kyoto.

**Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised. The minister said they spent a lot of time. We knew that much. They spent a lot of time.

At this rate, however, I hope for everyone's sake that they will not put the whole delegation on the same plane to Kyoto because at this rate they will probably come off the plane with a different position than the one announced today.

While they are at it, could they explain to Canadians how they expect to implement in Canada any position that is taken in Kyoto without the active engagement and support of provincial or territorial governments?

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I understand from my colleague's comments that he supports the federal government in what it is trying to do.

We have made it very clear that implementation will depend on our plans and negotiations with all of our partners in Canada, after Kyoto, when we know exactly what the international legally binding targets are.

We will be there with the provinces, the territories, industry and business.

\* \* \*

**THE ECONOMY**

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Canadians from coast to coast are demanding that the government get off its shop-until-you-drop spending fixation in favour of debt reduction.

In fact, the hon. member for Hillsborough found out that 79% of his constituents favour lower debt, lower taxes, and only 21% favour an increase in spending, and that is in hard-pressed Prince Edward Island.

Will the government listen to the hon. member for Hillsborough and all Canadians and start to move forcibly in the direction of reducing debt? That is what Canadians want.

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have already paid down \$16 billion of debt this year. Our government is going to take a very

balanced approach. We will continue to pay down the debt, we will reduce taxes and we will strengthen our social and economic framework.

• (1430)

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** That is hardly a balanced approach, Mr. Speaker. They offered 29 new spending initiatives in the throne speech.

As usual Canadian people are a way ahead of the government. They understand how vulnerable we are with this \$600 billion debt. They understand that rising interest costs will eat the heart out of social programs and remove our ability to start to reduce taxes.

Will the government make a firm commitment today to devote at least half of all surpluses to debt reduction?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I have said to the hon. member, we are committed to debt reduction. We have already demonstrated our commitment by deeds and actions.

We are committed to making sure we have the strongest social and economic framework for Canadians for the future and to ensure opportunities for all Canadians from coast to coast. We are also committed to reducing taxes which we know in many cases are high.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**KYOTO SUMMIT**

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, after waiting until the last minute, the government is finally informing us of the position it will take at the Kyoto summit. As we know, following the Rio summit, in 1992, only Quebec and British Columbia ratified the agreement.

Now that the Minister of the Environment has finally managed to achieve a consensus on greenhouse gases among cabinet members, what will she do to ensure that the potential Kyoto agreement is accepted and ratified by the provinces?

[English]

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have indicated to all the provinces, business, industry and environmental organizations, in fact all stakeholders, that they are invited and welcome to participate with us in the development and finalization of the implementation plan.

From day one we have adopted an inclusive, collaborative approach. Most of the stakeholders have responded positively. We expect that by the end of the day we will have all Canadians inside the tent working constructively on solutions.

*Oral Questions**[Translation]*

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of the Environment pledge today, in this House, to set up an independent committee to monitor the implementation of the recommendations in the potential Kyoto agreement?

*[English]*

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there will be a variety of means by which parliament and Canadians generally will be able to monitor progress toward the implementation of any agreement flowing out of Kyoto.

The hon. gentleman has made a suggestion that we should look at. I can also tell him that the Energy Council of Canada, the National Round Table on Environment and the Economy, and a whole variety of other groups and organizations are very anxious to participate in building the solutions and in monitoring the process.

\* \* \*

**TAXATION**

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the secretary of state talked about the deeds and actions of his government's fiscal policy. Let us look at a couple of them.

There have been 37 tax increases in different areas since 1993, \$25 billion in increased taxes since 1993, and now it wants to increase the CPP payroll tax by 73%. Those are the deeds and actions of the Liberal government.

Since the secretary of state astutely put it that he recognized the high taxes in the country, has he been able to demonstrate his perceptiveness to the finance minister?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, he has done this totally without my assistance. The finance minister has cut EI premiums by an accumulative amount of \$7.1 billion since we took office. The finance minister has cut taxes for the families of the working poor, for the disabled, for charities and voluntary organizations, for students and their parents. This is what the finance minister has done.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the average Canadian family has had \$3,000 less disposable income every year since the Liberal Party took power in 1993. That is how the finance minister has been achieving some of these targets.

If the secretary of state recognizes the incredible burden high taxes are putting on Canadian families and businesses, how will he be able to convince the finance minister to see his point of view?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. member would recognize that Canada has the lowest payroll taxes of the G-7.

It would be totally irresponsible for us to announce massive across the board tax decreases when we still have a deficit.

\* \* \*

● (1435)

*[Translation]***MARINE INDUSTRY**

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

The federal government provides strong support to the aerospace industry and boasts about its success. However, it refuses to do the same for the shipbuilding industry, which develops sophisticated products and employs a highly skilled workforce.

Given the success of the aerospace industry, should the government not provide similar support to shipbuilders in Quebec and Canada?

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is not an accurate statement, since we already have a national policy in place. Depreciation rates for ships are very high. There are also programs in place to support ship sales and operations. Therefore, it is not true that there is no policy to support shipbuilding companies.

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, will the minister admit that he should support the shipbuilding industry in Quebec and Canada by taking the same kind of measures the U.S. government has in place for its industry, so that our builders can at least compete on a level playing field with the Americans?

*[English]*

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it depends on what the hon. member exactly means.

If she means that we should have an equivalent to the U.S. style of protectionism in the Jones Act, I do not think she would find very general support for that. If she thinks we should have export sales support as does the U.S., my answer to her is that we do. If she asks me whether I think we should turn over subsidies to an industry to enable it to sell into international markets, I suggest to her that I do not agree with that.

*Oral Questions***SENATE REFORM**

**Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, the prime minister said in 1990 "if elected Liberal leader I pledge to work for a Senate that is elected and that has legislative powers of its own". Yet for the past seven years Senator Andrew Thompson has had his toes in the sand and Pacific breezes on his face. The Canadian people have shelled out over a half million dollars to keep him there.

Canadian taxpayers want Senate reform. The opposition wants Senate reform. Only the prime minister does not want Senate reform. Is there any Liberal who will stand up now for the Canadian people and demand Senate reform? Is there one?

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the applause by Reform Party members does not indicate the rumour is true that they are seeking to have me replace the current leader of the Reform Party.

We are interested in Senate reform but the Reformers have proven there is no point in pursuing it because of the way they opposed it when they opposed the Charlottetown accord.

**Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, people in Canada want real Senate reform. Since 1990 Senator Thompson has collected a half million taxpayer dollars while he suns himself in Mexico.

What did the Prime Minister do? He gave Thompson even more beach time by relieving him of his caucus duties.

How many more Senate haciendas will Canadians have to buy? How many more six month Margaritaville holidays will taxpayers pick up the tab for before the PM keeps his word and reforms the Senate?

**Hon. Herb Gray (Deputy Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we do not condone the conduct of the senator in question. However this is not due to any government decision or anything within the direct power of the government. It is a matter for the internal economy committee of the Senate. I understand it is dealing with the matter.

In the meantime let us have members of the Reform Party make clear that they are dropping their opposition to Senate reform which they voted against in the course of the Charlottetown accord. Let Reformers get up and say what they really stand for when it comes to true reform of the Senate, not just electing one way but unelecting if a—

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Verchères.

[Translation]

**INARI**

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

The Department of Foreign Affairs have been aware, for at least five years, of the dubious activities of INARI, despite its UN accreditation.

How is that, despite criticism of this agency, the government has still, five years later, not asked the UN to withdraw INARI's accreditation?

• (1440)

[English]

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member I would welcome any representation he would like to make on the exact kinds of changes he believes should be made.

We are looking very carefully at the matter. We would be very happy to hear what the opposition has to say.

\* \* \*

**HIV-AIDS**

**Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this is World AIDS Day. The Minister of Health announced this morning that there would be funding for AIDS and HIV programs.

Given the significant importance of this health issue, how does Canada compare with other countries in its attack against AIDS?

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will know that in the course of the last mandate the amount of funds contributed to strategies to combat AIDS ranks second worldwide.

The \$200 million plus that were designated for dealing with this epidemic have again been renewed for an additional five year term. It comes out to about \$42.2 million per annum to address the epidemic, the therapies, the vaccines and perhaps a cure, hopefully a cure. Canada is leading and is in the forefront of addressing the AIDS epidemic.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**CANADIAN UNITY**

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, ten long weeks ago, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs said he was going to consult Quebecers about the Calgary declaration.

*Oral Questions*

Ten weeks later, he has done nothing. Separatists, however, have not been sitting idle. Lucien Bouchard is already talking about a snap election or referendum.

What is the government doing to ensure that the separatists no longer overtake it?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, if I may reassure the member, the forces of Canadian unity are now overtaking Quebec's separatist forces.

[*English*]

**Mr. Rahim Jaffer (Edmonton—Strathcona, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. minister would act on his words.

The separatists alarm clock is ringing but the government is hitting the snooze button. It is sleepwalking its way toward another referendum.

Why are Quebeckers the only Canadians not being consulted on the Calgary declaration? Why is Lucien Bouchard the only politician talking to Quebeckers on unity?

**Hon. Stéphane Dion (President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will accept that what he said is wrong. It is nonsense.

He knows that we are working very hard. All the parties believe in unity for Canada. The results are promising. We must keep going. A good way to do it would be for he and his party to be strongly behind supporting the Calgary declaration.

\* \* \*

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Natural Resources.

On the Kyoto announcement, is the government intent on supporting the Reform fearmongering on this issue instead of acknowledging that efforts to cut emissions can be a powerful job creator?

Could the Minister of Natural Resources explain what targets have been set for job creation through greenhouse gas emission efforts like public transportation, building retrofits, clean environmental technologies and transitional funding for displaced workers and industries?

**Hon. Ralph E. Goodale (Minister of Natural Resources and Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, all elements mentioned by the hon. gentleman may well be part of an implementation package.

We will work on that package immediately after Kyoto in consultation with provinces and otherwise. He should know that my department is already investing \$70 million a year in efforts directed toward the climate change issue.

In the 1997 budget that was increased by a further \$20 million a year. We are hopeful that innovations like the Ballard fuel cell, the separation of carbon dioxide, the deal between Petro-Canada and IOGEN, and all these new technology innovations will create jobs.

**Mr. Rick Laliberte (Churchill River, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, the Liberal announcement for Kyoto is finally here but it is no where near the previous red book promises or international commitments. Canadians know that Liberals often miss or forget their promises.

Will the Minister of the Environment assure Canadians that job creation will be a major instrument used to reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

• (1445)

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, this government believes that dealing with this issue, bringing in all of our partners to focus on measures in fact will be a win-win situation. The environment will be improved. We will have jobs created. There will be many benefits not only for Canada but also for the international community through our efforts.

\* \* \*

**CANADA PENSION PLAN**

**Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise an issue today in the House of Commons that I can only assume has never been raised in the Liberal caucus in the last four years. That is the issue of unemployed Canadians.

I would like to know whether the government would want to acknowledge today that the increase in CPP premiums the Liberals are now planning for will have the net effect of taking away a week's wages for a worker who works and earns less than \$35,000 a year. If they do know that, why are they doing it, or is it someone else's fault?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, Canada still has the lowest payroll taxes of any country in the G-7.

Under the Conservatives, not one responsible action was taken to deal with the growing crisis in the CPP, a deficit that was going to be unfunded by the year 2030 of \$6 billion. But we acted. We acted with the provinces. We acted on behalf of workers and present and future pensioners and we are proud of it.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Jean J. Charest (Sherbrooke, PC):** Mr. Speaker, might I suggest to the minister and the government that they should act their age; they really should assume their responsibilities.

*Oral Questions*

If they are doing so, why is the government now syphoning billions of dollars annually out of the pockets of workers and small businesses in order to create a unnecessary surplus in the EI fund?

Why are they going along with that? Instead of feeding the poor and unemployed statistics, why does the government not return a bit of these people's own money, so as to create jobs in our economy?

[English]

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, when it comes to payroll taxes, that is the government that started out with EI premiums at \$1.95 heading to \$3.30. We have cut them four times: to \$3, to \$2.95, to \$2.90 and now to \$2.70. We do not have anything to learn about payroll taxes from that side of the House.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**UNITED NATIONS MISSION TO HAITI**

**Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Yesterday, the Canadian civilian police mission to Haiti came home. The impact of our contingent on the Haitian people was, without a shadow of a doubt, extremely beneficial. In response to President Préval, the security council unanimously decided to create a new civilian police mission.

What is this new UN mission to Haiti and will Canada be participating?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we are very proud of the 600 members of the Canadian Armed Forces and the civilian police. I think it is a great contribution that will improve the future of Haiti.

As for the new mission, Canada will be sending 24 officers to help the Haitian government train its new national police force.

\* \* \*

[English]

**JUSTICE**

**Mr. Jack Ramsay (Crowfoot, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, last week a group of young offenders beat an innocent girl to death. What comfort did the Minister of Justice offer? This is what she said: "I hope there is nobody out there who believes that if we just made the law tough enough that youth crime would disappear." That is what she said when talking about cruelty to innocent girls, while

indicating she is going to increase the penalty for cruelty to animals by more than four years.

Why is it that people who are cruel to animals are going to serve more jail time than the young offenders who were involved in the beating death of Reena Virk?

**Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to be under a misapprehension. What I indicated in relation to my comments regarding cruelty to animals is that we and the provinces are in the process of reviewing the existing laws. There may or may not be changes made.

I have made it clear over and over again in this House that we are reviewing the Young Offenders Act. We plan to make changes to the Young Offenders Act to make sure that we condemn the kind of conduct that led to the tragedy in Victoria last week.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY**

**Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Orléans, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the St. Lawrence Seaway's closure for the winter, relations between the 525 workers and the administration are strained.

• (1450)

The slowdown by employees could affect traffic severely as ship crews hurry to leave the Seaway before it closes.

My question is for the Minister of Transport. Could the minister assure us that he will encourage the St. Lawrence Seaway authority to negotiate in good faith and to sign a new collective agreement to replace the one that expired a year ago?

[English]

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of Transport, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is appropriate for a minister to give instructions to a crown agency such as the St. Lawrence Seaway in terms of dealing with its employees. I am sure, knowing the management of that body, that it will be dealing with its employees in a fair and just manner, taking into account the financial situation of the seaway and the general economic climate at the time.

\* \* \*

**AIDS**

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister.

Five years ago the Prime Minister promised \$55 million per year for a national AIDS strategy. Today the health minister basically

announced the status quo, coming in at \$42 million per year despite a 50% increase in the rate of HIV infection over the past five years.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister acknowledge that the HIV-AIDS crisis is even more serious today than when the government promised \$55 million? Will he commit to a plan that makes a real difference in stopping this deadly disease?

**Mr. Joseph Volpe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Health, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the commitment that was made has already been lived up to. As I indicated earlier, Canada is essentially a world leader in financing research to combat the AIDS epidemic and in providing funds for palliative care, for therapeutic care and for drug research.

That record is being replicated and improved upon with today's announcement of \$211 million spread out over five years. That is in addition to all the funds that are being disbursed by other agencies like the Medical Research Council for that purpose.

\* \* \*

#### FOREIGN AFFAIRS

**Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC):** Mr. Speaker, section 110 of the U.S. Immigration Reform Act was before Congress for 13 months, passing in September 1996.

When I asked the Minister of Foreign Affairs to table a list of official representations made by our ambassador in Washington, I was told it would be a very long list. In committee a department official confirmed that there was only one representation made and it was a letter sent in December 1996, three months after the bill passed.

Why did the minister indicate that greater representation had been made than had actually been made? Why did our ambassador drop the ball in representing Canadian interests in Washington?

**Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I basically stand by my previous answer. A wide variety of people made a wide variety of representations to a wide variety of congressmen and senators, including the administration. We have the result that the United States Congress is moving to eliminate that part of Bill 110.

\* \* \*

#### TAXATION

**Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for International Financial Institutions.

Canada made some structural changes a decade ago to our income tax system and we have taken some steps in our previous budgets. Can the secretary of state tell us whether income tax reform is on the government's agenda?

#### Oral Questions

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, yes, we look forward to the report of the finance committee as well as to the report of the Mintz committee.

As well, we have already undertaken some important reforms. We are the party for example that has abolished the \$100,000 lifetime capital gains exemption. We have restricted the use of tax shelters. We have eliminated the advantages for family trusts. We have also dealt with the issue of taxpayer migration.

It is important to recognize that Canada has the most progressive income tax system in the G-7. Two per cent of tax filers have an income over \$100,000. They pay 21% of taxes. We will continue to look forward to methods of improving—

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

**Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, Corporal Matthew Schovanek's hopes and dreams were robbed from him while on peacekeeping duty in Croatia. He was left paralyzed, blind and in need of full time care for the rest of his life. His skull was crushed because our military sent him into service without a helmet. Helmets were not issued because of significant accounting difficulties, whatever that means.

• (1455)

The government must accept responsibility for what has happened to Matthew. Will the government assure Matthew and his family that he will be properly compensated for this horrendous preventable accident?

**Hon. Fred Mifflin (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of State (Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this House and I am sure the government and the opposition share the tragedy of the event when any member of the Canadian forces has a casualty, whether on duty or not.

I have to say and I think the hon. member knows that this matter is before the courts. It would be most inappropriate for me to comment any further.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### ASBESTOS INDUSTRY

**Mr. Jean-Guy Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, with respect to the asbestos issue, the Government of Quebec has sent four letters since February to the federal government asking it to lodge a complaint against France before the World Trade Organization. Only the Minister for International Trade seems not to be aware of these letters.

*Oral Questions*

When will the government make up its mind to complain to the WTO about France's banning of asbestos?

[English]

**Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that the member forgot to mention that when the premier of Quebec visited France, he specifically requested the federal government to back off and back away from any WTO challenge. Now that he is safely back, the member asks where have you been? In case he has gone missing in action, my deputy minister chaired a meeting in Quebec last week with government officials from Quebec and with the industry. There is strong consensus on moving forward together.

\* \* \*

**EDUCATION**

**Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources Development.

Last week in speaking to students at Carleton University, the premier of B.C. spoke out boldly and called on Ottawa and the provinces to work together to freeze tuition fees and reduce growing student debt. B.C. has already led the way in freezing tuition fees.

Will the minister support the B.C. initiative and admit that government must put the brakes on tuition fees and restore government funding now?

**Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, we have the great pleasure and privilege to live in a federation. As you know, tuition fees are the responsibility of provincial governments. I am going to respect what the provincial governments do as far as they are concerned.

What I can tell the member is that we as a government have been working very hard to help the students. We are going to make changes to the Canada student loans program because there needs to be a number of changes as far as that is concerned. We have met with the student associations, with the provinces, with the banks and we are moving along pretty well.

\* \* \*

**GOVERNMENT SPENDING**

**Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC):** Mr. Speaker, over the last four years the Liberal government has been cutting indiscriminately, all this without considering the impact of cuts and the future competitiveness of young Canadians. Now that there is some evidence of a surplus, it appears that the government is ready to spend indiscriminately. There is a feeding frenzy going on. The ministers are

fighting for their share of the surplus pot. The government is planning to spend carelessly and quickly.

Will the Minister of Finance inform the House of the criteria that new initiatives will undergo?

**Hon. Jim Peterson (Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions), Lib.):** First, Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize that we still have a deficit. We still have a debt which is over 73% of our gross domestic product.

Yes, the hon. member has recognized that we have had to cut program spending from \$120 billion to \$105 billion. A lot of programs have suffered because of that. The member also has to recognize that there are tax cuts which we would hope to be able to bring in when they are sustainable.

\* \* \*

**TRADE**

**Mr. Steve Mahoney (Mississauga West, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry.

In 1994 the federal government and the provinces signed an agreement on internal trade as a beginning toward the elimination of all interior trade barriers in Canada.

Can the minister inform the House on the implementation of this accord and what plans are there to eliminate all remaining internal trade barriers?

• (1500)

**Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the agreement on internal trade signed in 1994 was an important first step in eliminating and reducing the trade barriers. However, I have to say that the progress that we had hoped to see in chapters such as government procurement in the MASH sector, energy, agriculture and so on has been very slow in coming.

I would also like to point out that many of the changes we would like to see adopted in the internal trade agreement, changes that would, for example, cause all the rules to apply to all trade except where exceptions are taken, are ones we think should be implemented as soon as possible.

I hope provincial governments will share our enthusiasm.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

**PRESENCE IN GALLERY**

**The Speaker:** I wish to draw the attention of members to the presence in our gallery of His Excellency, Mr. Erik Derycke, Minister of Foreign Affairs for Belgium.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

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

\* \* \*

### COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

#### FINANCE

**Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan—King—Aurora, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 83.1, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the second report of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance entitled "Keeping the Balance: Security and Opportunity for Canadians". This report reflects the input of literally thousands of Canadians from coast to coast and outlines the committee's recommendations for the 1998 budget.

Canadians approached this consultation with an understanding that economic growth and fiscal success are not ends in themselves but rather a means to improving the quality of life for all Canadians.

Our conversation with Canadians has allowed us to answer the question of what our approach should be for the challenges of this new era. To put it simply, Canadians want balance; not just a balanced budget but balance in government policies, in its goals and results.

Canadians want balance between the security offered by debt reduction and the benefits of investing in people, technology and research and development. Canadians firmly believe that health and education are not just items on a balance sheet but rather an expression of our core values.

• (1505)

Canadians have demanded accountability from the government, as well as responsibility from themselves. In "Keeping the Balance" we have tried to respond with the substance our fellow citizens demand as well as a budget plan they deserve.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to respond to the government report. The Reform Party minority report is appended to the government report on the prebudget hearings. In that report we point out that Canadians across the country, from coast to coast, universally do not accept the government's 50:50 spending promise. They do not accept that we need to

### Routine Proceedings

spend ever more money. In fact, there is a tremendous emphasis on paying down debt and reducing taxes.

I believe that reflects what the Reform Party has heard in consultations across the country and that is reflected in its minority report which is appended to the government report.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if there would be unanimous consent for all parties to respond to the tabling of the committee report in the same manner as the Reform Party just did.

**The Speaker:** We have a report from the committee. We have a response. We now have a request from the hon. member for Winnipeg—Transcona to speak to the tabling of the committee report. We are going to try to do this legally.

Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to put the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Speaker:** Does the House agree that all the parties should have a chance to respond to the report with equal time?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps I missed it, but I would like to ask you whether there was a time limitation put on this. I would also like the House to be well aware that this is in no way a case precedent and not necessarily going to be given to parties—

**The Speaker:** The usual tradition of the House is that whatever time it takes for the report to be tabled, other parties get equal time.

I would presume if the House has agreed to have responses that all the responders to this committee report would have approximately the same amount of time as the presenter of the report.

With that I will hear the hon. member for Halifax.

• (1510)

**Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words about this report, specifically to draw attention to the dissenting opinion filed by the NDP finance critic who quite correctly is concerned about the priorities reflected in the report.

I think the point of view he has presented on behalf of our caucus is summed up by the words "the federal books may be in balance, but the economy is out of kilter".

For that reason, the New Democratic Party has put forward a dissenting view in which we have outlined the priorities that we think more accurately reflect the concerns, the voices and the values of the broad majority of Canadians that simply do not find expression in the government's majority report.

*Privilege*

We have had an opportunity to set forward what we think the priorities ought to be, starting with making jobs the number one priority, first and foremost, which is still not reflected in the prebudget report.

Finally, the overall priority in addition to finally setting timetables and targets with respect to job creation is to be given to investments which raise our long term social and economic well-being, investments in education, in health, in tackling poverty and in the sustainability of our natural environment.

[Translation]

**Mr. Odina Desrochers (Lotbinière, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, once again, in reading the report presented by the chair of the Standing Committee on Finance, we can recognize the style of the Liberal government, a government focused on maple leaf-flavoured propaganda.

Reading this report, which was leaked by the Toronto media, we can see that the Liberals are attempting to pass it off as an objective summary of what the numerous organizations and individuals consulted since mid-October from coast to coast had to say. This is false.

In reality, this report is nothing but the red program of the Liberals from the last electoral campaign. Once again, the Liberals have thumbed their noses at the rules of democracy, by squeezing the opposition parties into a tight timeframe and thus trying to prevent us in the Parti Québécois from voicing our opposition.

I have, moreover, strongly urged the chair of the Standing Committee on Finance to hold an in-depth review of the process surrounding publication of the finance report and to conduct his own investigation in order to identify the person or persons responsible for the leak to the media.

At any rate, this report shows that there are two economic visions, one belonging to Canada and the other to Quebec, which are diametrically opposed. Quebec condemns federal intrusion into areas of provincial jurisdiction, while the other provinces are calling for a stepped-up federal presence. The solution is extremely simple. All Quebecers are aware that what will solve all of Quebec's socio-economic problems is Quebec sovereignty.

\* \* \*

[English]

**PRIVILEGE**

## STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

**Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege concerning several matters which arise from the report which was just forwarded from the Standing Committee on Finance.

By an order of this House I am a member of the standing committee. The committee, in obedience with Standing Order 83(10), undertook consideration of proposals regarding the budgetary policy of government. The staff from the Library of Parliament assisting the whole committee prepared a draft document which was to be considered in the formulation of our report.

It is well known that there have been media accounts of the contents of this committee report. I want to express my regret that our report was not first given to all members of the House. That part of the draft report started to find its way into the media before the opposition members of the committee had access to the draft material. We were not given access to the draft material until 10 a.m. last Friday and we were required to prepare a report for today. We had less than three hours to consider that material. Obviously some other members had earlier access.

The premature disclosure of a report or the disclosure of confidential committee documents is a long established ground for contempt proceedings by the House. I was unsuccessful in having this matter reported to the House by the committee so that actions could be taken by the House. I am aware that you are therefore restricted in the actions you can take.

• (1515)

However, I was further obstructed in the discharge of my obligations to this House. On several occasions I requested access to the document which was to form the basis of our draft report. I made my request known to the chairman of the committee and was repeatedly told that I could not have access to these papers which were prepared for the entire committee by staff. This included descriptions of the hearings, summaries of the testimony of witnesses, history of past government policies and so forth.

I was then informed that my opinion about our hearings or the government's budgetary policies could be included in a section of dissenting opinions. In other words, no matter what I may have wanted to propose, I would not be given a chance to have my opinions considered by my colleagues on the committee for inclusion in the report proper.

Opposition views would not find their way into the committee report. I would not have a chance to see a draft report within a reasonable timeframe nor to debate its accuracy and merits and any views which I might have. Whether or not I agreed with the draft report would be relegated to the status of dissent opinions.

Mr. Speaker, this contempt for the maintenance of a legitimate process is troubling to me. These hearings cost Canadian taxpayers over \$400,000. Are they to be nothing but a public relations show for the Minister of Finance? Did they go through this exercise just to save the minister the time of having to meet with the groups that addressed the committee while he met with the select groups of his choosing?

*Privilege*

Certainly there will be a division of opinion about which budgetary policy the government should follow. However, the one-sided nature of this process is a mockery of this House. The Liberal attitude was that there was no need for debate, no need to defend their position, no need to do anything other than to tell the Minister of Finance what he wanted to hear.

The only people on the committee who could offer opinions for inclusion in the main body of the report were the Liberal members of this committee. All other members were denied access to the draft material and their views were held to be not worthy of debate. They were told their opinions would be slapped into the report as dissenting views. Dissenting from what? We committee members were never to know. Nor were the Liberals to consider our views and debate them in committee. We on this side of the House, we are not to be participants. By virtue of where we sit, we are labelled as dissidents from the revealed truth of the Liberals.

The old Liberal arrogance is back. Stop opposition members from participating in discussions, deny them access to draft reports. "They couldn't possibly agree with us so don't waste time letting them in the door". The finance committee of the House of Commons is nothing more than an organ of the Minister of Finance and the Liberal caucus. Certainly this was the view of several witnesses after their experiences before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to consider whether or not the denial of my access to committee draft papers available to other members of the committee constitutes an obstruction of a member and therefore constitutes a prima facie question of privilege.

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, the question of privilege is very serious. I saw two members rising in their places. Is it on this question of privilege?

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** Yes, it is.

**The Speaker:** The hon. member for Medicine Hat.

**Mr. Monte Solberg (Medicine Hat, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, on the same question of privilege, I want to confirm that what I saw of how the finance committee conducted itself with respect to sharing information with members of the opposition exactly reflects what the member said.

When I confirmed to the chairman of the finance committee that we would probably be bringing in a minority report, we were told that we would have to have that minority report in by last Wednesday without seeing the majority report. We never had a chance to even see the report but had to put in a minority report.

• (1520)

To add insult to injury, the next day we read about the government's report in the newspapers. It could only have been leaked from one place, the government. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, it has

really jaundiced my opinion of how the government operates its committees. I do believe that this is a breach of the hon. member's privileges and those of all opposition members who sit on the finance committee.

I hope that the Speaker will very seriously consider what the hon. member is saying. I really do confirm his concerns. I hope that the government takes what it has done extraordinarily seriously because I believe it has caused quite a rift between government and opposition members.

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the points raised by the hon. two members across.

On one hand we heard a number of remarks on the government. Even the government's motive is being questioned by the hon. member from the Conservative Party. While I totally reject the premises and indeed the allegations behind the government's sincerity, what the government is seeking to do and what it asked the committee to do and what I believe the committee did in all sincerity is provide valuable input which I am sure this report will be. I have not read it yet. I suspect neither have most people.

There are two points in particular which I would like to address. One is that the hon. member for Medicine Hat has just said that it wanted to provide a minority report before seeing the report of the majority. He then went on to say that it was wrong for the majority to pretend that it would not agree with the minority report. At the same time he said that he wanted to file a minority report without having seen what he believes was the report of the majority. Mr. Speaker, one cannot have it both ways. That is not logical in the thought process.

On a more fundamental point and where I do agree with hon. members, and hopefully we will all agree, is the following. That a leak from a report from the committee is not appropriate before the House is seized with the report. I believe that the first group of people who should see a report prepared by any committee are hon. members of this House. That is why we have been sent here. This is our mandate. It is our sacred duty. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that you are the custodian of our rights as members of Parliament. To that extent I agree that no one should ever make a report accessible to someone who is not a member of Parliament prior to members of Parliament—

**An hon. member:** What are you going to do about it?

**An hon. member:** So why did you do it?

**Hon. Don Boudria:** Mr. Speaker, one member has just gratuitously accused me personally of leaking the government document. I hope that he would choose to withdraw an allegation like that. For him to even say that is not knowing me very well.

*Privilege*

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is wrong for anyone to leak a report from the committee. Members of the House, I, you and everyone else have a right to see it at the same time, possibly before anyone else.

In regard to the government's motives behind this, Mr. Speaker, I can give you my impression as a member of this government. What we want to know through this process is what the general public thinks should be in the budget. That is why the process is there and that is why we have already scheduled a two day debate later in this session but before Christmas so that Canadians through their members of Parliament can have a debate in the House of Commons and listen to the valuable contributions which all members of Parliament will make in that process.

I summarize by saying that I do not believe that anyone on the government side did anything wrong in terms of the content of the report. I do agree that if anyone leaked this report to the media then that in itself is obviously wrong.

**Mr. Peter MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough, PC):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of privilege just put forward by the hon. member for Markham.

Keeping in mind the comments made by the hon. House leader for the government, I am not going to burden the House with a recitation of precedents on the issue of advanced disclosure of committee reports. The hon. member has put forward the principle that he certainly agrees that all members of this House should be given the opportunity to view this prior to it being made public. Unfortunately, that is no the case here.

• (1525)

Unfortunately, the *Globe and Mail*, the *Star* and another publication—I believe the *Financial Post*—had this information in advance of opposition members. This is a very serious breach of privilege, I would submit.

It is not only an insult to the House, but it is an insult to all members and an insult in particular, I would suggest, to staff members on this committee because as a result of this occurrence, it casts a shadow over their involvement in the process. Those persons are now under suspicion, I would suggest, as a result of this leak occurring.

The point brought forward by the member for Markham is very serious. This is a situation that the government is going to have to look into in more detail, not only to ensure that it does not happen again, but to ensure accountability and to ensure that the good name and reputation of those staff persons involved in this particular committee are not going to be besmirched by this incident.

It is problematic in and of the fact that some members of the committee had it and others did not, but I would suggest equal importance and equal emphasis have to be placed on the fact that these staff persons are now castigated by this particular occurrence.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of a distinct report on the matter from the standing committee, there is an overriding duty on you to permit this House to probe the situation which compromises the staff of this House. They should not have to tolerate this situation in silence, and I say emphatically that I do not believe for one moment that any staff person involved here is the source of the leak—that is not the allegation—but because of the leak, they have been placed in a non-acceptable position and it is up to this House, I would suggest, to remove that cloud.

If the House does not address this premature disclosure issue and the standards it expects regarding disclosure and non-disclosure, the bad situation will be made worse. Some members of this House favour more transparency at the committee deliberations. That, I would suggest, is a good thing. Certainly the Finance committee is not of a mind that leaking a report is going to do anything to help improve the reputation of this House.

They voted down a motion by the hon. member for Markham to bring this matter to the House and now I would suggest a double standard exists. The rules require confidentiality, the committee has voted not to bring the matter of the leak to the attention of the House and others may see merit in keeping it confidential.

However, I would suggest that having a report introduced through the media rather than the proper channels that we know exist in this House is completely inappropriate.

Whatever the views of this House, I would suggest that there should be some debate and an agreement on the standards that we expect with respect to the introduction of these reports.

Mr. Speaker, I invite you to consider the position of the employees involved in this particular matter when this game is played and leaks are put out to the media and I would ask that should you find that a prima facie case exists meriting priority consideration by this House, I would be pleased to move the motion in this regard.

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, I want to hear opinions, of course, on a point of privilege. I do not want us to get into debate. If we go back and forth, it turns into a debate.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say briefly that we support the comments by the Conservative members about the Liberals. In the present circumstances, it is very obvious

that what has been done is very harmful to the government's pre-budgetary consultations.

I would like to speak about my personal situation. I conducted a pre-budgetary consultation in my riding and constituents kept asking me if it was serious, if it would be taken into consideration, if they would be able to see the results of the suggestions they were making. I said that when I was elected to Parliament, this pre-budgetary consultation process did not really exist. It can be considered one of this government's good moves.

But today, with the news of the leak, everything that has been said—and that is what I told my constituents as their member of Parliament—has been thrown into question by the fact that there is now no point in participating, that this is more political opportunism to give one party a leg up over the others.

I therefore find the comment by the Conservative member to be very relevant. The government can try to make the best of it by allowing two days of debate. I think that that would perhaps be interesting.

• (1530)

My feeling as a parliamentarian, however, was that I and the constituents in my riding who took part in the consultations had been taken for a ride.

[*English*]

**The Speaker:** I am going to listen a second time out, if you have new information to give us, the hon. member for Medicine Hat, and then I will go to the hon. member for Mississauga South.

**Mr. Monte Solberg:** Mr. Speaker, I simply want to point out very quickly that oftentimes opposition parties do issue minority reports. I was being very frank with the chairman of the finance committee when I made that statement. I did not suggest for a second that opposition members should not be allowed to see the majority report. Even if we do issue a minority report, Mr. Speaker, certainly it would be nice to be able to see the majority report so that if we wish to amend what we are proposing we can do that but that was not allowed.

The second point I wish to make very briefly is that I trust, Mr. Speaker, you will look into the very serious matter of who leaked this document and that it will be made very public so that we can get to the bottom of this. I do believe that it besmirches the whole reputation of the committee system when that sort of thing happens in Parliament.

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to bring to the Chair's attention that a point of privilege on this very same matter came before the House last Friday.

### *Privilege*

I would also like to advise the Chair that at the finance committee meeting last Friday when this matter first came to light as a result of the article in the *Globe and Mail* that morning, the committee did spend extensive time discussing it. I think the record will show this. I urge the Chair to look at the transcript of the committee, if it is available as it was an in camera session. The members on the finance committee unanimously agreed that the situation that had occurred was unacceptable and passed a resolution requiring the chair to undertake a full investigation of what happened on behalf of all the members so that we could all know.

I just wanted the Chair to know that since last Friday this issue is being dealt with by the chair of the finance committee. I just raise that for your attention, Mr. Speaker.

**The Speaker:** We are still on this point of privilege. Unless there are more pertinent facts to be brought to the Chair's attention, I trust we will not go over information that was given previously. The hon. member for Prince George—Bulkley Valley.

**Mr. Dick Harris (Prince George—Bulkley Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, in support of the question of privilege by the hon. member for Markham, I want to tell you that I have firsthand knowledge of the proceedings and how he got to his question of privilege.

I want to add to the argument. It is very clear from comments made that the Liberal members of the committee in fact did have prior knowledge of the committee report before it was presented to the committee. That was absolutely clear from statements that were made.

Also, there were members of the committee who did acknowledge that they had discussed certain issues that the committee dealt with with the media over the last few days. To what extent that went is up for debate but members had recognized that.

I also believe that the opposition members' privileges were breached due to the fact that the Liberal members of the committee took part in the formation of the committee report at the exclusion of the opposition members of that committee.

**Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Transcona, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into the details of this dispute because I am not a member of the finance committee and was not previously consulted about this point of privilege.

I do however want to register a concern that we have with any evidence or suggestion that committee reports are being leaked to the media before other members, particularly opposition members, have seen them or for that matter that committee reports are being leaked anywhere. We remember still with great offence that the committee report on the review of the drug patent legislation was leaked to the minister before it was finally reported.

*Routine Proceedings*

• (1535)

We want to register our continuing opposition to any way in which reports are released prematurely or vetted prematurely in ways that are detrimental to the rights and privileges of opposition members.

**The Speaker:** I will hear one final intervention.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether this is a corollary to the same point of order but I think you would agree that we are getting into a little dangerous ground when the member from Mississauga talks about votes taken in camera and the result of those votes and so on. It starts to get into a bit of what does an in camera meeting really mean if the vote is then reported back to the House.

**The Speaker:** Colleagues, that is what it is when we get into these points where we get opinions from each side. It is a little difficult just to cut off members at a certain point.

The allegations that are made here I take to be very serious for the House. I have had the opinions now of six or seven members which I want to take into consideration. I also want to get other information for myself with regard to what went on in committee. I think I will probably be able to get that so that will come into my decision.

I will take all of this information into account and I will return to the House because it is very important for all of us.

\* \* \*

**POSTAL SERVICES CONTINUATION ACT, 1997**

**Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Minister of Labour, Lib.)** moved for leave to introduce Bill C-24, an act to provide for the resumption and continuation of postal services.

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

\* \* \*

**POSTAL SERVICES CONTINUATION ACT, 1997**

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 56(1), I move:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of this House, the bill in the name of the Minister of Labour entitled an act to provide for the resumption and continuation of postal services shall be disposed of as follows:

1. Commencing when this order is adopted and concluding when the said bill is read a third time, the House shall not adjourn except pursuant to a motion by a minister of the crown and no Private Members' Business shall be taken up;
2. The said bill may be read twice or thrice in the same sitting;
3. After being read a second time, the said bill shall be referred to a committee of the whole; and

4. During the consideration of the said bill no division may be deferred.

• (1540)

Mr. Speaker, if this motion is adopted, it would be my intention to call it tomorrow.

**The Speaker:** Will those members who object to the motion please rise in their places.

*And fewer than 25 members having risen:*

**The Speaker:** Fewer than 25 members having risen, the motion is adopted.

(Motion agreed to)

\* \* \*

**PETITIONS**

## CANADA PENSION PLAN

**Ms. Judy Wasylcia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table a petition on behalf of a good number of constituents of mine.

The petitioners call on this government to take serious my constituents' concerns about changes to the Canada pension plan and to propose changes to the seniors benefit. Many of these constituents are senior citizens who know the benefits of a comprehensive pension system.

• (1545)

They are concerned about the future of their children and their grandchildren. They call on the government to rescind Bill C-2, which they believe imposes massive CPP premium hikes while it reduces benefits. They call for changes in the financial arrangements to provide for a more effective mechanisms of investment than that proposed in Bill C-2. They call on the House for a national review of the retirement income system in Canada to ensure the adequacy of Canada's retirement system today and tomorrow.

## TAXATION

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to table a petition from a number of Canadians, including some from my riding of Mississauga South.

The petitioners draw to the attention of the House that managing the family home and caring for preschool children is an honourable profession which has not been recognized for its value to society.

The petitioners would also like to raise an issue included in the report of the National Forum on Health, that the Income Tax Act does not take into account the cost of raising children for families that make the choice to provide care in the home.

Therefore the petitioners pray and call upon parliament to pursue initiatives to assist families that decide to provide care in the home for preschool children.

PUBLIC NUDITY

**Mr. John Maloney (Erie—Lincoln, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition today on behalf of my constituents of Erie—Lincoln.

The petitioners are concerned that the moral structure of society is being threatened and that community standards are being eroded.

They request that the Criminal Code of Canada be reviewed and amended to correct and clarify the sections pertaining to public nudity to abolish exposure of female breasts in public.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

**Mr. Peter Adams (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I suggest that all the questions be allowed to stand.

**The Speaker:** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

---

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

CANADA PENSION PLAN INVESTMENT BOARD ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-2, an act to establish the Canada Pension Plan Investment Board and to amend the Canada Pension Plan and the Old Age Security Act and to make consequential amendments to other acts, as reported with amendments from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 6.

**The Speaker:** I believe that the hon. member for Tobique—Mactaquac still had seven minutes. He has the floor.

[English]

**Mr. Gilles Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac, PC):** Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, CPP contribution rates will have to rise to adequate levels to ensure the long term viability of the plan.

These increased contributions must be more than offset by substantial reductions in other taxes like EI. This means more money going into the plan without asking Canadians to pick up the tab and without creating more threats to job creation. As a result,

Government Orders

the CPP will get the funding it needs without increasing personal tax burdens.

Canadians need to know that never again will their pension funds be mismanaged the way they have been in the past. They also deserve a greater return on their investment. For this reason there must be a complete restructuring of the financing of the CPP to secure it for the future.

Many young people today are already sure they will not have the CPP when they need it. In my riding I see young people who have a lot of trouble finding jobs that would allow them to earn a decent living and plan for the future. The NDP amendments would let them foot the bill for us. The NDP wants all sorts of benefits and all sorts of goodies. That is just not right. I cannot support that. I cannot support putting my children's future on the line.

As the only effective opposition in the House of Commons it is our role to explain to Canadians that there are alternatives to the government's position. The government is trying to steamroll these changes through parliament and the official opposition party has been too inept to stop it. Canadians deserve real policy alternatives, not just opposition while the cameras are rolling.

• (1550)

It is with some dismay that we have seen the government suggest reckless changes to the CPP which would affect Canadians long after the government has been forgotten.

In good faith we presented a series of amendments to the legislation during the committee hearings. The government rejected all our amendments and then proceeded to introduce watered down versions of what we proposed. Its amendments are too little too late but show how effective opposition and effective policy alternatives can influence change to misguided government legislation.

**Mr. Rob Anders (Calgary West, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, there is a lot of hypocrisy on the benches across the way. While Canadians will have to pay 9.9% for a Canada pension plan, a plan which the Liberals across the way first created and ran into the hole to the tune of \$600 billion, the government has another plan. Its members have their gold plated pension plan. While Canadians are contributing to the tune of 9.9%, having their premiums hiked up 70% or better from 5.85%, government members have their gold plated MP pension.

There is no greater hypocrisy than to have politicians set their own pension separate, above and beyond that of the people they serve. That is exactly what the Liberal government has done.

The Liberals do not seem to see a problem, but I do and I think a lot of taxpayers do when they see members of Parliament collecting million dollar pensions. Indeed one of their former

*Government Orders*

colleagues, Brian Tobin, who is now the premier of Newfoundland, is collecting a pension which, if he lives to the age of 75, will result in him collecting \$3.4 million. It is outrageous that they are collecting this amount of money. A number of members opposite will be collecting millions.

The Minister of Finance is a millionaire. He is talking about the changes to the CPP as though he personally cares about them. He has a lot of his money offshore in foreign trusts and is not paying tax on it. However Canadians will have to pay nearly 10% of their income into the Canada pension plan to a government that bankrupted the pension plan. The finance minister's own father said that it would never amount to more than a few hundred dollars and would never rise to more than 5%. Shame on the government.

It gets even worse. In the last term from 1993 to the last election there were 36 tax increases. The bill represents either the 37th or the 38th tax increase depending on which passes first, Bill C-2 or Bill C-10. With Bill C-10 once again the government is hitting upon those least able to pay. The government is taxing back and redefining as income social security benefits which a number of our seniors receive from the United States. It will affect 50,000 people to the tune of about \$2,000 each. It is a tax grab of \$100 million. The government is hitting seniors. Bill C-2 and Bill C-10 represent two new tax increases which will impact the pensions and retirement incomes of Canadians. Shame on the government.

Now I would like to speak about our youth. It is a subject which is near and dear to my heart. The young people of Canada are being forced to pay into a pension plan out of which they will see less than a 2% rate of return. Anyone could get that rate of return. They are being forced to contribute to the plan in the same way as I have been forced as a new member of Parliament to contribute to the gold plated pension plan of which I do not want to be a part. Many of my colleagues had the opportunity to opt out of that pension plan in the 35th parliament.

● (1555)

We are seeing here a draconian measure of the greatest degree. The Liberals are plucking from taxpayers what they make by the sweat of their brows and the fruits of their labour. They are telling them that they have to contribute to the government pension plan. It has been poorly mismanaged in the past.

The Reform Party has been proposing the idea of a mandatory or super RRSP. What could be better than that? People who would contribute to that plan would own it. There would be a real sense of ownership. They would be able to track the super RRSP. They would be able to know where their money is. It would not go into some account. It would not go in through one door and travel out

through another. The fund would actually be theirs. They would own it. These people would have far more responsibility and far more accountability for it.

How do we trust a government across the way that talks about a Canada pension plan investment board when it has such a heinous record in terms of patronage appointments? This year alone, excluding the Senate, there were 50 patronage appointments made by the government. Those were just the ones we could find. It can be guaranteed that for every patronage appointment we could find there are probably two or three more. The government has that type of track record with patronage appointments.

The government broke its word. A member across the way helped to write a critique of patronage positions and what was being done with the previous Tory administration. The Liberals in opposition said that these matters should be brought before a parliamentary committee and that these jobs should be given based on merit. Yet when the Liberals got into government what did they do? In 1997 alone there were 50 patronage appointments. They made more patronage appointments to the Senate than even Brian Mulroney made when he was prime minister.

The Liberals have an atrocious record on the whole issue of patronage appointments. Yet once again the finance minister screams that we should trust him when it comes to the Canada pension plan investment board.

The record speaks for itself. How can we trust somebody who has given his word but goes ahead and breaks it time and time again? How can we trust a man who has little or no understanding or empathy for what the average taxpayer does or for what lower incomes Canadians have to pay into this and what a struggle it is for them? With his shipping companies and his tens of millions of dollars offshore, how can he relate to the amount of money these people have to take from their incomes to put into his Canada pension plan scheme?

The Liberals have a poor track record yet this finance minister has the gall to stand before us and say that this is the save all, the same way his own father said that the Canada pension plan was a save all when it first came out. It was a pay as you go plan with no accountability and no ownership on behalf of the individual Canadians contributing to it. Shame on them.

I will go through the reasons for it being wrong. Who will pay for it? Taxpayers, in the same way they paid for the \$600 billion unfunded liability that was the CPP before reform. Who wants it? Do people want to have a 10% CPP contribution rate? No. They wish the money had been invested properly in the first place. They wish they had a sense of ownership with respect to the plan instead of having it badly mismanaged by the Liberal government.

*Government Orders*

Who slips through the cracks? Let us look at all the people who will be paying outrageously greater amounts of money than what they reasonably should. For example, people under 35 years of age will be paying into the plan many more times than what they will receive from it if the plan even survives under the government mismanagement.

Let us also look at the hypocrisy of MP pensions, the idea that Liberals have pensions above and beyond what any taxpayer could ever get. For every dollar they put in, the taxpayer puts in close to four dollars. Yet with the pension plan the public gets a pittance.

We can also look at the idea of the Liberals going after the seniors in terms of social security benefits from the United States. Once again they are going after the young and everybody else with the Canada pension plan tax hike. We can look at it from the point of view that it is the 37th or the 38th tax increase the government has brought in since 1993. We can look at it from the point of view of a finance minister who has little or no appreciation and does not care, a finance minister who does not pay his own fair share of taxes because he hides money out of the country.

For all these reasons, shame on them.

• (1600)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC):** Madam Speaker, I was listening to my Reform colleague talking about the previous government. He was saying that the present government is not any better than the previous government. I got the impression, listening to the Reform members, that they think they know the answer to everything.

I wish to emphasize that we have nothing to be ashamed of regarding the work of the previous government in the area of tax reform. Unfortunately, the present government did not follow up on that reform. We should also remember the free trade agreement, which allowed us to increase our exports by 140%. Talk is cheap, but the facts of history should not be ignored.

To come back to Bill C-2, I believe that one of the basic errors the present government is making is to want to go too far too quickly. I think it should be criticized for acting this way. This is cause for concern because this government does not presently have a very heavy legislative agenda. The government would have time to consult the population further, to better inform Canadians of the importance of this reform.

The reform of the Canada pension plan is the key issue during this mandate. I believe the government should be willing to spend more time on this. Unfortunately, it is addressing this issue with considerable indifference.

They seem to want to copy very quickly, especially in the case of the investment board. They seem to think that this investment board will prevent all mistakes, protect us from any patronage, and so on. Quebec offers an interesting example, with the Caisse de dépôt et placement managing all Quebec funds, but perhaps we should take a closer look at this example.

I am convinced that further consultations on the subject would show that Canadians feel it is a little risky to give exclusive access to this kind of money—tens of billions of dollars—to an exclusive fund, which, as we will see in a moment, may not be protected against political interference.

Unfortunately, the government is moving ahead quickly, establishing an investment board that will enable it to manage all funds contributed by Canadians. I think this is a very dangerous and risky proposition. In time, it will justify thinking that there should have been two or three boards, in totally different areas, instead of just one. This would at least have had the advantage of giving us a higher degree of security in every regard, including patronage appointments and investment choices.

We all agree, of course, that it is important to amend this act. It is a fundamental component of our social safety net. However, we must try to be as fair and equitable as possible in making these amendments. With this bill, we will be dipping into the pockets of all Canadian taxpayers in a totally unacceptable fashion. Tens of thousands of jobs will be lost as a result.

Change is clearly required, but the main reason for that change is obviously our aging population. It is an inescapable reality. There is also the dwindling birth rate. This means even greater pressure on the fund.

Life expectancy is, of course, another factor that is not negligible. There is also the rising number of people on disability. There is the great concern generated by the general thrust that the government wants to give the fund. Then there are the reduced benefits that will be paid, even though the government will be dipping deep in the pockets of all Canadian taxpayers.

We are not talking about one or two billion dollars: we are talking about an annual average of \$11 billion. This measure will result in the loss of tens of thousands of jobs.

As a political party, we want to ensure the program's long term viability. Obviously, everyone agrees with this goal. We also want to ensure sound management of the fund. Sound management simply means there should be a variety of investment options, given the huge amounts that will be collected.

• (1605)

What we want in particular is for the investment board to be protected from political interference. I will forego giving any examples of this; all the hon. members of this House are aware that

*Government Orders*

it is possible for a government to intervene with the investment board and to steer it more toward ends that could be partisan or even political.

Our political party agrees with an equitable contribution unrelated to income level. We are also particularly in agreement with the fact that all of our fellow citizens need to be encouraged not to rely solely on government retirement funds. I think that, when positive measures are taken, people are in a position to understand, and particularly to make their own investments, if they are given worthwhile means to encourage this.

What we want above all is for the \$11 billion in increased contributions taken from the pockets of Canadian taxpayers to be offset by lower taxes and, for goodness' sake, by lower employment insurance premiums as well. It is inconceivable that the government has created a \$15 billion fund at a time when all Canadians need that money. Not \$1 billion or \$2 billion, but \$15 billion have been salted away in order to reduce the federal deficit.

We know very well that the record of the present government as far as its battle with the deficit is concerned is due, among other things, to—and you will forgive me for bringing up measures of the former government—the way free trade has performed. The present government voted against free trade. Our exports to the U.S. market have risen from \$90 billion to \$215 billion. This is one of the measures which now enable the government to fight the deficit without having to dig into the taxpayers' pockets.

We are, therefore, in agreement with a variation in the contribution rate, but we are particularly in agreement with people not having to pay more in order to ensure the long term survival of the federal pension fund. This means lowering employment insurance contributions at a time when there are \$10 to \$15 billion dormant in the fund. Book transfers are made, and then they say we can eliminate the deficit. It is being eliminated now, thanks to other measures adopted by the previous government.

It is obvious that we would be in favour of increasing the foreign content limit of RRSPs from 20% to 50%. This is a progressive measure and one with which we are in agreement. We are also in agreement with staggering the increase over a longer period. We will not go to the wall over a staggered increase, but we do want to see this increase balanced out by a corresponding decrease in EI premiums and a reduction in taxation sectors.

It seems to me that the government would now be able to start the process of giving money back to Canadians. That is the only way to create jobs. Let us not forget that a 1% increase represents 25,000 to 35,000 lost jobs. This is the completely unavoidable reality of the situation.

Back then, the Liberals criticized payroll taxes. They no longer feel bound by the wonderful promises they made. The increase in CPP premiums must be offset by a decrease in other taxation

sectors. The Liberals opposed a ceiling on increases in CPP premiums. These increases could go well beyond 9.9% without Parliament having to give its approval. This is an enormous door cabinet is opening. We must be very cautious. Above all, we must not be too quick to pass this measure. The aftermath could be terrible. A 1% increase—believe it or not—will result in 25,000 to 30,000 lost jobs. Entire municipalities will be threatened by this bill.

My last point is that politics must not be allowed to play any role whatsoever in the Canada pension plan investment board. I repeat that it is extremely dangerous to have just one investment board to manage a fund of \$100 to \$200 billion dollars. There have been cases in some countries where exclusive public funds were completely misappropriated.

• (1610)

I therefore ask all my opposition colleagues and even government members to think long and hard before turning over a large fund to one board. I am not sure that the Caisse de dépôt et placement alone is the ideal tool for managing the entire Quebec fund. I have questions about this, as do many people, and our party will make this argument over the coming hours in an attempt to change this aspect.

[English]

**Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP):** Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to join in this debate on Bill C-2, the Canada pension plan.

The Canada pension plan is a very important part of our society. This universal plan, I believe, is under attack by the Liberal government. This plan, which guarantees benefits for people when they reach their senior years, is facing a great amount of difficulty by the proposals in Bill C-2.

I want to talk particularly today about the disability provisions. I stand in support of the motions that were made by our party, the NDP, concerning this aspect of the Canada pension plan. These motions we made are designed to offset the provisions in the bill which alter the rules for calculating disability benefits and which make it harder to be eligible for benefits.

We know that the people applying for these pensions have enough difficulty now when they try to obtain what they are entitled to obtain; some of the bureaucratic delays that they have to go through, some of the difficulties while they are experiencing pain and disability. It is very degrading for many people.

Now we have a bill which proposes to make it even more difficult for people to obtain their benefits.

The proposed bill is very hard on those who are self-employed, on seniors and on women. By deindexing the year's basic exemption by freezing it at \$3,500 beginning in 1998, this downloads the burden of pension hikes on the low income earners. We know that

*Government Orders*

low income people are experiencing enough difficulty now without having to pay more in order to obtain benefits.

Another concern is that the effect of adding the definition of maximum pensionable earnings average alters the benefit formula for calculation with a net effect again of reducing benefits. Reducing benefits is all we need to hear about today. Pensions themselves are so low right now that when we talk about reducing them even further we realize that we are creating extreme difficulty for people.

Just this past weekend I was at a function where a constituent was telling me that he receives a \$560 disability pension. Out of that he has to pay a mortgage of \$400. That leaves him with \$160 to pay his lights, heat, telephone and buy groceries to feed himself and his family. Imagine \$160 a month. Now we are talking about looking at the Canada pension plan so that we end up reducing people's benefits.

The changes proposed regarding the minimum contributory requirements for a disability pension result in a reduction to disability benefits and further hardship, requiring recipients to work and contribute in four of the last six years instead of two of the last three or five of the last ten. We want clause 69 which provides for that to be deleted altogether. Let us not make things more difficult for people.

Another concern is that Canada pension plan premiums are collected from only the first \$35,800 of income. The effect of this is that those who make over the maximum pensionable earnings pay a lesser percentage than those who make less. We need to make sure that as one earns more, one contributes accordingly rather than having the low income workers always bearing the brunt.

An hon. member of the Bloc Québécois mentioned earlier that the NDP wanted to remove elements of the legislation relating to fraud. I believe some reference was being made to our motions where we want to amend Bill C-2 by deleting clauses 87 and 107. These are the clauses which spell out massive new powers for the minister responsible to conduct investigations into the viability of claimants.

• (1615)

These clauses go so far as to talk about being able to enter people's dwellings with a warrant to enforce penalties, to gather information, to request information from third parties. What third parties, I ask. Your neighbours, your friends? These clauses also talk about investigating Canada pension plan claims and imposing penalties for infractions. Who is imposing penalties for the infractions that the government administration causes with respect to the administration of this plan right now?

I draw the House's attention to a case where someone applied for benefits, was refused, appealed to the review board tribunal, a favourable decision was rendered and then the minister through the department appealed that favourable decision. Here is someone who is unable to work, is suffering, is going through all kinds of mental anguish, wins at the tribunal level and then it is appealed by the department.

Under the appeal process when that appeal is made, I believe to the vice-chair of the Canada pension board, that official is supposed to forthwith under the act let the parties know whether that leave to appeal has been granted. What is happening is the applications for appeal are piling up on that official's desk and a year later the person has not even got around to responding as to whether or not that appeal will be allowed, let alone setting up the process to carry through with that appeal.

This kind of bureaucratic delay and infraction of the current plan is of deep concern to me. And now under Bill C-2 we are going to introduce even more powerful mechanisms that will slow down the process and cause indignity to those who need to apply for these pensions. We have to think very carefully about this.

When we talk about safety and we talk about safeguards against fraud, I maintain that that safeguard is already there now. The safeguard is there in the integrity of our seniors, the people who are going to receive these benefits, the people in our society who are going to benefit from the Canada pension plan.

By introducing the kinds of changes that are addressed in this bill, we are automatically implying that our senior citizens and others are not—

**Mr. Tony Valeri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think you will find that the member is now discussing Group No. 7 and if you check, you will find that we are still on Group No. 6.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** Yes. May I remind the hon. member that we are still discussing Group No. 6.

**Mr. Gordon Earle:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will return to Group No. 6.

I brought that forward because when my hon. colleague was speaking earlier, he made reference to the fraud element.

Moving back to Group No. 6, we are very concerned about the fact that the definitions outlined in Bill C-2 will end up reducing benefits. With the amendments we have put forward in Group No. 6 we want to counter that effect.

We do not believe that in today's society it benefits anybody to reduce the amount of benefit that someone receives. Rather, by doing that we end up paying in the long run because those people then have to seek other means to try to compensate their income.

*Government Orders*

Therefore it is very important that the level and the integrity of the plan be maintained.

In conclusion, I support the motions we have put forward under Group No. 6. We feel that those motions should be adopted in order to keep the plan effective.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Frontenac—Mégantic, Dairy Industry; the hon. member for Waterloo—Wellington, The Economy; the hon. member for Hochelaga—Maisonnette, Department of Citizenship and Immigration; the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton, Privacy.

• (1620)

[English]

**Mr. Philip Mayfield (Cariboo—Chilcotin, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, as I listen to the debate on the report stage amendments, I do understand that the devil is in the details.

I want to discuss a little more generally some of the fundamentals as we consider these amendments, particularly those in Group No. 6 before us now. I want to talk about the fundamentals of retirement security. I am thinking primarily of RRSPs, the old age pension, the Canada pension plan and tax relief.

First of all to talk about RRSPs, company pension plans and RRSPs are the largest portion of retirement savings plans for most Canadians. Consequently the Liberals hit RRSPs hard with tax grabs over the last four years, undermining the fundamentals of retirement security.

For example, in 1995 the RRSP contribution limit was reduced from \$14,500 to \$13,500 for 1996-97. That is \$1,000 less for people to invest for their retirement and \$1,000 more for the government to tax and grab from Canadians.

As well in 1996 the government reduced the age limit for contributions to a RRSP from 71 years to 69 years. As well as giving two years less to contribute to a person's own retirement security, reducing the age limit allows retirement income to be a tax target two years sooner. It is one big tax grab after another, aimed directly at seniors.

Even worse, the government plans to erode the RRSP retirement pillar even further. During the last session of Parliament, the government members reluctantly admitted that they were looking at more ways to tax RRSPs. This is shameful. It is a shameful action of the Liberals to do this. No sooner do people try and salt

some money away for their retirement than the government is right there with its hand in their pockets trying to get every last red cent. If the Liberals continue the steady calculated hacking away at RRSPs, people will lose their incentive to save for self-sufficient retirement.

The old age pension is the second pillar of retirement that the Liberals are slowly destroying. In the year 2001, the old age pension, the guaranteed income supplement, the pension income tax credit and the age tax credit will be replaced by the so-called seniors benefit. Unfortunately when the seniors benefit is implemented, the government plans to claw it right back again.

For example, pension experts estimate the seniors benefit will raise the average tax bill of a retiree from \$3,000 to \$7,000 a year. The government in its effort to grab every tax dollar it can, will base the amount of the clawback on family income, not individual income. This means seniors will end up paying more of their retirement income to the government. Some seniors are even considering divorcing to avoid this unfair tax grab.

Why does this government shamelessly hammer away at the family institution at every level from youth to seniors? Why do the Liberals consistently kill individual self-sufficiency, instituting more and more costly controls on citizens with its we know what is best for you attitude?

It is clear that the government invented the seniors benefit strictly for the purpose of grabbing more tax dollars from the elderly knowing this will impoverish many. By the year 2030, the seniors benefit is projected to produce \$8.2 billion in additional tax back benefits. The only beneficiary in this case is the government, not the seniors.

The third pillar of Canadian retirement security is the Canada pension plan. When the Liberals established the CPP 30 years ago it was structured in a fashion similar to a pyramid scheme. Early contributors reaped attractive benefits paid for by younger entrants to the plan. The problem in the 1990s however is that there are fewer and fewer contributors paying for more and more beneficiaries. It would take \$600 billion to pay all the benefits promised so far, but the CPP fund can only meet present commitments. That is the catastrophe the plan is facing.

• (1625)

To rectify this problem the government plans to hike the CPP payroll tax. For example, CPP premiums will be hiked from 5.85% of wages up to a maximum salary of \$35,800 to 9.9% by the year 2003. Workers now paying \$944 a year will see their annual contributions rise to \$1,635 by the year 2003, which is an increase of 73%, the largest tax hike in Canadian history. And for all this the retired person will receive less than \$8,800 per year after retirement.

This means that Canadians, especially young Canadians, will have to pay much higher premiums for much smaller benefits. For

*Government Orders*

example, the Library of Parliament says a person who retired in 1976 will get \$12 for every dollar contributed, but a person retiring in the year 2041 will actually get a negative return. This means that after all the years of contributing, instead of being paid interest on the money contributed, Canadians will actually be eligible to receive less than the amount they paid into the CPP fund.

Nearly doubling CPP premiums will also kill thousands of jobs, reducing the number of Canadians who can contribute to the fund. Even the finance minister admitted this fact on May 3, 1994 when he said "payroll taxes are a cancer on job creation". Further, Department of Finance economist F. Weldon wrote in 1993 that a one percentage point increase in payroll taxes means a decline of nearly 1% in employment. That works out to 140,000 jobs lost. The Liberals want to hike premiums by four percentage points. That is 560,000 jobs sacrificed for this latest Liberal scheme. Bill C-2 will kill more than half a million jobs.

So far I have explained the three pillars of retirement security: RRSPs, old age pension and the CPP. Now if I may, I would like to read a letter that I received from one of my constituents expressing her concern about the amendment to the CPP. She writes:

I am writing in regard to the increase in CPP. I am a housewife with two small children. My husband works 12 hour days, six or seven days a week. Even with all the hours my husband works, we are only making ends meet.

We cannot afford an increase in CPP. This increase only means my husband has to work even harder which means we will see even less of him. How is this good for my two children? How is this good for our marriage?

The government borrows, or should I say steals, from the CPP fund and then increases it because they can't pay it back. Why do we have to pay for a dishonest government? They preach about how they want to save our children. They preach about broken marriages. Then they turn around and screw us again. Couples stress over money and it does affect the children. It does affect the marriage.

How can I afford to put my children in swimming lessons or baseball when any extra money we have the government takes? My oldest son is five and he said to me, "Why can't I, mommy? We can't afford it, right?" This is from a 5 year old. All his friends at school get hot lunches on Fridays but he doesn't. How are we supposed to dish out another \$100 a month?

Will CPP be there when my husband retires? I doubt it. I have a friend who at 28 is having to declare bankruptcy. She has three children. I know that it could be us. Kids are in trouble today more than ever because parents aren't there. They have to work harder and longer so the kids are on their own. The future looks bleaker. Something has to be done about this CPP. Canada is on its way to ruin the way I see it.

The lady who wrote this letter speaks for millions of Canadians. Thus, I urge the government to take a second look at the proposed changes to the Canada pension plan and to review them carefully for the benefit of Canadians.

• (1630)

**Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in favour of Bill C-2. I also rise to speak to the motions in Group 6.

One of the motions put forward by a party opposite indicates that the proposed amendment would remove new investigative powers and administrative penalty provisions designed to prevent fraud and to allow for remedial action outside of court processes.

We oppose this motion for the simple reason that client rights are protected by the availability of full appeal rights pertaining to all matters within this bill and arising from the imposition of an administrative penalty.

These new investigative powers align the Canada pension plan with old age security and with current provisions of the EI act.

The previous speaker spoke rather scurrilously about Bill C-2. I was reminded of something which Mark Twain once said. He said that there are lies, there are damn lies and then there are statistics. The hon. member for Cariboo—Chilcotin played fast and loose with the statistics.

He was making disparaging remarks about the CPP and endorsing RRSPs. RRSPs are not guaranteed. People can invest their money in RRSPs and lose it, but if they invest their money in the Canada pension plan it is guaranteed by the federal government. It is a pension plan.

**Mr. Philip Mayfield:** It is a guaranteed loss.

**Mr. Hec Clouthier:** Madam Speaker, the member opposite has a beautiful wife. She is a very good friend of my wife. I really do not know what she sees in the hon. gentleman, but I guess he does have some redeeming qualities.

The hon. member opposite indicated that it was a payroll tax. All hon. members opposite know full well that it is not a payroll tax. It is a pension plan.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Hec Clouthier:** Madam Speaker, tell them to watch my lips. It is a pension plan. We will look after people when they decide to ride off into the sunset with their pension.

The actuaries of the Reform Party have already told them that it would be more costly initially to get into an RRSP plan than it would be to get into the CPP. They know full well that is the truth.

Another motion that was put forward, I believe it is No. 11, suggested that the new contribution rate schedule be deleted and the old unsustainable schedule remain in effect. That would be absolutely devastating. This motion would put the financial sustainability of the CPP at risk, which is the very thing our bill

*Government Orders*

addresses. We want this plan to be sustainable. That is why Bill C-2 is before the House.

This motion most certainly should not be considered, as far as we are concerned. It would bankrupt the plan by the year 2015. I realize that some members opposite are bankrupt of ideas with respect to the CPP, but the plan would actually have no money in it by the year 2015 if we went along with this motion.

We are talking about money. The Greek philosopher, Sophocles, once said that there is nothing so demoralizing in the world as money or the lack thereof. I say to members opposite that if we went along with some of these motions there would certainly be a lack of money in the pension plan. Therefore we cannot endorse them.

Motion No. 22 would delete the requirement for increased contribution rates to cover the costs of new or increased benefits.

• (1635)

That is an important statement of principle, but the federal and provincial governments agreed that any future benefit enrichments must be paid for and that we should never ever again put the security of the CPP at risk by enriching benefits without being able to pay for them. We must have the money to pay for these benefits. We will ensure that because we want to ensure that our young people most certainly of all are not saddled with this unbearable burden.

This leads to leadership. As you well know, Madam Speaker and members opposite, leadership is not necessarily a leadership act. On many occasions it is a moral act. It is not merely the assertion of power, but the assertion of vision. It is having the moral integrity and the intellectual courage to make this vision compelling.

I know the Leader of the Opposition and I believe the leaders of some of the other parties when referring to the throne speech brought forth and quoted fairly liberally from a great Canadian. I know the hon. Leader of the Opposition most certainly did. It was Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Sir Wilfrid Laurier over a hundred years ago had this to say, and I will paraphrase it, about liberalism. Before some of the members opposite start indulging in idle rhetoric and yelling at me, it is small "l" liberalism.

He said: "Liberalism is inherent in the very essence of our nature. It is that desire of happiness with which we are all born into the world. We constantly gravitate toward an ideal which we never attain. We dream of good but never realize the best and thus it will be as long as people are what they are. As long as their immortal soul inhabits a mortal body, their desires will always be vaster than their means".

The means by which we are going to set a plan that is viable and is sustainable for the youth of this country is this Canada pension

plan because we and I believe all members in this chamber care. We as federal members of Parliament must lead the way. We must get Canadians to look beyond the Teflon and the show biz of perhaps question period and perhaps of some of the things we do and say in this House. We must get them to look at the reality of life.

This will not be done by each and every member in this House standing up and reading a speech that has perhaps been penned by hired guns, a speech that perhaps sounds good. We need speeches that are good and sound. We do not need speeches that bring people to their feet. We need speeches that bring people to their senses.

To do this each and every one of us as parliamentarians must make sacrifices. We must give up a little bit of our self-interest. On occasion we cannot get exactly what we want. The truth of the matter is that this truth must ring loud and clear. It must not be muffled by crass manipulation.

The truth of the matter is that in order to proceed as parliamentarians, in order to proceed with this bill, our people must be more intelligent, more highly organized, our social standards more just and each and every person in this chamber, in the House of Commons, must be more united in our cause. We must not fail in our duty at this time.

As parliamentarians we must believe in a country as blessed as ours, and blessed we are with the riches of our natural resources, be they gas, oil, water or timber. The richness we really have is our human resources. All members in this House, irrespective of their race, creed, colour, religion or political affiliation, must come together and do what is best for our country Canada.

We must believe that we will be able to reach out to those people, reach out to the hungry, the homeless, the sick and the destitute. How do we do that? By bringing forth a bill such as Bill C-2, a Canada pension bill that is good for all. It is time that we stood up and shaped our own Canadian identity, that we stood up and did what we have to do.

• (1640)

What we have to do is endorse Bill C-2 because it is a tremendous bill. By following this bill, we can and will lead the entire country into a brighter, more prosperous, more beautiful future.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Madam Speaker, I was a minister in Quebec briefly in 1985, and I remember at the time the government of René Lévesque brought down an orange paper. The colour stuck in my mind. What was it about? It was on the need to better finance the Quebec pension plan. That was in 1985. The Quebec pension plan and the Canada pension plan serve the same

purpose, which is to ensure that people who have worked receive universal benefits so they can enjoy a comfortable retirement.

What I find surprising is that a number of members in this House are just discovering the problem. What I also find surprising is the fact that this government, in power since 1993, has not looked at this urgent matter before now. What I find even more surprising is that we are not hearing the Conservatives repent openly, saying “We should have looked at the viability of the Canada pension plan when we were in office”.

In Quebec, some 0.5% of people receive a pension from the Canada pension plan, while the others receive theirs from the Quebec pension plan.

The motions in Group No. 6 concern viability. I understand those colleagues who would like people not to have to pay for this collective insurance and would like them to receive more. Unfortunately, over the years, we have learned that when we pay out benefits we must ensure there is money to cover them, otherwise the plan is threatened, and with the passage of time young people are increasingly facing the prospect of no benefits.

This House must quickly go through the democratic process to approve the increased contributions proposed, even if they hurt. This is the only way to ensure that future generations can benefit from this program, which is rightly considered the jewel of the social safety net.

No other system can do the job. Some people, of course, can invest in RRSPs, but everyone agrees that it takes a certain salary level and a secure income. Only people with no problems in life, who do not have to stop working because of illness or pregnancy, for example, can afford to invest in RRSPs.

So, as a supplement, yes. But there must be a universal plan that is viable and not only for one generation, but for all generations to come. This is why this bill, which increases contributions, must be approved quickly.

The government must also further reduce unemployment insurance premiums. I think I was the first to say in this House that unemployment insurance premiums had to be cut. When we were elected, I was the human resources development critic. It was true then, but today it is outrageous. I say it as I see it. It is crazy for the government year after year to plan surpluses of \$6 billion a year from the premiums paid by workers who earn up to \$39,000 and then stop paying premiums. I am speaking primarily of small and medium size businesses, because capital intensive businesses pay much higher salaries and so pay proportionately less. It is the people who work, the small and medium size businesses that pay these premiums, which are not even a disguised tax but an obvious tax imposed to reduce the deficit.

• (1645)

We in the Bloc have been saying for some time that premiums must be reduced and that the plan must be improved. With a

### *Government Orders*

surplus of at least \$13 billion already in the fund, we will never be in a situation—given the current plan’s structure—where it could become empty.

Let us not forget that the former unemployment insurance plan incurred an annual deficit of \$2 billion during the 1990-92 crisis, but it was a more generous plan and the unemployment rate was also extremely high.

It is absurd and outrageous to have such a high payroll tax. The government is in a position to lower contributions while promoting the growth of the Régime des rentes du Québec and the Canada pension plan.

To ensure the viability of the plan, the bill provides that it will be managed by a board. In my speech at second reading, I mentioned that, in Quebec, a board was set up in 1965 to not only manage the fund, but also to promote economic development. I do realize however that in Canada a board with such powers will necessarily have centralizing effects. I must say that if I thought I had to live with that board for a long time, I would be concerned about its centralizing effects. Members from other parties should look into this, because there is a lot of money involved.

We know that the Caisse de dépôt et placement now has assets—and I am quoting from memory—of at least \$62 billion. It has investments in all large corporations and also in small and medium size businesses. It plays an important economic role, and Quebec is a mixed economy, partly thanks to the Caisse de dépôt et placement. We are very proud that, in 1965, the government of the day, whose motto was “masters in our own house”, decided to co-ordinate management of the premiums paid by workers and employers.

The bill is not perfect, and nor is the Régie des rentes du Québec. Personally, I would like to see some conditions changed but, generally speaking, if we are serious in our commitment to younger people, we must quickly ensure adequate financing of the Régie des rentes du Québec and the Canada pension plan. The RRQ must continue to serve as economic leverage.

[*English*]

**Mr. Reed Elley (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Madam Speaker, it intrigues me that we can have such different views of Canada and such different views of what Canadians are saying to us. I will take some time to speak against Bill C-2 and somewhat to the group of amendments before us.

Before I begin that it is necessary for me to begin my remarks by touching on something that was recently written by Michael Jenkinson of the Edmonton *Sun*. Like many other Canadians, he is realizing that the proposed changes to the CPP are tantamount to the biggest tax rip-off in Canadian history. Mr. Jenkinson writes:

I apologize if I misled people into thinking that the CPP premium increase would be a massive tax hike instead of a freaking monstrous tax grab.

*Government Orders*

I am now satisfied that the Liberals are not ignorant, money grubbing, peons who believe the answer to every problem is to hike taxes. Instead people should correctly understand that the Liberals are actually treacherous demon spawn who would rather sell out today's younger generation for the sake of a quick political fix.

• (1650)

Now those are not my words. I would be a little more delicate in what I would say about people. However, it is an expression of some of the outrage we in the Reform Party are hearing about the proposed changes to the CPP.

The notion that this Liberal government is selling out future generations of Canadians is at the heart of this matter. We take the opposite viewpoint from our hon. colleagues across the way who see it as the great salvation for our young people.

Aside from the cruel intergenerational transfer of wealth that this bill proposes, this legislation will give Canadians in the upcoming generation a pathetic return once they retire.

My colleagues, for just a second I plead with you to think of what this legislation will do in conjunction with a \$600 billion or more national debt. Not only has this Liberal government effectively relegated repayment of the national debt to future generations of Canadians, it has now saddled them with the \$590 billion unfunded liability present within the Canada pension plan.

I wonder if Liberal members across the way have children. Do they not have grandchildren? What can they possibly say that would justify placing this heavy debt around the necks of our young? What will these future generations of working Canadians have to look forward to after decades of debt repayment? What will be their reward for the thousands they will pay into CPP contributions? A pathetic pension which will give them a negative return on their investment once they retire. I think that is downright criminal and sad.

Beyond that, when I listen to the flippancy coming from the government benches during question period and when I listen to the finance minister twist his responses on the matter of the CPP it is disgusting.

I have eight children. Some of them are old enough to vote and some are not. In either case, the proposed changes to the Canada pension plan are and will be nothing short of a national tragedy. What say do my children have right now in this matter? Actually their say will mirror that of their future pensions, nothing at all.

Right now contributions are 5.8% of every working Canadian's gross salary whether employed or self-employed. Participation is mandatory. Contributions will increase over a six year period until the year 2003 when they will reach a steady state of 9.9%.

According to the Library of Parliament, those who retire in the year 2026 will only get back 64% of what they put into the Canada

pension plan. That same study also shows that people who retired in 1976 will receive nearly 12 times what they put into the scheme. Is that fair to our young people?

That is exactly what this is. It is a scheme. More precisely, it is a pyramid scheme, one which greatly benefits those who are in first and gives the shaft to those who will follow.

There is, however, a major difference between Bill C-2 and the illegal investment scams conducted in places like Albania. Yes, just like the pyramid schemes that plagued but were accepted by the Albanian government, the CPP is also sanctioned and condoned by our government in Canada, except the people of Albania at least had a choice in whether or not they wanted to participate.

• (1655)

Through Bill C-2 this Liberal government is not giving Canadians any choice whatsoever in the matter. In short, this state sanctioned mugging is mandatory.

By the year 2003 every worker making at least \$35,800 will pay \$1,635 per year and his or her employer will have to match it. Of course, self-employed people will have to pay both contributions, as much as \$3,270 per year.

The maximum benefit payable under CPP is 25% of an average salary of \$35,800. This works out to a top yearly payment of \$8,725. If that is not obscene, what is?

The tax grab hits everyone. The only real difference is the proportional way in which it does so. In terms of low income workers and part time workers, they will feel the pinch disproportionately. The first \$3,500 of income is exempt from CPP deductions. It is called the yearly basic exemption. However, Bill C-2 will freeze this deduction. So as the price index rises with inflation over the years the real level of the YBE, the yearly basic exemption, will decline. This will effectively shift the burden of contributions more heavily on to low income earners. This is a regressive feature that widens the contributory base by stealth.

Aside from the negative consequences that Bill C-2 will have on future generations of workers, this legislation also represents a huge obstacle to anyone who will be looking for a job. Why? Because the proposed premium increases are the biggest payroll taxes ever put to Canadians since the inception of the Canada pension plan, 73% over the next six years.

Madam Speaker, colleagues, Canadians, payroll taxes kill jobs. Do not take my word for it. In the House of Commons on May 3, 1994 Paul Martin said in an answer to a question by the leader of the Reform Party "payroll taxes are a cancer on job creation". In his own presentation to the Standing Committee on Finance on October 17, 1994 finance minister Paul Martin said it even more clearly—

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, on a point of order, with due respect, the rules of this place do not allow members to refer to members by their name but only by their riding.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** That is correct.

**Mr. Reed Elley:** Madam Speaker, the finance minister said it clearly: "We believe there is nothing more ludicrous than a tax on hiring, but that is what payroll taxes are. They have grown dramatically over time. They affect lower wage earners much more than those at the high end. We took steps early in our mandate to reverse this trend in the case of UI premiums. We would hope to take further steps in the future".

There we have it. Even the finance minister admits that payroll taxes kill jobs. Yet we now have the most hypocritical of positions before us in Bill C-2. The Liberals are not listening to themselves and they are certainly not listening to average Canadians.

Joe Italiano of the Department of Finance did a study in April 1995 on the employment implications for growth in CPP contributions. The CPP premium rate grew just seven-tenths of a percentage point between 1986 and 1993 but Italiano said it cost Canada 26,000 jobs.

The Liberals intend to increase the rate almost six times the rate increase Italiano used. Using Italiano's assumptions and projecting into the future we calculate that the phased-in increase of the higher CPP premiums will cost the Canadian economy 100,000 jobs.

In closing, I serve notice of my intention—

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** I must apologize but the time really has run over. Resuming debate, the hon. member for Brandon—Souris.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik (Brandon—Souris, PC):** Madam Speaker, it is not necessarily with great pleasure that I rise to speak to this piece of legislation, but I certainly do have the opportunity to speak, albeit somewhat limited because of the closure that has been suggested by the Liberal government.

• (1700)

I find that in itself terribly damaging to this piece of legislation.

Normally when legislation is put forward by the government in power, it is done with the best interests of Canadians at heart when the legislation is proposed.

The government suggested that this legislation cannot be debated in the House and did not give the opportunity to consult Canadians about this piece of legislation which will impact them quite dramatically over the next numbers of years, not only from a premium perspective but also from the perspective of a return on those dollars that are going to be invested in the CPP program.

I take exception to the fact that Canadians were not consulted, that the people who will be paying the majority of the premium price have not had an opportunity to tell us one way or another what their views are. This government has decided in its own wisdom to stop the debate, "Let's not give anybody an opportunity to talk about the pros and cons".

There are a number of citizens who would love to have the opportunity to speak to this. The first are obviously the seniors. We have a high proportion of seniors.

They have been talking to me. They have been calling me and asking what is going to happen to them. As well, they have a need and a desire to make sure that their children and their children's children are taken care of in the years to come.

Those seniors would like to be consulted. They are currently reaping some of the benefits of a Canadian pension plan that was put in place 30 years ago. It also behoves the government to consult with the baby boomers—I put myself in that category and you too, Madam Speaker—who are going to be affected quite dramatically by the fact that we will be faced with substantial increases in premiums and may not be able to get any return on investment.

The Canada pension plan, I believe, should be based on a very simple premise. That premise is a pension plan is a pension plan. It is not a tax. It is not an opportunity to raise money to pay for others who have gone before us.

A pension plan is a pension plan. When money is put into a pension plan, you expect to have a rate of return and certainly a return on that investment at some later date.

That is not the case here. Until the government admits that this is a tax grab, believe me, we will be debating this bill as long and as hard as we possibly can for the benefit of all Canadians.

Let us look at the legislation. I will talk to the motions before us. By the way, they are good motions in some cases and in some other cases perhaps not quite as valid.

This is just one attack on what is happening with our pension structure in Canada. Other effects are going to be on the OAS, the old age security, and on RRSP contributions as was mentioned earlier by a speaker from another party.

Make no mistake about it. The Progressive Conservative Party wishes to have a sustainable, stable Canada pension plan, but a pension plan, not a tax. We believe in sustainability. In fact, we believe that premiums have to be increased in order to make the plan sustainable.

We have said all along that in order to do that, we would like to offset these regressive payroll taxes that are being proposed now with the huge, intolerable increases, excessive increases in the CPP premium.

*Government Orders*

That can be offset quite simply by taking the EI premiums that are currently in place and generating substantial revenues that are going to offset the deficit. This government in a self-congratulatory fashion is saying that those dollars are going to the deficit.

There are other methods to reduce the deficit. The huge resources that are being generated from EI premiums should go into the CPP. Those are payroll taxes. Payroll taxes destroy jobs. I am sure that everybody recognizes that the change in premiums to \$1,635 in the year 2003 is a premium matched by the employer.

• (1705)

An employer will have few options to fund the premium increase; reduce the salaries of their employees which would give them less disposable income; do not give increases in the following years because of the excessive changes to the CPP premium level or lay people off. In fact, at that time nobody would be contributing, not to society and tax revenues but also to the CPP. The final and worst option is to lose money in the business and not have a business in the future. That does not help anybody. That is what happens when there are regressive payroll taxes.

Our plan is simple. Have a sustainable fund and make sure that the offset of the CPP premiums come from EI. The Reform plan, unfortunately, is very simplistic. It does not have a plan. We should simply throw up our arms and say every man, woman and child for themselves. Let us simply say that a \$600 billion unfunded liability does not exist. It does not work and it never has worked. However, these are very simple solutions for complex issues.

I would also like to say that it is not only seniors and the baby-boomers that I am concerned about, but the people who come after. I too have children, ages 22 and 18. They are going to join the job market as soon as I have paid for their university education. They will be in the job market and be contributing members of this society. In fact, they will be contributing a substantial amount of money to a plan that may well, for all intents and purposes, not be available to them when they are depending on it.

Remember the simple premise? A pension is a pension. CPP is a pension. When we contribute to it, we should get a return back on the investment. If we are not going to do that, then call it what it really is, a tax.

I hate looking at the term benefit. There are benefits that are paid. No, there is a return on the investment that is being paid. The return on that investment is proposed to be decreased on an annual basis. However, in fact, the premiums are being increased on annual basis.

We have heard the numbers and they are not refutable. Contributors will be getting no return on their investment when they want to collect CPP in the not too distant future.

Motion No. 11 from the NDP, unfortunately we cannot support it. It is a proposal to eliminate the premium table. We have always said that we believe in the CPP. There has to be funding in order to have a sustainable fund. There has to be a premium table. Premiums have to be paid and certainly premiums have to be increased, but with a decrease in the EI premium as well. That is sustainability. That is not regressive payroll taxes.

**An hon. member:** We have reduced it four times.

**Mr. Rick Borotsik:** Not enough. The comment was made that EI premiums have been reduced four times. It is our very valid opinion that they can be reduced dramatically to offset this CPP contribution.

Motion No. 14 is to freeze the yearly basic exemption for ten years. We believe that there should be a freeze on the YBE, but it should be for a ten year period, not in perpetuity for the simple reason that there are changes in our inflationary factors in Canada. Let us put it in place for the first ten years and review it after a ten year period.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this very, very important piece of legislation. I hope that the government will look at the ramifications that this legislation will have on the Canadian public, the Canadian employees and employers of this country. This legislation will have serious, negative ramifications.

• (1710)

**Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Madam Speaker, I would like to express why I am so supportive of the government's Bill C-2.

It is a demonstration that we are willing to restore Canada's faith in its pension plan. We are dealing with this pension plan in a businesslike manner. It is one of the things that we hear more and more lately: The community is asking the government to operate as a business.

There were extensive hearings in partnership with the provinces from April 1996 to June. It was a David Walker committee. The reforms that this government is suggesting reflect the wishes of those people who were consulted.

I have heard hon. members opposite talk about a contribution to the Canada pension plan as a job-killing payroll tax. When I consult with the small business people in my area, they say that contributions to the Canada pension plan are merely the costs of doing business and that if your bottom line indicates you can hire more people, you will.

The Canada pension plan has aspects of it that I think demonstrate the kind of country Canada is. We have insurance benefits. We have disability pension and survivor benefits. They, too, reflect the kind of character that we heard Canada wanted in its pension plan.

*Government Orders*

The Canada pension plan is not a wealth redistribution plan. It is a plan that will be there for all Canadians. That is why I feel that it will restore the Canadian belief that a pension plan will be there for our children and our grandchildren.

I would like to speak to Group 6. Motion No. 11 speaks about deleting the new contribution schedule rate. One of the things that the reform to the Canada pension is doing is establishing a sustainable rate that Canadians can rely on. The suggestion that we do not deal with the increases both on the part of the employer and the employee would put the sustainability of the Canada pension plan at risk. That is the very issue that this bill addresses.

The suggestion by the hon. member opposite that we not raise the contribution rates would mean that the plan would be bankrupt by the year 2015. The Canada pension plan has an unfunded liability that these reforms will deal with, again in a businesslike manner.

Motion No. 13 by the member opposite talks about removing the year's basic exemption and freezing it. The year's basic exemption is the portion of earnings on which contributors do not pay premiums but receive benefits. Under the proposed changes, the year's basic exemption will continue at its current level of \$3,500 rather than growing on the line with average wages. By freezing the year's basic exemption at \$3,500, more and more very low earning workers will be eligible to contribute to CPP and receive benefits from the plan.

Earlier the member opposite talked about a very compelling letter by a constituent whose husband works six days a week. I believe there was real angst in that letter. Those kinds of people do not have the kind of money that they can contribute to the super RRSP plans that have been suggested by the Reform. That is why it is fundamental that the Canada pension plan be there for all Canadians in their retirement.

Motion No. 22 speaks about deleting the requirement for increased contribution rates to cover the cost for new or increased benefits. When we had hearings with the provinces and Canadians in the communities we visited across Canada, one thing we heard about was the fact that they did not want current recipients to be impacted and they wanted it to be there, to be sustainable.

Of the 9.9% that we will go to and stay with, 4.3% goes to pension contribution, 1.7% would go to the insurance component. Again I would underline that that is something Canadians said that they wanted to see in their Canada pension plan. .1% goes to administration, which is a very low percentage when you look at private pension plans and how they are administered, and 3.8% would go to the unfunded liability, which is the very point this government needs to wrestle with in order that this plan be sustainable.

This is the first step of many. We are going to look at track 2 in dealing with other issues that we heard Canadians were concerned with. Bill C-2 is a step forward and something that all Canadians need for their future.

• (1715)

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** It being 5.15 p.m., pursuant to order made earlier today, 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.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to the order made Wednesday, November 26, all motions in Group No. 6 are deemed to have been put to the House and the recorded divisions are deemed to have been requested and deferred.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** The House will now proceed to consideration of the motions in Group No. 7.

Pursuant to the same order, all motions in Group No. 7 are deemed to have been put to the House and the recorded divisions are deemed to have been requested and deferred.

**Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Qu'Appelle, NDP)** moved:

Motion No. 20

That Bill C-2 be amended by deleting Clause 87.

Motion No. 25

That Bill C-2 be amended by deleting Clause 107.

**The Acting Speaker (Ms. Thibeault):** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at the report stage of the bill now before the House.

Call in the members.

• (1735)

[*English*]

*Before the taking of the vote:*

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of Bill C-2. The first question is on Motion No. 1.

## Government Orders

● (1745)

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 34)*

## YEAS

## Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Anders	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bigras Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brisson
Cadman	Canuel
Casey	Charest
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Fournier
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Harvey
Hill (Macleod)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lefebvre	Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Ramsay	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Solberg	Solomon
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—108	

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bakopanos

Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélaïr
Bellemare	Bennett
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Duhamel
Easter	Finstone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)	Guarnieri
Harvard	Htford
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Robillard
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—135	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Duceppe	Eggleton
Godin (Châteauguay)	Graham
Grose	Hubbard
Karetak-Lindell	Loubier
Marceau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mitchell	Perron
Richardson	Sauvageau
Turp	

*Government Orders*

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 1 lost.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 3.

**The Speaker:** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 34*]

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 3 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are voting in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of our party will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 35)*

## YEAS

## Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alarie	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Charbonneau
Charest	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Copuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen

Cummins	Dalmond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Elley	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Iftody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchand	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Morrison	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nystrom	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Power	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Shepherd	Solberg
Solomon	Speller
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Julien
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Charlotte)	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

*Government Orders*

Ur  
Vanclief  
Wasylcia-Leis  
Whelan  
Wilfert  
Wood—243

Valeri  
Venne  
Wayne  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)  
Williams

Dhaliwal  
Discepolo  
Doyle  
Drouin  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Dumas

Dion  
Dockrill  
Dromisky  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Duhamel

## NAYS

Members

Nil/aucun

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Eggleton
Duceppe	Graham
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hubbard
Grose	Loubier
Karetak-Lindell	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marceau	Perron
Mitchell	Sauvageau
Richardson	
Turp	

Earle  
Elley  
Finestone  
Folco  
Forseth  
Fry  
Gagnon  
Gauthier  
Girard-Bujold  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Goodale  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Guay  
Hanger  
Harris  
Harvard  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Jackson  
Jennings  
Jordan  
Kerpan  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Kraft Sloan  
Lalonde  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Lefebvre  
Lincoln  
Lowther  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marchand  
Mark  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
Mayfield  
McDonough  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McNally  
McWhinney  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Morrison  
Murray  
Nault  
Nyström  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Power  
Proud  
Ramsay  
Reed  
Robinson  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Serré  
Solberg  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Hilaire  
St-Julien  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Valeri  
Venne  
Wayne  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)  
Williams

Duncan  
Easter  
Epp  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Fournier  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Gilmour  
Godfrey  
Goldring  
Gouk  
Grewal  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Hardy  
Hart  
Harvey  
Hilstrom  
Iftody  
Jaffer  
Jones  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Konrad  
Laliberte  
Lastewka  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Leung  
Longfield  
MacAulay  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Manning  
Marchi  
Marleau  
Massé  
McCormick  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McTeague  
Ménard  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Minna  
Muise  
Myers  
Normand  
Obhrai  
O'Reilly  
Pankiw  
Parrish  
Penson  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Redman  
Robillard  
Rocheleau  
Saada  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
Solomon  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Stinson  
Strahl  
Telegdi  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wasylcia-Leis  
Whelan  
Wilfert  
Wood—244

**The Speaker:** I declare the Motion No. 5 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 21.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I would like you to take note that we add to the government roster the Minister of Health from this vote forward.

I also believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken, with the addition of the Minister of Health, to Motion No. 21.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 21, which was agreed to on the following division:)

*(Division No. 36)*

## YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alarie	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Charbonneau
Charest	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	DeVillers

## NAYS

Members

Nil/aucun

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Duceppe	Eggleton
Godin (Châteauguay)	Graham
Grose	Hubbard
Karetak-Lindell	Loubier
Marceau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mitchell	Perron
Richardson	Sauvageau
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 21 carried.

The next question is on Motion No. 23.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

• (1750)

[*English*]

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are opposed to this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the New Democratic Party present vote yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party will be voting in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 23, which was negated on the following division:)

## Government Orders

(Division No. 37)

## YEAS

Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison	Cadman
Casey	Charest
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Harvey
Hill (Macleod)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Mayfield	McDonough
McNally	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Power	Ramsay
Robinson	Schmidt
Solberg	Solomon
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—73	

## NAYS

Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin

*Government Orders*

Dubé (Lévis)	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harvard
Iftody	Jackson
Jennings	Jordan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Whelan	Willfert
Wood—171	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Duceppe	Eggleton
Godin (Châteauguay)	Graham
Grose	Hubbard
Karetak-Lindell	Loubier
Marceau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mitchell	Perron
Richardson	Sauvageau
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 23 defeated.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 10.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 37*]

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 10 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 24.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I propose you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP present vote yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party are voting in favour of this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 38*)

YEAS

Members

Alarie  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bellehumeur

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Bergeron

Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
 Blaikie  
 Brien  
 Canuel  
 Charest  
 Crête  
 Davies  
 Debieu  
 Desrochers  
 Doyle  
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
 Earle  
 Gagnon  
 Girard-Bujold  
 Guay  
 Hardy  
 Jones  
 Laliberté  
 Laurin  
 Lefebvre  
 Marchand  
 Ménard  
 Muise  
 Picard (Drummond)  
 Power  
 Rocheleau  
 St-Hilaire  
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
 Venne  
 Wayne—65

Bigras  
 Borotsik  
 Brison  
 Casey  
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
 Dalphond-Guiral  
 de Savoye  
 Desjarlais  
 Dockrill  
 Dubé (Lévis)  
 Dumas  
 Fournier  
 Gauthier  
 Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
 Guimond  
 Harvey  
 Keddy (South Shore)  
 Lalonde  
 Lebel  
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
 McDonough  
 Mercier  
 Nystrom  
 Plamondon  
 Robinson  
 Solomon  
 Thompson (Charlotte)  
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
 Wasylycia-Leis

Marleau  
 Massé  
 McCormick  
 McKay (Scarborough East)  
 McNally  
 McWhinney  
 Milliken  
 Mills (Red Deer)  
 Morrison  
 Myers  
 Normand  
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
 Pagtakhan  
 Paradis  
 Patry  
 Peric  
 Pettigrew  
 Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
 Pratt  
 Provenzano  
 Redman  
 Robillard  
 Saada  
 Scott (Fredericton)  
 Shepherd  
 Steckle  
 Stewart (Northumberland)  
 St-Julien  
 Szabo  
 Thibeault  
 Ur  
 Vanclief  
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)  
 Williams

Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
 Mayfield  
 McGuire  
 McLellan (Edmonton West)  
 McTeague  
 Miffin  
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
 Minna  
 Murray  
 Nault  
 Obhrai  
 O'Reilly  
 Pankiw  
 Parrish  
 Penson  
 Peterson  
 Phinney  
 Pillitteri  
 Proud  
 Ramsay  
 Reed  
 Rock  
 Schmidt  
 Serré  
 Solberg Speller  
 Stewart (Brant)  
 Stinson  
 Strahl  
 Telegdi  
 Torsney  
 Valeri  
 Whelan  
 Wilfert  
 Wood—179

## NAYS

### Members

Ablonczy  
 Alcock  
 Anderson  
 Assadourian  
 Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
 Bakopanos  
 Beaumier  
 Bélanger  
 Bennett  
 Bertrand  
 Blondin-Andrew  
 Bonwick  
 Bradshaw  
 Brown  
 Bulte  
 Caccia  
 Calder  
 Caplan  
 Catterall  
 Chan  
 Clouthier  
 Cohen  
 Comuzzi  
 Cullen  
 De Villers  
 Dion  
 Dromisky  
 Duhamel  
 Easter  
 Epp  
 Finlay  
 Fontana  
 Fry  
 Gallaway  
 Godfrey  
 Goodale  
 Gray (Windsor West)  
 Grey (Edmonton North)  
 Hanger  
 Hart  
 Hill (MacLeod)  
 Hoepfner  
 Jackson  
 Jennings  
 Kerpan  
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
 Knutson  
 Kraft Sloan  
 Lavigne  
 Leung  
 Longfield  
 MacAulay  
 Malhi  
 Manley  
 Marchi

Adams  
 Anders  
 Assad  
 Augustine  
 Bailey  
 Barnes  
 Béclair  
 Bellemare  
 Benoit  
 Bevilacqua  
 Bonin  
 Boudria  
 Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
 Bryden  
 Byrne  
 Cadman  
 Cannis  
 Carroll  
 Cauchon  
 Charbonneau  
 Coderre  
 Collette  
 Copps  
 Cummins  
 Dhaliwal  
 Discepola  
 Drouin  
 Duncan  
 Elley  
 Finestone  
 Folco  
 Forseth  
 Gagliano  
 Gilmour  
 Goldring  
 Gouk  
 Grewal  
 Guarnieri  
 Harris  
 Harvard  
 Hilstrom  
 Ifody  
 Jaffer  
 Jordan  
 Keyes  
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
 Konrad  
 Lastewka  
 Lee  
 Lincoln  
 Lowther  
 Mahoney  
 Maloney  
 Manning  
 Mark

## Government Orders

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Eggleton
Duceppe	Graham
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hubbard
Grose	Loubier
Karetak-Lindell	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marceau	Perron
Mitchell	Sauvageau
Richardson	
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 24 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 2.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[English]

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote yes on this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are voting against this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote no on this motion.

*Government Orders*

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party are voting in favour of this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 39)***YEAS**

## Members

Ablonczy  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Benoit  
Borotsik  
Brisson  
Casey  
Cummins  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Elley  
Forseth  
Goldring  
Grewal  
Hanger  
Hart  
Hill (MacLeod)  
Hoepfner  
Jones  
Kerpan  
Lowther  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McNally  
Morrison  
Obhrai  
Penson  
Ramsay  
Solberg  
Strahl  
Wayne  
Williams—59

Anders  
Bailey  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cadman  
Charest  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Epp  
Gilmour  
Gouk  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Harris  
Harvey  
Hilstrom  
Jaffer  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Konrad  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Mark  
Mayfield  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Muisse  
Pankiw  
Power  
Schmidt  
Stinson  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélangier  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bevilacqua  
Blaikie  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brien  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Calder  
Canuel  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Comuzzi  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
DeVillers  
Dion  
Dockrill  
Drouin  
Duhamel  
Earle  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fournier

Alarie  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Barnes  
Bélaïr  
Bellehumeur  
Bennett  
Bertrand  
Bigras  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chan  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Coderre  
Collenette  
Copps  
Cullen  
Davies  
Debien  
Desrochers  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Dromiskiy  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Dumas  
Easter  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Fry

Gagliano  
Galloway  
Girard-Bujold  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guay  
Hardy  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Keys  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lalonde  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Lefebvre  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marchi  
Massé  
McDonough  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Ménard  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Murray  
Nault  
Nystrom  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patri  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Proud  
Redman  
Robillard  
Rocheleau  
Saada  
Serré  
Solomon  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Valeri  
Venne  
Whelan  
Wood—185

Gagnon  
Gauthier  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Harvard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Laliberte  
Lastewka  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchand  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Minna  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Robinson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Hilaire  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wasylcyia-Leis  
Wilfert

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Eggleton
Duceppe	Graham
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hubbard
Grose	Loubier
Karetak-Lindell	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marceau	Perron
Mitchell	Sauvageau
Richardson	
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 2 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

• (1755)

[Translation]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, you will find unanimous consent for members who voted on the preceding motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

## Government Orders

[English]

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc members will vote ya on this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present this evening vote no on this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of our party will vote yea on this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

## (Division No. 40)

## YEAS

## Members

Ablonczy	Alarie
Anders	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brison	Cadman
Canuel	Casey
Charest	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphonde-Guiral	de Savoye
Debin	Desrochers
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Dumas
Duncan	Elley
Epp	Forseth
Fournier	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Harvey	Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kerpan
Konrad	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lefebvre	Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Marchand	Mark
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Mayfield
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Mills (Red Deer)
Morrison	Muise
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Ramsay	Rocheleau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Charlotte)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Venne	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—94

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Charbonneau
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Finestone
Finlay	Folco
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Hardy
Harvard	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jordan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchi	Marleau
Massé	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Murray	Myers
Nault	Normand
Nystrom	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Kent—Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Reed
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Serré
Shepherd	Solomon
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Torsney	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—150

## Government Orders

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Eggleton
Duceppe	Graham
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hubbard
Grose	Loubier
Karetak-Lindell	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marceau	Perron
Mitchell	Sauvageau
Richardson	
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 8 lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 9.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I propose you seek unanimous consent 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.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc members will vote against this motion.

[English]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members vote yes on this one.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of our party will vote nay on this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 9, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 41)

## YEAS

## Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Blaikie
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Hardy
Laliberte	McDonough
Nystrom	Robinson
Solomon	Wasylcia-Leis—14

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alarie	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Charbonneau
Charest	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel	Dumas
Duncan	Easter
Elley	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Hill (Macleod)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Iftody
Jackson	Jaffer
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchand
Marchi	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Miffiin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Morrison	Muise

Murray  
Nault  
Obhrai  
O'Reilly  
Pankiw  
Parrish  
Penson  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Redman  
Robillard  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Serré  
Solberg  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Stinson  
Strahl  
Telegdi  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wayne  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)  
Williams

Myers  
Normand  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Power  
Proud  
Ramsay  
Reed  
Rocheleau  
Saada  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Hilaire  
St-Julien  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Valeri  
Venne  
Whelan  
Wilfert  
Wood—230

#### PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Eggleton
Duceppe	Graham
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hubbard
Grose	Loubier
Karetak-Lindell	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marceau	Perron
Mitchell	Sauvageau
Richardson	
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 9 lost.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to report stage Motions Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 20 and 25.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 41*]

**The Speaker:** The next question is on Motion No. 12.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, you will find unanimous consent for members who voted on the preceding motion to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

#### Government Orders

[*English*]

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members will vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois will vote no on this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, on this specific motion, members of my party will vote yea.

• (1800)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 42*)

#### YEAS

##### Members

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Borotsik	Brisson
Casey	Charest
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Harvey	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Muise	Power
Thompson (Charlotte)	Wayne—16

#### NAYS

##### Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alarie	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellehumeur	Bellemare
Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Cummins	Dalphon-DuGail
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion

*Government Orders*

Discepolo	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis)	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Easter
Elley	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Goodale	Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hardy
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Ifody	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Jordan	Kerpan
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Lefebvre
Leung	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Manning
Marchand	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	Massé
Mayfield	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Nystrom
Obhrai	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Pankiw	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reed	Robillard
Robinson	Rocheleau
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	Solomon
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	Stinson
St-Julien	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Willfert
Williams	Wood—228

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Eggleton
Duceppe	Graham
Godin (Châteauguay)	Hubbard
Grose	Loubier
Karetak-Lindell	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Marceau	Perron
Mitchell	Sauvageau
Richardson	
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 12 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 11.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP vote yes on this motion, and we are proud of it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of our party will be voting against this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 43)***YEAS**

## Members

Ablonczy  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Benoit  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cummins  
Desjarlais  
Duncan  
Elley  
Forseth  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Gouk  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Hardy  
Hart  
Hilstrom  
Jaffer  
Konrad  
Lowther  
Mark  
Mayfield  
McNally  
Morrison  
Obhrai  
Penson  
Robinson  
Solberg  
Stinson  
Wasylcia-Leis  
Williams—57

Anders  
Bailey  
Blaikie  
Cadman  
Davies  
Dockrill  
Earle  
Epp  
Gilmour  
Goldring  
Grewal  
Hanger  
Harris  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Kerpan  
Laliberte  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McDonough  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Nystrom  
Pankiw  
Ramsay  
Schmidt  
Solomon  
Strahl  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bertrand  
Bigras  
Bonin  
Borotsik  
Bradshaw  
Brisson  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Calder  
Canuel  
Carroll  
Catterall  
Chan  
Charest  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Comuzzi  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Debien  
DeVillers  
Dion  
Doyle  
Drouin  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Dumas  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fournier  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Girard-Bujold  
Goodale  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Harvey  
Jackson  
Jones  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson

Alarie  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Barnes  
Bélaïr  
Bellehumeur  
Bennett  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Boudria  
Brien  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Caplan  
Casey  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Coderre  
Collenette  
Copps  
Cullen  
de Savoye  
Desrochers  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Dromisky  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Fry  
Gagnon  
Gauthier  
Godfrey  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guay  
Harvard  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Jordan  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan

*Government Orders*

Lalonde  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Lefebvre  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchand  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Ménard  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Muise  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Rocheleau  
Saada  
Serré  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Hilaire  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Valeri  
Venne  
Whelan  
Wood—187

Lastewka  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Leung  
Longfield  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Minna  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Petigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Power  
Proud  
Redman  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wayne  
Wilfert

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Asselin  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Duceppe  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Grose  
Karetak-Lindell  
Marceau  
Mitchell  
Richardson  
Turp

Baker  
Eggleton  
Graham  
Hubbard  
Loubier  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Perron  
Sauvageau

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 11 lost.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to report stage Motion No. 13.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, when this vote to which the government House leader has referred is applied to this motion, I would like the member for Winnipeg Centre to be included. He just arrived in the House. This would apply to this vote and subsequent votes thereto.

**The Speaker:** So ordered.

(The House divided on Motion No. 13, which was negated on the following division:)

## Government Orders

## (Division No. 44)

## YEAS

## Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bailey
Benoit	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cadman
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Jaffer	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lowther	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Nystrom	Obhrai
Pankiw	Penson
Ramsay	Robinson
Schmidt	Solberg
Solomon	Stinson
Strahl	Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—58

## NAYS

## Members

Adams	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaire
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brien
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chan	Charbonneau
Charest	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye
Debien	Desrochers
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Doyle	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Dumas	Easter
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Fournier	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Goodale	Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Harvard
Harvey	Iftody
Jackson	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan

Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Marchand	Marchi
Marleau	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Milliken
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Petigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Kent—Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Reed	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Serré	Shepherd
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (Charlotte)
Torsney	Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—187	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Baker
Duceppe	Eggleton
Godin (Châteauguay)	Graham
Grose	Hubbard
Karetak-Lindell	Loubier
Marceau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mitchell	Perron
Richardson	Sauvageau
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 13 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 14.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the preceding motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[English]

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote yes on this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote against this motion.

*Government Orders*

[English]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present vote no on this motion.

[Translation]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of our party vote in favour of this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 45)***YEAS**

## Members

Ablonczy  
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)  
Benoit  
Borotsik  
Brisson  
Casey  
Cummins  
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)  
Elley  
Forseth  
Goldring  
Grewal  
Hanger  
Hart  
Hill (Macleod)  
Hoepfner  
Jones  
Kerpan  
Lowther  
Manning  
Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)  
McNally  
Morrison  
Ohrai  
Penson  
Ramsay  
Solberg  
Strahl  
Wayne  
Williams—59

Anders  
Bailey  
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)  
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)  
Cadman  
Charest  
Doyle  
Duncan  
Epp  
Gilmour  
Gouk  
Grey (Edmonton North)  
Harris  
Harvey  
Hilstrom  
Jaffer  
Keddy (South Shore)  
Konrad  
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)  
Mark  
Mayfield  
Mills (Red Deer)  
Muise  
Pankiw  
Power  
Schmidt  
Stinson  
Thompson (Charlotte)  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

**NAYS**

## Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélangier  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bevilacqua  
Blaikie  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brien  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Calder  
Canuel  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Comuzzi  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral

Alarie  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Barnes  
Bélaïr  
Bellehumeur  
Bennett  
Bertrand  
Bigras  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chan  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Coderre  
Collenette  
Coppes  
Cullen  
Davies

de Savoye  
Desjarlais  
DeVillers  
Dion  
Dockrill  
Drouin  
Duhamel  
Earle  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fournier  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Girard-Bujold  
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guay  
Hardy  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lalonde  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Lefebvre  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marchi  
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)  
McCormick  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Minna  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Robinson  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Hilaire  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Wasylcia-Leis  
Wilfert

Debien  
Desrochers  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Dromisky  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Dumas  
Easter  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Fry  
Gagnon  
Gauthier  
Godfrey  
Goodale  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Harvard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Laliberte  
Lastewka  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchand  
Marleau  
Massé  
McDonough  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Ménard  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Murray  
Nault  
Nystrom  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Pary  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Proud  
Redman  
Robillard  
Rocheleau  
Saada  
Serré  
Solomon  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
St-Julien  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Valeri  
Venne  
Whelan  
Wood—186

**PAIRED MEMBERS**

Asselin  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Duceppe  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Grose  
Karetak-Lindell  
Marceau  
Mitchell  
Richardson  
Turp

Baker  
Eggleton  
Graham  
Hubbard  
Loubier  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Perron  
Sauvageau

*Government Orders*

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 14 lost. The next question is on Motion No. 15.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are voting against this motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** NDP members present this evening vote yes on this one.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of our party are voting in favour of this motion.

• (1805)

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 15, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 46)***YEAS**

## Members

Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Borotsik	Brison
Casey	Charest
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Earle
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Hardy
Harvey	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Laliberte
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Martin (Winnipeg Centre)
McDonough	Muise
Nystrom	Power
Robinson	Solomon
Thompson (Charlotte)	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne —31	

**NAYS**

## Members

Ablonczy	Adams
Alarie	Alcock
Anders	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)

Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bergeron
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Cadman
Calder	Cannis
Canuel	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier	Coderre
Cohen	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis)
Duhamel	Dumas
Duncan	Easter
Elley	Epp
Finestone	Finlay
Folco	Fontana
Forseth	Fournier
Fry	Gagliano
Gagnon	Galloway
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Gray (Windsor West)
Grewal	Grey (Edmonton North)
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harris	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom	Hoepfner
Iftody	Jackson
Jaffer	Jennings
Jordan	Kerpan
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Konrad	Kraft Sloan
Lalonde	Lastewka
Laurin	Lavigne
Lebel	Lee
Lefebvre	Leung
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	MacAulay
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Manley
Manning	Marchand
Marchi	Mark
Marleau	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Massé	Mayfield
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Mifflin
Milliken	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mills (Red Deer)	Minna
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Normand	Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Pankiw
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peterson

*Government Orders**[English]*

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

*(Division No. 47)*

## YEAS

## Members

Adams  
Alcock  
Assad  
Augustine  
Bachand (Saint-Jean)  
Barnes  
Bélair  
Bellehumeur  
Bennett  
Bertrand  
Bigras  
Bonin  
Boudria  
Brien  
Bryden  
Byrne  
Calder  
Canuel  
Carroll  
Cauchon  
Charbonneau  
Clouthier  
Cohen  
Comuzzi  
Crête  
Dalphond-Guiral  
Debien  
DeVillers  
Dion  
Dromisky  
Dubé (Lévis)  
Dumas  
Finestone  
Folco  
Fournier  
Gagliano  
Galloway  
Girard-Bujold  
Goodale  
Guarnieri  
Guimond  
Iftody  
Jennings  
Keyes  
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)  
Kraft Sloan  
Lastewka  
Lavigne  
Lee  
Leung  
Longfield  
Mahoney  
Maloney  
Marchand  
Marleau  
McCormick  
McKay (Scarborough East)  
McTeague  
Ménard  
Mifflin  
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)  
Murray  
Nault  
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)  
Pagtakhan  
Parrish  
Peric  
Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Reed  
Rocheleau  
Saada

Alarie  
Anderson  
Assadourian  
Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)  
Bakopanos  
Beaumier  
Bélanger  
Bellemare  
Bergeron  
Bevilacqua  
Blondin-Andrew  
Bonwick  
Bradshaw  
Brown  
Bulte  
Caccia  
Cannis  
Caplan  
Catterall  
Chan  
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)  
Coderre  
Collenette  
Coppes  
Cullen  
de Savoye  
Desrochers  
Dhaliwal  
Discepola  
Drouin  
Duhamel  
Easter  
Finlay  
Fontana  
Fry  
Gagnon  
Gauthier  
Godfrey  
Gray (Windsor West)  
Guay  
Harvard  
Jackson  
Jordan  
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas)  
Knutson  
Lalonde  
Laurin  
Lebel  
Lefebvre  
Lincoln  
MacAulay  
Malhi  
Manley  
Marchi  
Massé  
McGuire  
McLellan (Edmonton West)  
McWhinney  
Mercier  
Milliken  
Minna  
Myers  
Normand  
O'Reilly  
Paradis  
Patry  
Peterson  
Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Proud  
Redman  
Robillard  
Rock  
Scott (Fredericton)

Pettigrew  
Picard (Drummond)  
Pillitteri  
Pratt  
Provenzano  
Redman  
Robillard  
Rock  
Schmidt  
Serré  
Solberg  
Steckle  
Stewart (Northumberland)  
Stinson  
Strahl  
Telegdi  
Torsney  
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)  
Valeri  
Venne  
White (Langley—Abbotsford)  
Williams

Phinney  
Pickard (Kent—Essex)  
Plamondon  
Proud  
Ramsay  
Reed  
Rocheleau  
Saada  
Scott (Fredericton)  
Shepherd  
Speller  
Stewart (Brant)  
St-Hilaire  
St-Julien  
Szabo  
Thibeault  
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)  
Ur  
Vanclief  
Whelan  
Wilfert  
Wood—214

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin  
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)  
Duceppe  
Godin (Châteauguay)  
Grose  
Karetak-Lindell  
Marceau  
Mitchell  
Richardson  
Turp

Baker  
Eggleton  
Graham  
Hubbard  
Loubier  
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)  
Perron  
Sauvageau

**The Speaker:** I declare Motion No. 15 lost.

**Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.)** moved that the bill, as amended, be concurred in.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find unanimous consent that the members who voted on the preceding motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting yea.

*[English]*

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are voting in favour of this motion.

*[English]*

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, NDP members present, including the member for Kamloops who just arrived, will vote no on this motion.

*[Translation]*

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party are voting against this motion.

*Government Orders*

Serré	Shepherd
Speller	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Hilaire	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Venne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—171	

## NAYS

## Members

Ablonczy	Anders
Axworthy (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar)	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey	Benoit
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison	Cadman
Casey	Charest
Cummins	Davies
Desjarlais	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan	Earle
Elley	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Godin (Acadie—Bathurst)	Goldring
Gouk	Grewal
Grey (Edmonton North)	Hanger
Hardy	Harris
Hart	Harvey
Hill (Macleod)	Hilstrom
Hoepfner	Jaffer
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Manning
Mark	Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)
Martin (Winnipeg Centre)	Mayfield
McDonough	McNally
Mills (Red Deer)	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Pankiw
Penson	Power
Ramsay	Riis
Robinson	Schmidt
Solberg	Solomon
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Charlotte)	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—75	

## PAIRED MEMBERS

Asselin	Baker
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Duceppe	Eggleton
Godin (Châteauguay)	Graham
Grose	Hubbard
Karetak-Lindell	Loubier
Marceau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Mitchell	Perron
Richardson	Sauvageau
Turp	

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

**INCOME TAX CONVENTIONS IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1997**

The House resumed from November 28, consideration of the motion that Bill C-10, an act to implement a convention between Canada and Sweden, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Lithuania, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Kazakhstan, a convention between Canada and the Republic of Ireland and a convention between Canada and the Kingdom of Denmark for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income and to amend the Canada-Netherlands Income Tax Convention Act, 1986, and the Canada-United States Tax Convention Act, 1984, be read the third time and passed.

**The Speaker:** The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the third reading stage of Bill C-10.

**Mr. Bob Kilger:** Mr. Speaker, if the House would agree, I would propose that you seek unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House with Liberal members voting yea.

**The Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Chuck Strahl:** Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no unless instructed otherwise by their constituents.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Bloc Québécois are voting in favour of this bill.

[*English*]

**Mr. John Solomon:** Mr. Speaker, members of the NDP who are now all present vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. André Harvey:** Mr. Speaker, members of the Conservative Party are voting against this motion.

[*English*]

[*Editor's Note: See list under Division No. 47*]

**The Speaker:** I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

**Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I move:

That, pursuant to the order made earlier this day, this House do now adjourn.

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

*Government Orders*

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Speaker:** Motion carried.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Speaker:** The House will now adjourn until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

(The House adjourned at 6.09 p.m.)

---



# CONTENTS

Monday, December 1, 1997

## Business of the House

Mr. Gagliano ..... 2471

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### Access to Information Act

Bill C-216. Second reading ..... 2471  
Mr. Gilmour ..... 2471  
Mr. Gilmour ..... 2472  
Mr. Jackson ..... 2472  
Ms. Girard-Bujold ..... 2474  
Mr. Bryden ..... 2475  
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) ..... 2476  
Mr. Pickard ..... 2476  
Mr. Solberg ..... 2477  
Mr. Szabo ..... 2478  
Mr. Mark ..... 2479

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

### Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act

#### Bill C-2—Time Allocation Motion

Mr. Boudria ..... 2479  
Motion agreed to ..... 2479  
Mr. Boudria ..... 2480  
Motion ..... 2480  
(Motion agreed to) ..... 2480

### Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act

Bill C-2. Report stage ..... 2481  
Mrs. Gagnon ..... 2481  
Mr. Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche) ..... 2481  
Mrs. Gagnon ..... 2481  
Mr. Harris ..... 2482  
Ms. St-Jacques ..... 2483  
Ms. Davies ..... 2484  
Mr. Mahoney ..... 2485  
Mr. Mills (Red Deer) ..... 2486  
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) ..... 2488  
Ms. Hardy ..... 2489  
Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) ..... 2489

## STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

### The Late John Sopinka

Mr. McKay ..... 2490

### AIDS

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) ..... 2490

### Impaired Driving

Mr. Maloney ..... 2490

### Nagano Olympic Games

Mr. Saint-Julien ..... 2491

### United Nations Mission in Haiti

Mrs. Debien ..... 2491

### Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Mr. Alcock ..... 2491

## War

Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca) ..... 2491

## World AIDS Day

Mrs. Bakopanos ..... 2491

## World AIDS Day

Mr. Dumas ..... 2492

## Terrorism

Ms. Jennings ..... 2492

## Avalanche

Mr. Lowther ..... 2492

## Jacques Parizeau

Ms. Leung ..... 2492

## Westray

Ms. McDonough ..... 2493

## Jacques Parizeau

Mr. Bertrand ..... 2493

## Pornography

Mrs. Wayne ..... 2493

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Canada Post

Mr. Manning ..... 2493  
Mr. MacAulay ..... 2493  
Mr. Manning ..... 2493  
Mr. MacAulay ..... 2494  
Mr. Manning ..... 2494  
Mr. MacAulay ..... 2494

### The Environment

Mr. Gilmour ..... 2494  
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... 2494  
Mr. Gilmour ..... 2494  
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... 2494

### Canada Post

Mr. Gauthier ..... 2494  
Mr. MacAulay ..... 2494  
Mr. Gauthier ..... 2494  
Mr. MacAulay ..... 2495  
Mr. Lefebvre ..... 2495  
Mr. MacAulay ..... 2495  
Mr. Lefebvre ..... 2495  
Mr. MacAulay ..... 2495

### Pay equity

Ms. Desjarlais ..... 2495  
Mr. Massé ..... 2495  
Ms. Desjarlais ..... 2495  
Mr. Massé ..... 2495

### The Environment

Mr. Charest ..... 2495  
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... 2496  
Mr. Charest ..... 2496  
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) ..... 2496

### The Economy

Mr. Solberg ..... 2496

Mr. Peterson .....	2496
Mr. Solberg .....	2496
Mr. Peterson .....	2496
<b>Kyoto Summit</b>	
Mr. Bigras .....	2496
Mr. Goodale .....	2496
Mr. Bigras .....	2497
Mr. Goodale .....	2497
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mr. Harris .....	2497
Mr. Peterson .....	2497
Mr. Harris .....	2497
Mr. Peterson .....	2497
<b>Marine Industry</b>	
Mrs. Lalonde .....	2497
Mr. Manley .....	2497
Mrs. Lalonde .....	2497
Mr. Manley .....	2497
<b>Senate Reform</b>	
Mr. Anders .....	2498
Mr. Gray .....	2498
Mr. Anders .....	2498
Mr. Gray .....	2498
<b>INARI</b>	
Mr. Bergeron .....	2498
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	2498
<b>HIV-AIDS</b>	
Ms. Phinney .....	2498
Mr. Volpe .....	2498
<b>Canadian Unity</b>	
Mr. Jaffer .....	2498
Mr. Dion .....	2499
Mr. Jaffer .....	2499
Mr. Dion .....	2499
<b>The Environment</b>	
Mr. Laliberte .....	2499
Mr. Goodale .....	2499
Mr. Laliberte .....	2499
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) .....	2499
<b>Canada Pension Plan</b>	
Mr. Charest .....	2499
Mr. Peterson .....	2499
Mr. Charest .....	2499
Mr. Peterson .....	2500
<b>United Nations Mission to Haiti</b>	
Mr. Coderre .....	2500
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	2500
<b>Justice</b>	
Mr. Ramsay .....	2500
Ms. McLellan .....	2500
<b>St. Lawrence Seaway</b>	
Mr. Guimond .....	2500
Mr. Collenette .....	2500
<b>AIDS</b>	
Ms. Wasylycia-Leis .....	2500
Mr. Volpe .....	2501

<b>Foreign Affairs</b>	
Mr. Brison .....	2501
Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) .....	2501
<b>Taxation</b>	
Mrs. Redman .....	2501
Mr. Peterson .....	2501
<b>Canadian Armed Forces</b>	
Mr. Hanger .....	2501
Mr. Mifflin .....	2501
<b>Asbestos Industry</b>	
Mr. Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic) .....	2501
Mr. Marchi .....	2502
<b>Education</b>	
Ms. Davies .....	2502
Mr. Pettigrew .....	2502
<b>Government Spending</b>	
Mr. Jones .....	2502
Mr. Peterson .....	2502
<b>Trade</b>	
Mr. Mahoney .....	2502
Mr. Manley .....	2502
<b>Presence in Gallery</b>	
The Speaker .....	2502

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

<b>Government Response to Petitions</b>	
Mr. Adams .....	2503
<b>Committees of the House</b>	
<b>Finance</b>	
Mr. Bevilacqua .....	2503
Mr. Solberg .....	2503
Mr. Blaikie .....	2503
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford) .....	2503
Ms. McDonough .....	2503
Mr. Desrochers .....	2504
<b>Privilege</b>	
<b>Standing Committee on Finance</b>	
Mr. Jones .....	2504
Mr. Solberg .....	2505
Mr. Boudria .....	2505
Mr. MacKay .....	2506
Mr. Crête .....	2506
Mr. Solberg .....	2507
Mr. Szabo .....	2507
Mr. Harris .....	2507
Mr. Blaikie .....	2507
Mr. Strahl .....	2508
The Speaker .....	2508
<b>Postal Services Continuation Act, 1997</b>	
Bill C-24. Introduction and first reading .....	2508
Mr. MacAulay .....	2508
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed) .....	2508
<b>Postal Services Continuation Act, 1997</b>	
Mr. Boudria .....	2508
Motion .....	2508
(Motion agreed to) .....	2508

**Petitions****Canada Pension Plan**

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis ..... 2508

**Taxation**

Mr. Szabo ..... 2508

**Public Nudity**

Mr. Maloney ..... 2509

**Questions on the Order Paper**

Mr. Adams ..... 2509

**GOVERNMENT ORDERS****Canada Pension Plan Investment Board Act**

Bill C-2. Report stage ..... 2509

Mr. Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac) ..... 2509

Mr. Anders ..... 2509

Mr. Harvey ..... 2511

Mr. Earle ..... 2512

Mr. Valeri ..... 2513

Mr. Earle ..... 2513

Mr. Mayfield ..... 2514

Mr. Clouthier ..... 2515

Mr. Mayfield ..... 2515

Mr. Clouthier ..... 2515

Mrs. Lalonde ..... 2516

Mr. Elley ..... 2517

Mr. Szabo ..... 2519

Mr. Elley ..... 2519

Mr. Borotsik ..... 2519

Mr. Borotsik ..... 2520

Mrs. Redman ..... 2520

(Divisions deemed to have been requested and deferred) ..... 2521

Mr. Nystrom ..... 2521

Motions Nos. 20 and 25 ..... 2521

(Divisions deemed to have been requested and deferred) ..... 2521

Motion No. 1 negatived ..... 2522

Mr. Kilger ..... 2523

Mr. Strahl ..... 2523

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2523

Mr. Solomon ..... 2523

Mr. Harvey ..... 2523

Motion No. 5 agreed to ..... 2524

Mr. Kilger ..... 2524

Motion No. 21 agreed to ..... 2525

Mr. Kilger ..... 2525

Mr. Strahl ..... 2525

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2525

Mr. Solomon ..... 2525

Mr. Harvey ..... 2525

Motion No. 23 negatived ..... 2526

Mr. Kilger ..... 2526

Motion No. 10 negatived ..... 2526

Mr. Kilger ..... 2526

Mr. Strahl ..... 2526

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2526

Mr. Solomon ..... 2526

Mr. Harvey ..... 2526

Motion No. 24 negatived ..... 2527

Mr. Kilger ..... 2527

Mr. Strahl ..... 2527

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2527

Mr. Solomon ..... 2527

Mr. Harvey ..... 2528

Motion No. 2 negatived ..... 2528

Mr. Kilger ..... 2528

Mr. Strahl ..... 2528

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2529

Mr. Solomon ..... 2529

Mr. Harvey ..... 2529

Motion No. 8 negatived ..... 2530

Mr. Kilger ..... 2530

Mr. Strahl ..... 2530

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2530

Mr. Solomon ..... 2530

Mr. Harvey ..... 2530

Motion No. 9 negatived. .... 2531

Mr. Kilger ..... 2531

Motions Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 20 and 25 negatived ..... 2531

Mr. Kilger ..... 2531

Mr. Strahl ..... 2531

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2531

Mr. Solomon ..... 2531

Mr. Harvey ..... 2531

Motion No. 12 negatived ..... 2532

Mr. Kilger ..... 2532

Mr. Strahl ..... 2532

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2532

Mr. Solomon ..... 2532

Mr. Harvey ..... 2532

Motion No. 11 negatived ..... 2533

Mr. Kilger ..... 2533

Mr. Solomon ..... 2533

Motion No. 13 negatived ..... 2534

Mr. Kilger ..... 2534

Mr. Strahl ..... 2534

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2534

Mr. Solomon ..... 2535

Mr. Harvey ..... 2535

Motion No. 14 negatived ..... 2536

Mr. Kilger ..... 2536

Mr. Strahl ..... 2536

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2536

Mr. Solomon ..... 2536

Mr. Harvey ..... 2536

Motion No. 15 negatived ..... 2537

Motion for concurrence ..... 2537

Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard) ..... 2537

Mr. Kilger ..... 2537

Mr. Strahl ..... 2537

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2537

Mr. Solomon ..... 2537

Mr. Harvey ..... 2537

Motion agreed to ..... 2538

**Income Tax Conventions Implementation Act, 1997**

Bill C-10. Third reading ..... 2538

Mr. Kilger ..... 2538

Mr. Strahl ..... 2538

Mr. Bergeron ..... 2538

Mr. Solomon ..... 2538

Mr. Harvey ..... 2538

Motion agreed to ..... 2538

(Bill read the third time and passed) ..... 2538

Mr. Boudria ..... 2538

Motion ..... 2538

(Motion agreed to) ..... 2539

**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation/Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**03159442**

**Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*

Canadian Government Publishing,

45 Sacré-Coeur Boulevard,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

*En cas de non-livraison,*

*retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à:*

Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada,

45 boulevard Sacré-Coeur,

Hull, Québec, Canada, K1A 0S9

**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:**

**Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique «Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire» à l'adresse suivante :**

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

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Additional copies may be obtained from Canadian Government Publishing, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**

**On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à :**

**Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9**