



CANADA

House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 135 • NUMBER 222 • 1st SESSION • 36th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, May 5, 1999

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

Wednesday, May 5, 1999

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

• (1400)

The Speaker: As is our practice on Wednesday we will now sing O Canada, and we will be led by the hon. member for Kelowna.

[Editor's Note: Members sang the national anthem]

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[English]

NATIONAL FITNESS MONTH

Ms. Jean Augustine (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, May is National Fitness Month.

May is a special month, the month of flowers, the month of good weather and the month in which we celebrate Mother's Day. Yet, there are some among us who are seen as unreachable or as someone else's child. They are the sexually exploited youth who exist in a world of shadows invisible. The voice of these sexually exploited children and youth must be heard and strategies must be devised to meet their specific needs.

A special program "Out from the shadows and into the light" was brought to my attention today. That special program is using a community development approach beginning with the youth themselves, the youth who tell their stories and the youth who make recommendations.

I encourage all of my colleagues, as the Minister of Foreign Affairs has said, to express support for this program and to combat the sexual exploitation of children.

* * *

PENTICTON AIRPORT

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the people of Okanagan—Coquihalla who are concerned about the future of the Penticton airport. Negotiations

for the transfer of the airport to the city of Penticton have been ongoing since 1996. Here we are three years later and the process has been halted for the eighth time.

The Penticton airport injects over \$12 million into the economy of the south Okanagan. The airport manages over 44,000 air movements per year. To lose this important link in transportation infrastructure would be economically devastating.

The people of the south Okanagan are taking direct action to keep the airport open by signing a petition demanding that the federal government appoint a mediator to bring the parties back to the negotiating table.

The closure of the Penticton Regional Airport will clearly be the responsibility of the Liberal transport minister who has mismanaged this file from the beginning. What will it take for the Liberal government to appoint a mediator to finalize this vital agreement?

* * *

BRIDGEVIEW PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, May 1, students and teachers, present and former, gathered to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Bridgeview Public School in the village of Point Edward in my riding.

Hundreds of people from as far away as British Columbia and Florida gathered to renew friendships and reminisce over times past.

Despite school board centralization and closures, Bridgeview school has forged its identity as the heart of the community. After all, communities are built on institutions which are open to all and Bridgeview school is certainly a place that welcomes students, parents and indeed everyone from the community.

For 50 years students have been educated within its four walls and for 50 years the community of Point Edward has been strengthened by the friendships formed within the school. Clearly schools are essential to our future but schools are equally important to our community identity.

* * *

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, being a member of parliament for the great riding of Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke and having Canadian forces base

S. O. 31

Petawawa in my riding, I believe I know what kind of men and women wear the Canadian forces uniform. Their duty is to defend, protect and, if necessary, engage in the field of battle.

They are proud of this distinction and have never ever failed to follow that path. They have set high standards in the field of battle and have set high standards in conducting peacekeeping duties. They show tenacity and determination in defence just as they are intrepid in attack.

Above all else, their success is attributed to that superlative spirit found in every fibre and fabric of their being. Courage is the human quality which guarantees above all others. All Canadians must be proud of our courageous custodians of freedom, our military men and women, especially as the world watches events continue to unfold in Kosovo.

* * *

[Translation]

JOB CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. Guy St-Julien (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at the request of the people of Quebec and of Abitibi, the Government of Canada transferred several of its Canadian job creation, training and internship programs to the Government of Quebec in 1998.

Since that transfer, the staff of the Emploi-Québec centre at Val d'Or have been doing an excellent job of finding solutions for users of these employment programs.

At this point in time, the Val d'Or Emploi-Québec office is already short of money to meet the needs of the people of the Val D'Or region. It is already \$2 million short.

Why such a lack of budget planning by the government of Lucien Bouchard, at the very beginning of the 1999 budget year? Program recipients in Abitibi are waiting for an answer from you today, Mr. Bouchard.

* * *

[English]

TAXATION

Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the taxodus continues. Last week the CEO of Nortel told the government that high taxes were driving Canadian talent south. Over the weekend the industry minister agreed with him, but the tax minister does not think we have high taxes and he does not believe that Canada is experiencing a brain drain.

Allow me to give the government a very real example. Dr. Kurt Ellenberger, a constituent of mine and a respected musician and university professor, just accepted a position at Michigan University. He told me that he is leaving because he is tired of seeing the

lion's share of his wage "arrogantly gobbled up by this government's increasingly voracious appetite for the money it did not earn".

• (1405)

He is tired of his pay raises being rendered virtually meaningless as CPP premiums skyrocket. He is leaving because Canada no longer is, in his words, "the land of opportunity". Because of this government's high tax policies, Canada has lost a talented citizen.

When I asked Kurt if I could use his quotes, he wrote:

Dear Rick: Thanks for this opportunity—it is a delight to know that (Prime Minister) and his cronies will have to listen to me for a change. . .

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Sophia Leung (Vancouver Kingsway, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate all parties of the Nisga'a final agreement signed yesterday by the Government of Canada.

After decades of negotiation, the Nisga'a will finally be able to participate in society, to speak their language, to teach their traditions and to govern themselves.

Non-aboriginal British Columbians will also benefit from this settlement. The infusion of new funds will provide a boost to the economy surrounding Nisga'a lands and business will be able to invest in the region with confidence.

This is a fair and honourable agreement which balances the interests of all Canadians.

* * *

[Translation]

BERNARD VOYER

Mr. Ghislain Lebel (Chambly, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois salutes the courage, determination and perseverance of Quebec adventurer Bernard Voyer, a member of the first team to reach the summit of Mt. Everest this year.

This long climb, undertaken with two Americans, two Swedes and nine Sherpas, was completed last night. One can well imagine the great feeling of accomplishment being experienced by Bernard Voyer at this time.

Mr. Voyer is the second Quebecker to have accomplished this exploit, which serves as a reminder that fidelity to one's objectives allows one to attain the loftiest of summits, and that tenacity, constancy and energy can overcome all obstacles and make all things possible.

Reaching the roof of the world is an accomplishment few others can equal. Mr. Voyer, we are proud of you and hope you can now enjoy a well-deserved rest.

[English]

INTERCEDE DIVERSION PROGRAM

Mrs. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Ajax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, everyone says it is an exceptional program, but it is fighting a daily battle to stay alive.

It is called the Intercede Diversion Program and its goal is to break the cycle of crime that young people get pulled into. The program works.

A pilot project that led to intercede, an alternative to the court system, shows fewer than 9% of participants have gone on to re-offend, much lower than statistics coming from the court process.

It also saves the taxpayers a substantial amount of money. The average cost of putting a young person through intercede is \$500 as compared to \$2,500 to send them through court.

Intercede serves my riding and the entire region of Durham and has the support of nine provincial court judges in the area. Intercede reinforces the idea that every act has a consequence. It is a very valuable program and deserves our support.

I encourage my government to work with the provincial government in a expeditious manner so as to guarantee the future of intercede and similar programs across Canada.

* * *

ONTARIO BUDGET

Mr. Jason Kenney (Calgary Southeast, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for the taxpayers of Ontario.

Yesterday provincial finance minister Ernie Eves unveiled the last instalment in a tax cutting, job creating economic miracle of the Mike Harris common sense revolution.

Yesterday's budget completed the remarkable turnaround experience by a province which suffered a lost decade of economic decline under the tax and spend mania of the Liberal and NDP governments.

Mike Harris has kept his word to Ontarian voters by cutting taxes for working families by 30%, eliminating the huge provincial deficit by next year, creating over 850,000 new jobs and introducing a taxpayer protection act with teeth, all while increasing health care spending and absorbing the huge transfer cuts of this Liberal government.

Now the Harris team is set to keep Ontario's economy in high gear by delivering a further 20% cut in both property and income taxes.

Even Liberals are joining the common sense bandwagon, with Liberal MPP Annamaria Castrilli crossing the floor to join the Harris team today.

S. O. 31

She understands what these Liberals never will: real tax relief leads to hope, growth and opportunity. Four more years of tax cutting government in Ontario, that is what is going to happen in this election.

* * *

[Translation]

MEMBER FOR QUÉBEC EAST

Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there comes a point in life when it is time to fight injustice and vicious attacks. Our role is to knowledgeably inform and serve the public.

I could have remained insensitive to this rubbish. With the Bloc, as with the Parti Québécois, we have become used to personal attacks. Their flawed arguments and especially their constant crises over their identity force them to haul out all sorts of tricks and gimmickry.

● (1410)

How should we react when a member of the House of Commons asks a service he is entitled to use, doubtless, for information, paying for it, I would point out, with our taxes, and when the information attacks individuals et certain members of parliament.

We can debate the continued existence or the abolition of a House. We can use a tool put at our disposal to attack certain ideas, but we cannot viciously and wrongly attack certain members of parliament.

Insults are for the weak. I would ask the member for Québec East to offer a public apology, withdraw his publication on the Senate and rectify the facts.

I would remind the House—

The Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member. The hon. member for Dartmouth.

* * *

[English]

THE LATE TERRY RIORDON

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Terry Riordon, 45, former marathon runner, dedicated husband, father of two and a Canadian veteran of the gulf war, died in his sleep on April 29.

I met Terry last May in Halifax, his body and mind wracked with pain as he tried to put forward his case for fair compensation for his condition, which he believes was caused by vaccines administered to troops and chemical exposures during the 1991 war.

Terry had no idea that his battle for a disability pension, assistive devices and appropriate housing would take up the rest of his life on earth.

S. O. 31

His wife, Susan, a fierce fighter for justice for our enlisted soldiers, has said "What this country must learn from this is to take care of those who care for them".

Or, as the president of the Canadian Peacekeeping Veterans Association said "Terry's passing is another failing grade to a country that asks its service personnel to give all but gives little in return".

May Terry Riordon rest in peace and may we never forget the sacrifice that Terry and all of our peacekeepers make to this country.

* * *

[Translation]

MARYSE COZIOL-LAVOIE

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to welcome to Parliament Hill the member for a day from Longueuil, Maryse Coziol-Lavoie, the grand prize winner of the first "member for a day" competition in the riding of Longueuil and a fourth year high school student at Jacques-Rousseau. Maryse was the best of 45 students in the national history course taking part in the competition.

I must say the choice was not easy, because the 11 finalists I had the pleasure of meeting all had fine qualities. I would like to congratulate the 10 other finalists on their excellent performance and all the students taking part in the competition.

During her visit to Ottawa, Maryse, who is here with her mother, Suzanne Coziol, will have a chance to see what members of parliament do.

With this competition, I wanted to get young people interested in and familiar with the world of politics, because they are tomorrow's decision makers.

Maryse, on behalf of my colleagues, I welcome you and hope you have a good time here.

* * *

[English]

HUNTINGTON'S DISEASE

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus everyone's attention on a terrible disease that preys upon unsuspecting individuals, attacking their nervous system and robbing its victims of their ability to control their own bodies.

Of course, I am talking about Huntington's disease. This disease is an inherited and fatal brain disorder that strikes individuals in the

prime of life. It is inherent among 50% of the children of victims of this deadly disease and, as of today, there is still no cure in sight.

The month of May is being observed as Huntington's Disease Awareness Month in communities across Canada. The Huntington Society of Canada has initiated and supported research into the cause and nature of this fatal disease. The work of the society has brought new hope to the people with Huntington's disease and families who bear the burden of this affliction.

On behalf of the Huntington Society of Canada and all those suffering from this terrible disease, I encourage everyone to lend their support to this most worthy cause so that we may finally find a cure for this deadly disease.

* * *

MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY

Mrs. Karen Redman (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the MS Society is the foremost voluntary agency in Canada that provides services to people with MS and their families, and supports an extensive research program.

Progress in the treatment of multiple sclerosis continues to expand with new drugs which modify the course of the disease and allow better management of the symptoms. Two recently approved treatments reduce the frequency and severity of MS attacks. The search for better treatment continues.

During the month of May, volunteers across the country will be taking part in fundraising and awareness campaigns. Please join me in urging all Canadians to join in this effort.

* * *

NATIONAL YOUTH WEEK

Mr. Mac Harb (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the first week of May is National Youth Week.

Youth across the country will be celebrating through various events and activities.

This initiative was launched by youth organizations in British Columbia. Canadians from coast to coast are welcome to join in. The festivities include art festivals, multicultural events, youth dances and educational workshops.

● (1415)

I would like to congratulate cities like Burnaby for taking the lead on this issue. I call on parliament to recognize the first week of every May as National Youth Week starting this year, starting this week, starting this day.

Our youths have every reason to take charge of their future making it full, happy and productive.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTION PERIOD***[English]***ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS**

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Indian affairs minister signed a treaty, which “constitutes the full and final settlement in respect to the aboriginal rights including aboriginal title in Canada of the Nisga’a nation.” This was done without a debate in parliament, without a vote in parliament, without the approval of parliament. When the minister was asked why she proceeded in this way, all she could say was “That is how we have done it in the past”, as if enough wrongs in the past make a right.

Does the Prime Minister not see that proceeding in this undemocratic way undermines potential support for this treaty and the treaty making process?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, absolutely not. Anybody knows there have been many treaties signed by governments that were not ratified by the different parliaments of the world. I know of many of them myself. One is well known, the Jay treaty. It was signed between Canada and the United States more than 100 years ago and has not been ratified by the Parliament of Canada. It is common practice in treaties to sign the treaty and after that parliament can say yes or no.

There will be a bill here and members will be invited to vote for or against fulfilling the obligation of the crown vis-à-vis the first citizens of Canada.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is fundamentally different. If parliament is ever asked to surrender its authority over any subject matter to another level of government, surely this parliament ought to be consulted first and asked its opinion on that surrender.

The Nisga’a treaty contains a provision that in the event of an inconsistency between Nisga’a law and federal or provincial law, the Nisga’a law prevails. That provision applies to 14 specific subject areas of constitutional interest to this parliament.

If the Prime Minister really believes in the role and authority of parliament, why would he even think of signing this treaty before getting parliament’s approval?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there will be a bill in the House. There will be first, second and third reading. There will be committee work. There could be amendments proposed. There will be a vote. All the privileges of parliament are being protected, but we have an obligation under the

royal proclamation of 1763 to meet our obligations to the first citizens of the land. It is an obligation that has been vested on parliament, not by a francophone, by the king of England.

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has not come clean on the real reasons why the government will not bring the treaty to parliament. We know that fisheries and oceans has a fundamentally different view on how to interpret the fishery provisions of this treaty from that of the department of Indian affairs. Finance has been unable to satisfy the auditor general’s requirement that the government specify how much these treaties cost before they are signed, not after.

Is not the real reason the government delayed bringing this treaty to parliament that the federal departments themselves are not agreed on what it means, how to implement it, or what it costs?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this was negotiated between the natives of that area of British Columbia and the provincial government and the federal government. It was agreed that the bill was to be introduced first into the provincial parliament and it was voted on not long ago. Now we have signed a treaty. When we want to have a debate in the House we will introduce the bill. We will give plenty of time for the members to look into it, but there will be a day where parliament will have to decide and face the obligations that have been vested on us.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

The Prime Minister knows that the Nisga’a treaty is a back door way of amending the Constitution. What is even more distressing is it creates a state within a state. In 14 areas Nisga’a are going to have supremacy of law over the Government of Canada and the province of British Columbia.

The Prime Minister is opposed to sovereignty association for Quebec. How can he possibly support the Nisga’a treaty when it is nothing more than sovereignty association for the Nisga’a people?

• (1420)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, long before I arrived it was decided that we had to sign treaties. The treaties were signed in Canada by the king or queen of England long before there was this government or other governments.

The government and myself personally have been dealing with the Nisga’a. I visited them to discuss that in August 1969, 30 years ago. It is about time to do something about it.

Mr. Mike Scott (Skeena, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said in response to an earlier question that there can be amendments to the Nisga’a treaty. Yesterday we heard from the government and from the leader of the Nisga’a nation that there can

Oral Questions

be no amendments. I am going to ask the Prime Minister to clarify for the House right here and now. Can there be amendments to this treaty once it gets to the floor of this House?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the treaty is not in force if there is no enabling legislation. Amendments can be introduced and the House will decide. The enabling legislation will be here. I repeat, I have been talking with the Nisga'a. I have probably visited them more often than the member who represents the Nisga'a in this House.

* * *

[Translation]

ECONOMIC MISSIONS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Quebec will be leading a business delegation to Mexico a few days from now.

He would have liked to meet with President Zedillo. He therefore requested the help of the federal government in organizing such a meeting.

Could the Prime Minister tell us why the federal government refused to provide any help to the Premier of Quebec, with the result that he will be unable to meet with the President of Mexico?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's ambassador to Mexico is completely at the disposal of Quebec's officials and has worked with them to prepare for Mr. Bouchard's visit.

Mr. Bouchard asked to meet with the President of Mexico. The latter does not need and is not obliged to meet with all the provincial premiers who visit Mexico. Having met with the Prime Minister of Canada a few weeks ago, he decided that it was perhaps not necessary to meet with the Premier of Quebec next week.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the help of the federal government was not what the Prime Minister said, as he knows very well.

In the past, premiers—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. Members must choose their words very carefully.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe: Mr. Speaker, other premiers, such as Mr. Harris, Mr. Klein, Mr. Clark, and the late Mr. Bourassa, have met with the President of Mexico.

The U.S. government encourages such meetings between governors of American states and the President of Mexico.

Does the Prime Minister realize that not only has the federal government hurt the Government of Quebec, which pleases him, I should think, but all the members of the business community who will be accompanying the premier? This is petty politics just to serve his cause.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the party across the way is always going on about duplication in Canada.

Now, they are opening embassies all over the place and the Premier of Quebec would like to be the head of an independent state. If that is his goal, let him run for the office of Prime Minister of Canada. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we fail to see why the federal government will not agree to allow the Premier of Quebec to lead an economic mission to Mexico and meet with President Zedillo there. Such a meeting is legitimate and desirable.

My question is for the Prime Minister. Is the federal government not still taking a hard line when it refuses to provide all necessary assistance to the Premier of Quebec and prevents him from meeting with President Zedillo?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are not preventing anyone from doing anything.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: There is something very important that Quebecers, like Canadians, do not like to see, and that is Canadian disputes taken to capitals all over the world, as the Parti Québécois is constantly trying to do.

• (1425)

Mr. Daniel Turp (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the federal government always says that political meetings are necessary to the success of Team Canada missions.

In the case before us, the hard line taken by the federal government confers an economic advantage on our foreign competitors, since President Zedillo has agreed to meet with the governor of New Jersey, as well as with the President of Catalonia.

How can the Prime Minister justify his short-sighted policy, which is damaging to the interests of Quebec and the efforts of its government and businesses?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada does not arrange the schedule of the President of Mexico.

The latter decided not to receive the Premier of Quebec. We helped to organize the business people's visit and to ensure that the Premier of Quebec could meet with a very large number of

ministers. He is not meeting with the president, which is unfortunate. I did, and I think that I represented Quebec's interests very well in our talks.

* * *

[English]

KOSOVO

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The purpose of military intervention was to allow Kosovars to return and remain home under the protection of an effective peacekeeping force.

President Clinton has now voiced support for a pause in the bombing if Milosevic will begin troop withdrawals, not complete but begin troop withdrawals. We have called for an immediate suspension of the bombing. At the very least, will the Prime Minister agree with the U.S. president on a possible pause in the bombing?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States made it very clear that the five conditions agreed upon by all 19 leaders of NATO have to be respected by President Milosevic. Of course, he wants to make sure that we have an international force to ensure that the cleansing, the murdering and the raping stops. The timing for the stopping of the bombing and the movement of troops is probably something that can be negotiated. We have to make sure that the cleansing and everything else stops, but he has been very clever in gaining time to carry out his job which is unacceptable to civilized countries such as Canada.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill once said "to jaw-jaw is better than to war-war". The release of both the American and Serbian soldiers has now been successfully—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Mr. Speaker, momentum is clearly building for a diplomatic solution. Why is the Prime Minister refusing to recognize that an offer of a pause in the bombing will add to the diplomatic resolution?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we had a debate on this. We agreed that it was right for NATO to intervene in this. No later than a few days ago President Václav Havel said "No person of sound judgment can deny one thing: This is probably the first war ever fought that is not being fought in the name of interests but in the name of certain principles and values. If it is possible to say about a war that it is ethical, or that it is

fought for ethical reasons, it is true of this war". I think that was true last week and it is true today.

* * *

TAXATION

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, this chaotic, confused cabinet continues to confound Canadians. The Prime Minister says no to tax cuts. The industry minister says yes to tax cuts. The finance minister says "Maybe we should cut taxes, maybe we should not, but not right now". Yesterday the trade minister said—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order. We cannot hear the question. The hon. member for Kings—Hants.

Mr. Scott Brison: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is saying no to tax cuts. The industry minister is saying yes to tax cuts. The finance minister is saying "Maybe we should cut taxes, maybe we should not". Yesterday the trade minister told us that, yes, Canada needs lower taxes. So much for cabinet solidarity.

• (1430)

If entrepreneurs are having difficulty building their businesses in Canada because of high taxes, as the trade minister said yesterday, what taxes would he cut first to make sure that Canadian entrepreneurs can prosper here in Canada?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister for International Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that the hon. member was not at the trade committee because there was and still is no contradiction.

Let me quote to the hon. member exactly what I said: "I think it is clear that the tax base between the United States and Canada needs to continue to be closed". Clearly the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have stated repeatedly that we have started that work and that work will continue.

The Speaker: It is our tradition that we do not make comment as to whether a member is in this House and I would extend that to the committees.

Mr. Scott Brison (Kings—Hants, PC): Mr. Speaker, this is the same trade minister who when he was in opposition was one of the most vocal opponents of the free trade agreement.

The gap in taxes between Canada and the U.S. is growing almost as wide as the split in cabinet. The gap in taxes between Canada and the U.S. continues to hinder growth in Canada.

Canadians are united. Despite the split in cabinet, Canadians are united in their belief that we need lower taxes. The Canadian Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, the industry minister and the trade minister all know that taxes need to go down in Canada for growth to go up.

Oral Questions

Will the Prime Minister listen to the experts, listen to Canadians, listen to his own colleagues and lower taxes to keep industry leaders like Nortel here in Canada?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the hon. member that there was a government that was here before us which imposed a surtax on everything. That was the government that introduced what is called bracket creep today.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

The Speaker: Order, please. The Right Hon. Prime Minister has the floor if he wishes to use it.

Some hon. members: More, more.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we had a \$42 billion deficit that was a gift from the Tory party and we got rid of that.

I think that members of the Tory party should have a period of reflection and dream about policies that will not put the country into bankruptcy, as was the case when we became the government in 1993.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, last week the government admitted that there is no protection for property rights for the Nisga'a women in the agreement. Women in this country have fought for years to get legal protection for property rights. Why is the minister prepared to ignore Nisga'a women and deny them the same legal protection for property rights that other Canadian women enjoy?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, members of the Reform Party continue to show why they have no credibility on this issue.

First they undermine the process of the government and of parliament to accept or reject such an important treaty. Then they continue to show that they do not have any understanding of the significant roles in this land of the Constitution and the charter of rights which apply and protect aboriginal rights.

Here again we have them confusing the details of the treaty. Maybe the hon. member should go with her colleague, the critic for the Reform Party, and sit down with the Nisga'a to understand how they do protect and do include women in that society.

Ms. Val Meredith (South Surrey—White Rock—Langley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is the government, not the opposition, which is denying Nisga'a women their rights.

In the event of a marriage breakdown the Nisga'a women have no legal protection under the treaty for property rights.

Can the minister give me the section and verse of the Nisga'a agreement that guarantees Nisga'a women property rights protection?

• (1435)

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, if they would take the time to speak with the Nisga'a they would see that women are very much involved in that society. Women are leading the ratification process. Women are on the education—

The Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Jane Stewart: Mr. Speaker, fundamentally, the fact remains that provincial laws will apply on Nisga'a lands.

* * *

[Translation]

ECONOMIC MISSIONS

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in response to my first question just now, the Prime Minister stated that the President of Mexico had refused to meet the Premier of Quebec. In a letter from Foreign Affairs, however, it is clearly specified that it was the federal government which refused to pass Quebec's request on to the Mexican authorities.

Could the Prime Minister state the facts and admit that, if there is no meeting, it is because his government is opposed to such a meeting?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Bloc Québécois is the one who said earlier that the President of Mexico refused to meet with the Premier of Quebec, not I.

I am sure that the Government of Mexico has been informed of the Quebec Premier's desire to meet the president. However, the president had decided not to receive him. These are the facts, and known to everyone.

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I will quote an excerpt from the letter "Foreign Affairs informs Quebec that it is not diplomatic practice for the provincial premiers to meet the Head of State of Mexico". That is what happened.

Premier Bouchard wanted to meet with the President of Mexico, but was not able to at the time of the Team Canada mission, because of the ice storm. He was prepared to do so now, in the presence of the Canadian ambassador.

Does the Prime Minister realize that his petty partisan politics are doing a disservice to the business people of Quebec? The Prime Minister has none of the stature of a statesman.

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have given all the facts. There is a visit by the Premier of Quebec. He will meet with several ministers. He would have liked

to meet the President of Mexico, but for his own reasons the latter decided not to meet with him. I do not believe there have been very many meetings between provincial premiers and the President of Mexico, and there will not be one with Mr. Bouchard. That is the decision of the President of Mexico.

I cannot give any orders to anyone. When I receive people in my own office, I am the one who decides whether or not to do so.

* * *

[English]

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the federal aboriginal affairs minister, when asked to simply quote the chapter and verse that shows the constitutional protection for aboriginal women, cannot or will not do it. That is a shame.

This deal sets many precedents and yet many people, both aboriginal and non-aboriginal people, are afraid that it will divide Canadians along racial lines instead of uniting us along the principle of equality.

It also sets another precedent. The local Nisga'a chief will now have greater lawmaking powers than the Prime Minister of Canada in 14 constitutional areas. Think of it. We pass laws in this place which will not apply on Nisga'a land.

I ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs what he thinks of creating an ethnically based nation state in the heart of British Columbia.

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is becoming ridiculous. Here again they fall. They do not know how to read the treaty in the context of the application of laws. They bring up matrimonial property and they have that all wrong. They talk about labour provisions and they get that wrong.

They keep saying they do not need briefings to understand the treaty and how it was written because they know it all, but they have yet to show in this House how they know anything about the laws of Canada or the importance of this treaty.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I do not see the point in asking a question of the aboriginal affairs minister. She never quotes a single chapter or verse from the agreement when she tries to justify her point.

Let me read from the Nisga'a treaty for the intergovernmental affairs minister. It states:

In the event of an inconsistency between Nisga'a law and federal or provincial law, the Nisga'a law prevails.

That is in the agreement. That affects 14 key constitutional areas. These are the sorts of demands that Quebec would make on the

federal government, and properly it rejects those demands. Why would it accept those same things in a Nisga'a agreement in the heart of British Columbia?

• (1440)

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it would probably be helpful for the hon. member to take time to read the charter of rights and freedoms, in particular section 25. I remind him that the charter of rights and freedoms guarantees that certain rights and freedoms shall not be construed as to abrogate or derogate from any—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. We will hear the minister of Indian affairs.

Hon. Jane Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I thank you because this is very important. The charter of rights and freedoms states that nothing that we will do shall abrogate or derogate from any aboriginal treaty or other rights or freedoms that pertain to the aboriginal peoples of Canada, including any rights or freedoms that have been recognized by the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and any rights or freedoms that now exist by way of land claims agreements or may so be acquired.

These are the highest laws of the land. They protect aboriginal rights. We have a process to reconcile those rights in a modern Canada. What is Reform's strategy for dealing with that?

* * *

[Translation]

BILL C-68

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice received a letter from her Quebec counterpart requesting that Bill C-68 be amended so as to exempt Quebec from the application of this legislation. This request represents a very broad consensus of lawyers, judges, police officers, educators, social workers and decision makers in Quebec.

Does the minister intend to respond favourably to this broadly based request from Quebec and introduce an amendment? Yes or no? That is all I ask. I would like a yes or a no. Is the minister going to amend her legislation?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as I have said on a number of occasions in this House in response to questions from the hon. member, our youth justice legislation is based on an acknowledgement of diversity of approach and concern in this country and it is based upon the important principle of flexibility. For example, our youth justice legislation puts a premium on crime

Oral Questions

prevention. We believe it is better to prevent youth crime before it happens. It puts a premium on rehabilitation and reintegration for young people after they have broken the law.

I wonder if the hon. member could share with us which of those principles he and the people of Quebec disagree with.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the minister cannot even answer an extremely simple question with a yes or a no.

By sticking to this position, the minister is contradicting Quebec's lawyers, judges, police officers, educators and decision makers.

Does the minister really think she alone is right when all these stakeholders are saying that her bill threatens Quebec's approach, which is working well in Quebec?

[English]

Hon. Anne McLellan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, indeed our youth justice legislation is based on broad consultations all across the country. I only have one question for the hon. member. I would like him to precisely define for me, here today or at some time in the future, that which he and the attorney general of Quebec would like to do which is not possible under our proposed legislation. I believe in facts. He will find that that which Quebec wishes to do and is doing today will be done after this legislation is passed.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the Indian affairs minister quoted from the charter of rights and freedoms. I would like to quote to her a constitutional expert named Pierre Elliott Trudeau on the same subject. He said: "Our government passed a law recognizing self-government rights in native peoples and it is from that that much has followed. We made the point very specifically at that time that the self-government within a territory must not be exclusively based on one ethnic or linguistic group".

Why is this government departing from that fundamental principle which at one time it supported?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me explain something to the hon. member opposite. When we listen to the president of the Nisga'a talk about the decades it has taken for them to negotiate their way into this country, to feel that they can be part of something that we are all a part of, to have the opportunity to share in the economic and social benefits of this great nation, we understand why settling this long outstanding obligation and doing it in the context of building strong self-reliant first nations governments like the Nisga'a is so critically important to us all.

• (1445)

Mr. Preston Manning (Leader of the Opposition, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I asked a specific question and I will repeat it.

Does the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development agree, yes or no, with Mr. Trudeau's interpretation that self-government within a territory must not be exclusively based on one ethnic or linguistic group, which is the central feature of the Nisga'a treaty?

Hon. Jane Stewart (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I believe and what the government believes is that we have to stand true to the Constitution and to the charter of rights of the country. In the Constitution of Canada aboriginal rights are recognized and must be protected.

The challenge we have in a modern Canada is to identify those rights and to negotiate with first nations, and in some cases with the provinces, as the Government of Canada on how to reconcile rights in today's Canada.

We have an effective process that is giving us certainty and is allowing us to make economic investments in a part of the country that can use. It is beyond me—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière.

* * *

[Translation]

LÉVIS SHIPYARD

Mr. Antoine Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Lévis shipyard has just been given a four month reprieve to resolve its problems and find a buyer.

The person with one of the main keys to the solution is the federal Minister of Industry, who is refusing, however, to lift his pinky to help the shipbuilding industry, even though Liberal supporters are encouraging him to do so.

Does the minister realize that, if the Lévis shipyard closes, it will largely be his fault?

Hon. John Manley (Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Davie Industries is now under the protection of the Bankruptcy Act. They have just got more time, until September 15 of this year, to make a proposal to their creditors.

I believe two firms, one American and one European, have indicated an interest. I also believe that, because of the fierce competition among shipbuilders, the Asian crisis and the low price of oil, the time is perhaps not the best. However, we will continue to work with them through this difficult period.

STUDENT LOAN SYSTEM

Ms. Aileen Carroll (Barrie—Simcoe—Bradford, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, students in my riding often find it hard to obtain loans.

Could the minister tell this House what measures he has taken recently to improve and simplify the student loan system in Canada?

Hon. Pierre S. Pettigrew (Minister of Human Resources Development, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am impressed indeed that my colleague asked her question in perfect French.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to announce the most important change to the student loan system in Canada in 35 years.

[English]

The Government of Canada signed milestone agreements with the provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario to harmonize student loans. They will simplify the student loan system by ensuring that students only have to deal with one set of rules, one interest rate and one repayment schedule. This is one way the social union can help.

* * *

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the issue of serious offenders getting unescorted public bus passes to go from one prison to another is now a bit more serious.

I was informed by a senior government official that John Cassibo, a high risk sex offender, was given a bus ticket on March 10, 1999, to go from Kingston maximum to Keele centre in Toronto, and guess what? He was a no-show, kaput, a goner.

How many serious offenders are travelling by public bus in the country and how many are unlawfully at large?

• (1450)

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, public safety is always the number one issue.

Again it is important to get the facts straight. No prisoner is transferred from one prison, medium, minimum or maximum, to another prison unescorted. To indicate that is incorrect.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, this fellow here needs some lessons from people who know what they are talking about.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

The Speaker: Order, please. I would prefer that we refer to each other as hon. members.

Oral Questions

Mr. Randy White: Mr. Speaker, I should ask which escort service they are using in Corrections Canada.

I want to quote this public official. "He, John Cassibo, the high risk sex offender, told corrections officers he had no intentions to go to Keele". She also told me this was only the tip of the iceberg of this problem and "Corrections don't want the public to know all these guys are out there".

I would like to know again how many more repeat high risk sex offenders, or any other serious offenders for that matter, are going on these buses and are unescorted.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Solicitor General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member is referring to offenders who are on conditional release. They are going from an institution to a halfway house to be integrated back into society.

I just wish my hon. colleague would quit trying to put undue fear into the Canadian public.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Finance or whoever wants to take responsibility.

Since the signing of the memorandum of understanding for the cleanup of the Sydney tar ponds eight months ago, a number of health studies have identified alarmingly high cancer rates and other serious illnesses. Yet since that signing not one ounce of identified toxic waste has been cleaned up. Nor is there any indication it will be.

I have a simple question. Was there a specific funding commitment in the recent federal budget for the cleanup of the tar ponds and if not, why not?

Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Sydney tar ponds issue is of as great concern to the government as it is to the provincial government and as it is to the local community in Cape Breton.

We are carefully supporting the JAG process, the process that brings together all levels of government with private citizens.

We have provided funding to this group. There have been studies done. There has been some remediation going on. The process is ongoing. We will be there with the funding as is requested by the JAG.

Mr. Peter Mancini (Sydney—Victoria, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the minister. I would go further and ask if she could explain to the House and the people of Whitney Pier, who have contaminated toxic sludge bubbling up in their basements and yards where their children play, why nothing has been done about their concerns.

Oral Questions

I have another simple question. Will the government relocate the people on Frederick Street and surrounding area?

Hon. Christine Stewart (Minister of the Environment, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is quite incorrect to say that nothing is being done for these citizens and those who have had recent concerns about contamination on their properties.

Tests have been done. They are undergoing analysis right now and there will be reports out on them shortly.

* * *

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Mr. Jim Jones (Markham, PC): Mr. Speaker, today a provincial election was called in Ontario. The Conservatives are seeking a mandate to continue to cut provincial income tax by 20% and to increase health care spending by 20%.

Over 540,000 new jobs have been created by Premier Mike Harris, and according to the Conference Board of Canada the number of new jobs will total 866,000 by the end of next year.

• (1455)

Here in Ottawa we have three different cabinet ministers with three different lines on taxation. Will the Prime Minister explain why Ontario gets a booming economy and record setting health care spending while Canada gets the three stooges of high taxes?

The Speaker: The question is out of order.

* * *

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS

Mr. John O'Reilly (Haliburton—Victoria—Brock, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish I could answer that question.

When the document entitled "Gathering Strength—Canada's Aboriginal Action Plan" was released in January 1998, it contained a commitment to develop an aboriginal human resources development strategy.

Could the Secretary of State for Children and Youth inform the House if the government is acting on that commitment?

Hon. Ethel Blondin-Andrew (Secretary of State (Children and Youth), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would much prefer to hear the Prime Minister's answer but I will answer this question.

I thank the member for his question. Last week the Government of Canada announced a \$1.6 billion aboriginal human resources development strategy. We are entering into agreements in every part of the country with the Metis, Inuit and first nations.

This strategy flows from the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples and it includes labour market programs, youth programs, programs for urban aboriginal people, people with disabilities and child care. It is an excellent initiative and they should applaud it.

* * *

PORTS

Mr. Lee Morrison (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, the new provincial appointee to the St. John's port authority is a prominent Liberal and former candidate, the usual, but it gets even better. This gentleman also owns a controlling interest in a port user, which makes his appointment illegal according to section 16(e) of the Canada Marine Act.

Why did the minister sign off on this illegal appointment of another Liberal hack to a port authority?

The Speaker: Order, please. I hear the word illegal but I will permit the question.

Hon. David M. Collette (Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the responsibility for reviewing an individual's name and qualifications from the provincial level is with the appointing authority. The province of Newfoundland has determined that Mr. Woodward has met the criteria as defined by the act.

I find it passing strange that the hon. member opposite would publicly denigrate in the House of Commons one of Atlantic Canada's leading businessmen. Shame on him.

* * *

[Translation]

FRANCOPHONES OUTSIDE QUEBEC

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ): Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Commissioner for Official Languages, whose complacency as far as the federal government is concerned is legendary, was the one accusing the government of not doing enough to support francophone communities outside Quebec.

Does the Prime Minister realize that, when the Commissioner for Official Languages, who is known for his accommodating attitude toward the Prime Minister, reaches the point of making such a claim, it is because the situation of francophone minorities is deteriorating dramatically?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we were very pleased to substantially increase contributions to francophones outside Quebec in the last budget.

The hon. member, whose question is loaded with insinuation, is a member of a party that wants to abandon forever the one million

francophones outside Quebec, while we are doing everything possible to support them.

* * *

[English]

ETHICS COUNSELLOR

Hon. Lorne Nystrom (Regina—Qu'Appelle, NDP): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Prime Minister is about making our government more democratic. Tomorrow the ethics counsellor will respond to MPs' questions at a parliamentary committee regarding whether or not the Prime Minister was in a conflict of interest regarding his business practices in his riding.

The problem is that the ethics counsellor reports to the Prime Minister, not to the House of Commons. Will the Prime Minister commit to changing the law by having the ethics counsellor report to parliament in a similar way that the chief electoral officer reports to parliament and not to the Prime Minister of the country? Will he change the law?

• (1500)

Hon. Don Boudria (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the ethics counsellor, if he chooses to appear before a committee at the invitation of members of parliament, will answer the questions of the members of parliament provided that they are properly put.

The hon. member knows that he should not bring issues that are before the committee in front of the House. That is out of order.

* * *

[Translation]

TAXATION

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board and I do not want him responding with the \$42 billion deficit of the Conservative government, not to mention the \$200 billion debt the Liberals left us.

I simply want to ask him if he thinks it honest to continue policies of camouflaging on taxes in order to take as much money as possible from the pockets of middle class tax payers.

Hon. Marcel Massé (President of the Treasury Board and Minister responsible for Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to say once again that this government has the taxpayers' interests at heart.

What we are doing with the pension plan is returning to Canadian taxpayers what is rightly theirs, something the Conservative government did not manage to do during its years in office.

Routine Proceedings

PRESENCE IN THE GALLERY

The Speaker: I wish to draw the attention of the members to the presence in our gallery of His Excellency, El Hadj Omar Bongo, President of the Republic of Gabon.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

[English]

The Speaker: I also draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery of Dr. James Arthur. He is the recipient of the Canada Gold Medal for Science and Engineering.

[Translation]

This award recognizes the extraordinary and sustained contribution by an individual to research in the natural sciences and in engineering.

[English]

Please welcome our fellow Canadian, Dr. James Arthur.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1505)

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Gar Knutson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to two petitions.

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present, in both official languages, the 25th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts relating to votes 25 and 30 under the finance of the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2000, and reports the same.

I also present the 26th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts relating to chapter 24, Revenue Canada—International Tax Directorate: Human Resource Management, of the December 1998 report of the Auditor General of Canada.

[Translation]

I also present the 27th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts on chapter 27, Transport Canada—Investments in Highways, of the December 1998 report of the auditor general.

Routine Proceedings

[English]

I also present the 28th report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts relating to chapter 26, Contracting for Professional Services: Selected Sole-Source Contracts, of the December 1998 report of the Auditor General of Canada.

Pursuant to Standing Order 109 of the House of Commons, the committee requests the government to table a comprehensive response to these reports.

* * *

[Translation]

INCOME TAX ACT

Mr. Michel Guimond (Beauport—Montmorency—Côte-de-Beaupré—Île-d'Orléans, BQ) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-507, an act to amend the Income Tax Act (child adoption expenses).

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide individuals who adopt children from other countries with tax exemptions of at least \$2,000, or 20% of total expenses incurred.

Quebec already has such a tax provision. I feel that the federal government should follow Quebec's lead and introduce legislation that would provide financial assistance for people, who can spend up to \$20,000 to adopt a child from another country.

This measure will encourage international adoption in Quebec and in Canada, providing children with a better quality of life.

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

* * *

[English]

HEPATITIS AWARENESS MONTH ACT

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-508, an act to provide for a Hepatitis Awareness Month.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great privilege to introduce this bill. I also want to thank my hon. colleague from Dartmouth, Nova Scotia for supporting this initiative.

What we are trying to do on this side of the House is make the month of May hepatitis awareness month. It would be a gesture on the part of all parliamentarians in the country to honour and respect those people who have hepatitis in various forms.

I do wish to stand up on behalf of Mr. Joey Haché and on behalf of Mr. Bruce DeVenne from my riding of Lower Sackville who have hepatitis C. This bill will honour them in their fight and struggle for fair compensation and fair packages, and make every-

one more aware of the people who struggle with hepatitis in their lives.

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

* * *

• (1510)

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SUPERANNUATION ACT

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-509, an act to discontinue the retiring allowances payable to members of Parliament under the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act and to include members of Parliament in the Public Service Superannuation Act and to discontinue members' tax free allowances for expenses and include the amount in members' sessional allowances.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my private member's bill contains two simple provisions. One is to implement the Blais commission recommendation which would cancel a non-accountable allowance, gross it up and include it as income subject to full taxation.

The second, once that is implemented, is to cancel the MPs' pension plan in its entirety and place all MPs in the Public Service Superannuation Act plan. This would treat all MPs the same as federal public servants. It would also give the government more credibility in dealing with Bill C-78. If the government wants to change the pension plans of others it should first put members of parliament in that plan and then have those changes affecting them.

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

* * *

[Translation]

THE DEAF AND HARD OF HEARING

Ms. Caroline St-Hilaire (Longueuil, BQ): Mr. Speaker, following consultations with all sides of the House, I wish to seek consent of the House to put the following motion:

That during May, which is Hearing Month, the House recognize the importance for the public and private sectors to provide deaf and hard-of-hearing persons with the tools required for them to take their place in an increasingly communications-oriented world.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

[English]

PETITIONS

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36, I am pleased to present a petition on the subject of human rights signed by a number of Canadians including from my own riding of Mississauga South.

The petitioners would like to draw to the attention of the House that human rights abuses continue to be rampant around the world in countries such as Indonesia and Kosovo. They also acknowledge that Canada continues to be recognized as a champion of internationally recognized human rights.

Therefore, the petitioners call on the Government of Canada to continue to speak out against human rights abuses and also to seek to bring to justice those responsible for such abuses.

PENTICTON REGIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Coquihalla, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to rise pursuant to Standing Order 36 to present some petitions signed by people from the area of Penticton who are increasingly concerned about the future of the Penticton regional airport as negotiations have been ongoing for three years now and the negotiations are at an impasse.

The petitioners pray and request that parliament immediately appoint a mediator to assist in reaching an acceptable transfer agreement to all parties. I am presenting 98 of these petitions today and there will be thousands more to come.

YUGOSLAVIA

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Ahuntsic, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and honour of tabling a petition by Canadians of Hellenic origin and other Canadians who are opposed to the bombing in Yugoslavia.

MEDICARE

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to present a petition today signed by hundreds of Canadians, a petition indicating Canadians remain very concerned about the government's commitment to our beloved system of medicare.

This petition is part of a much larger effort to send a message to the government. I want to acknowledge the efforts of the Save Medicare Committee, particularly the work done by Russ Rak who is with the CAW local 222, retired workers chapter.

• (1515)

This petition calls upon the government to preserve and enforce the Canada Health Act and actually to go further and ensure that

Routine Proceedings

national standards of quality publicly funded health care for every Canadian citizen are guaranteed as a right.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of 424 people in my riding. This is one of many petitions I have had on this subject.

These individuals pray that parliament take all measures necessary to ensure that the possession of child pornography remains a serious crime and that federal police forces be directed to give priority to enforcing the law for the protection of our children.

GASOLINE ADDITIVES

Mrs. Rose-Marie Ur (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I am honoured to present a petition signed by residents of the Sarnia-Petrolia area who urge parliament to ban the gas additive MMT. They note that studies under way show adverse health effects especially on children and seniors.

THE SENATE

Mr. Roger Gallaway (Sarnia—Lambton, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition duly certified. It is signed by 275 people in southwestern Ontario. They ask this House to note that the Senate of Canada is an undemocratic institution, that it is costing taxpayers some \$50 million a year, that it is redundant and that it undermines the role of members of parliament. They call upon parliament to undertake measures aimed at the abolition of the Senate.

TAXATION

Mr. Ken Epp (Elk Island, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured again to stand on behalf of many Canadians. There are 102 signatures on the petition I am presenting. It calls for the consideration of tax fairness to families who choose to have one of the parents stay home and look after their own children. This petition is one of many that are coming in on this topic.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Gar Knutson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all questions be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Gar Knutson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers be allowed to stand.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The House resumed from May 4 consideration of Bill C-66, an act to amend the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and of the motions in Group No. 3.

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have been rising at every opportunity to speak against Bill C-66 and I continue to do that today.

When I put this bill in the context of the larger agenda being pursued by the Liberal government, it is obvious why members on this side of the House, at least those in the New Democratic Party, are opposing Bill C-66. It is our view that this bill completes the circle for the Liberal government. It completes a process by which it totally and absolutely offloads its responsibility for housing to provincial and municipal governments as well as to individual citizens right across the country.

It is interesting that whenever I raise this broader agenda, members of the Liberal government sit there and shake their heads. It is absolutely important to put on the record exactly what the government has done. I am sure it will come as no surprise when I clarify for members opposite that Canada, particularly the province of Manitoba where I come from, has not really built any public or social housing since 1994.

• (1520)

Why did that happen? Not to put all the blame on the Liberal government, let us remind ourselves that the former Conservative government, the Mulroney government began the process of offloading in the area of public housing. It was really this government when it came to power in 1993 that put the final stake in the whole effort. Today Bill C-66 completes that circle.

We are trying to persuade members opposite. If they are truly concerned as they seem to pretend to be about meeting the needs of

Canadians for adequate shelter regardless of where they may live, then surely they will consider these serious amendments we have put before the House. If not, then they should at least pull back the bill and reconsider their entire policy. We are talking about the importance of good public policy whether it is about shelter, about health, about safety or about quality of life.

It is absolutely clear from all analysts everywhere that quality public housing plays a direct role in terms of the health and well-being of Canadians. I remind members of that fact from a Manitoba perspective. Recently in some of our northern and remote communities there has been an unbelievable increase in the rate of tuberculosis. It would not take much analysis to realize that the rise in a disease which we thought we had stamped out forever is directly related to poor quality housing on reserves and in our northern and remote communities.

My colleagues in Manitoba have tried to make that point on many occasions. They have stated very clearly that the comeback of tuberculosis in Manitoba is further proof that many people living in overcrowded housing in remote communities face severe health risks.

That is but one example of how poor and inadequate housing can actually contribute to disease and ill health. It can actually cost all of us a great deal in the long run because we have not been prepared to act today. Good housing makes good health care policy.

It is absolutely clear when there is deteriorating housing, when many houses are boarded up and vacant, as in my constituency of Winnipeg North Centre, it has an impact on the whole sense of security and safety for the neighbourhood and community. In my community because of government offloading and lack of political will to address this very serious issue, dozens and dozens of boarded up houses are just waiting for arsonists to set them alight. That affects the entire community and it costs us all dearly.

In response to this very serious state of affairs, and what some would call a state of emergency, community activists are trying to get a handle on the situation and do what they can to turn the situation around. In the case of Winnipeg North Centre, in the last year five neighbourhood patrols have been established to ensure some sense of safety in neighbourhoods.

I want to acknowledge the kind of work the community is prepared to do, the kind of initiative that is coming from residents. That should be but a way to urge this government to act; not to simply say that it is good the community is doing something, but to say that it is good that there is a real sense to take hold of our destiny. Now let us support those efforts and work with communities to improve the quality of housing and safety for all citizens.

As I said, in just one year five neighbourhood safety patrols have sprung up in my area. They include the Northend Patrol, the Manitoba Avenue Patrol, the Night Owls, the Flora Place Patrol. More are springing up and working with residents to ensure safety.

Government Orders

It is very important for this government to realize that when it invests in housing, as it is not doing now and as it will not be able to do with Bill C-66, it will have a far reaching influence on the quality of life in our communities.

• (1525)

In my riding, community groups are working very closely with community policing efforts. Everyone is doing their part. However, the time has come for action and there is such an urgent need. There is so much deterioration of housing stock because of the retreat from this public policy area by governments. It truly is a crisis. It truly is a state of emergency. It truly does require the government to act now and act as comprehensively as possible.

Mr. Roy Bailey (Souris—Moose Mountain, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise on the debate at report stage of Bill C-66 on the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act.

Even though it is considered to be a large sprawling rural constituency, my constituency is very much affected by this bill, the regulatory measures that are in this bill and which have preceded this bill.

In my constituency most of the single house dwellings are under contract with a local individual who is a one man contractor. Some 15 people from one area have come to me. If there are 15 people in one area, there are probably 30 people within my constituency who are young contractors who are very upset with the regulatory body. Think of how many of these small contractors are being affected across Canada.

What I am trying to point out is that the regulations that apply to this bill hurt the businesses with one or two people who build houses. It is not like the huge developments I saw last night while I was driving on the outskirts of Ottawa. Individuals who 10 years ago built houses in the rural areas, in the cities and in the towns of my constituency can no longer afford to meet the regulatory measures of this bill.

Anyone who wants to see the quality of work these contractors do can go to the city of Weyburn, or Estevan, or out to a rural area like Moosomin. There are a dozen show homes that have been lived in for 20 years. Ask those people what kind of quality went into those homes. It is top notch, the very best. There is no excuse whatsoever to deny these people the right to maintain a business within their community.

A one man contractor gets a contract to build three separate houses and what happens? Not only does he have local employment but he hires students during the summertime. They get a salary and they have on the job training. The large firms from the city do not do that. Let me also point out that when a local contractor is engaged to build a house it also benefits the immediate community. The subtrades stay within that city and community. Because of this

bill these people can only build for those people who have the cash outlay.

The people in rural Canada, and not just in my constituency, are being denied the right to make a living, to live in that community, to buy in that community and to make that community prosper. And if there are 30 of these contractors in my constituency how many of these single contractors are throughout Canada?

They cannot at the present time meet all the CMHC regulations. In other words the government has regulated out of the business a whole new crop of top notch contractors. The key point is that they go out of business. In order to fill a contract, somebody has to come in from 100 miles away. They bring the subcontractors and their products with them and the local community suffers. If that is true in my constituency, it is true all across Canada.

• (1530)

There is another point I want to make. I have a letter presently in the hands of the Minister of Finance, the Minister of National Revenue and the Minister of Industry. That letter contains a suggestion from one of these local contractors. If the ministers will just look at this and get their responses to me it will provide me and the government with an insight as to how to keep business within the small community and how to keep the economy from going underground. As well, the suggestion which the contractor has made will help to facilitate home repairs to houses throughout the winter months.

I beg of the government to not just think of the CMHC as being involved in massive housing developments around our large cities and to not just think of the number of huge construction sites that are being developed. And I am not against that portion of it. I am simply saying that this bill, with all its regulatory means, is knocking the single contractor completely out of business. Unless he can build for a person who has money in his or her back pocket he is simply out of business.

The economy where I live is down. I do not know of a single contractor who formerly built houses who even has a house to build, for the simple reason that the only way he will get money is to go through the CMHC and that contractor cannot meet all the regulatory demands of the CMHC just to get one house to build this summer.

I beg this government to not only examine the letters that are with the three government ministers, but also to consider rural Canada, to consider these people who are quality craftsmen. They are being put out of work simply because of the regulations of this bill.

Ms. Wendy Lill (Dartmouth, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to speak to Bill C-66, an act to amend the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and the Housing Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act.

Government Orders

I wish to look at this bill and its intentions and implications in the context of the housing crisis which is plaguing our country, and specifically my community. When someone says "housing crisis" we often think of the problem of homelessness. We hear of 200,000 or more Canadians who are sleeping on hot air grates, in cars or in parks because they do not have addresses or roofs over their heads.

However, for millions of other Canadians the problem is not nearly that dramatic, although it is just as serious. I am speaking of the problem of finding decent, affordable housing. I am not suggesting that solving the problems of homelessness should be traded off against the problems of adequate and affordable housing. On the contrary, I would say the two are very interrelated. When the housing supply becomes less and less accessible or more and more decrepit we see more and more families and more children descending into homelessness.

There are some significant aspects of Bill C-66 that concern me, such as the fact that it will amend two pieces of legislation that deal with federal involvement in housing, the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act, and it will also make a consequential amendment to another act. This legislation could potentially remove a number of measures specifically intended to provide housing for low income Canadians and it could allow the federal government to avoid any responsibility for housing.

Across the harbour from where I live in Halifax I see dozens of families who are homeless waiting in line for dinner at the Hope Cottage.

● (1535)

In Dartmouth there are thousands of people who I would say are the homeless in waiting. They are people who are living in substandard housing. It is clear to me that the primary factor which keeps people trapped in poverty is a lack of decent, affordable housing.

Neighbourhoods such as Highfield Park in my riding have thousands of families, many of which are headed by single mothers. There are many disabled Canadians and seniors who are living on public support. These people are paying over half of their meagre income for walk-up apartments in poor condition. They are living in poverty and they are constantly juggling the problems of food, clothing, medical care and shelter.

One woman wrote to me this week depicting her own dilemma, which I think sums up what we are talking about today. She is a mother, a survivor of cancer, and she is raising a child with a disability. She is doing all of this in low income, decrepit housing. She is trying to make ends meet. She states in her letter:

Ms. Lill:

I do not drink, smoke, go to bars, go to bingo or even go to a coffee shop in the evening. I try to maintain good eating habits for myself and my daughter, but I still never have enough money. I live in a semi-safe place.

That is how she identifies where she lives with her daughter. She continues by saying:

But I still have to delve into my grocery money. There are a number of vitamins and prescriptions which I am supposed to take to keep my immune system up. However, I am not able to do that and still pay the rent.

This is a woman who has to trade off her health to live in a semi-safe place with her disabled daughter. That is a disgrace as far as I am concerned.

As the hon. member for Vancouver East, the NDP housing critic described, our substandard housing crisis is an unnatural disaster. That is what this woman who I just referred to is dealing with every day of her life.

Families are having to make trade-offs about whether to feed themselves and their children or pay the phone bill. Do they let their hydro bill slide and risk a few days of darkness, or do they spend the money on their daughter's field trip? All of these things are being juggled in light of the fact that they are paying too much money for substandard housing. I do not believe people should ever have to make those kinds of trade-offs.

I remember speaking with a group of local boy scouts in my riding recently about the universal declaration of human rights. I asked them what human rights meant to them. One of them answered "Food to eat. We all have the right to eat". Another one said "A dry, clean, warm place to live". In fact these are included in the universal declaration of human rights; the whole idea that we have the right to a safe place to lay our heads at night.

These are rights that many residents in my community of Dartmouth are being deprived of, as are hundreds of thousands of people across this country. That is why we need a national housing program which will deal with these problems, not just one which tinkers around the edges and slowly erodes even further the housing program which we have. That is why Bill C-66 fails the test of good public policy. It simply tinkers with a system in crisis and it fails to deal with the real problems.

We need a housing program which sees community based, non-profit, mixed income housing as the best vehicle to deal with our national housing crisis, not private partnerships with the same landlords who are currently failing to provide maintenance. We need more housing which is accessible to all Canadians, including the four million who have disabilities in this country.

We need more seniors housing in Dartmouth, not more rhetoric coming out of Ottawa about partnerships and developers. We need the government to understand that investment in housing is no more of a frill than investment in health care. We need this government to understand that housing is related to health care. It is counterproductive for us to be spending more on hospitals

Government Orders

without looking at alleviating the conditions which land people in hospitals. Poverty is caused by bad housing.

• (1540)

We need a national housing strategy. The federal government has a responsibility to develop a national housing plan and a housing supply program in co-operation with the provinces.

The New Democratic Party believes that the federal government should meet that goal of providing an additional 1% of the budget, approximately \$2 billion, over five years, to meet the basic housing needs of Canadians. This 1% investment by all governments is a key recommendation of the Toronto Disaster Relief Committee and must be supported.

I call on the government to reject the theme park approach to budget building and to adopt an approach which recognizes that investing in non-profit housing, investing in health and investing in children are ongoing requirements, not annual theme pronouncements which are based on extensive polling.

I call on the government to take back Bill C-66 and come forward with an anti-poverty agenda which will build quality, non-profit, accessible and affordable housing for Canadians.

Mr. Peter Stoffer (Sackville—Musquodoboit Valley—Eastern Shore, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to follow the hon. member from Dartmouth. If everyone in this country was listening to every word she said they would know that she is absolutely right when it comes to an unnatural homelessness disaster in this country.

Unfortunately, Bill C-66 is again legislation that came from the south end of a northbound cow. It just does not make any sense that the government can tinker around and pretend to give the people of Canada the perception that it is going to do something about homelessness in this country.

One would assume that the citizens of this country have a right to accessible, affordable housing, to look after their families, to live in communities that are safe. The government does absolutely nothing for them. It downloads, it skirts the issues, it runs away, it hides. The government never tackles the serious issue of homelessness.

If people need an example of the crisis in this country they could look to Toronto, which is our largest city. It is a magnet for many tourists from around the world. When they come here they think "Canada is great. This is nice. We can walk on the streets". I was in Toronto yesterday and in two downtown blocks we counted 42 people who were on the streets, begging, lying in sleeping bags and sitting on cardboard boxes. These people have no place to go because the federal government with its provincial counterpart in

Ontario have completely ignored them and have concentrated on tax cuts for the rich.

In Ontario an election has been called. Is the provincial government pursuing the matter? Did Mr. Harris, the premier of Ontario, stand today with his colleagues in the Tory party to fight for homeless people? Will the election be based on poverty issues and environmental issues? No. The issue will be based on trouble with the sports franchises. They are going to try to keep millionaire businessmen and players in Canada. There was not one word in the provincial budget which addressed poverty and homelessness in our major city of Toronto. Toronto is a microcosm of what is happening right across the country.

As the hon. member for Dartmouth well knows, in Nova Scotia there are a lot of people who were seriously affected by the downturn of the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, let me state this quite simply so that everybody in the country understands. You and I, because of our incomes, live in a fairly comfortable home that we can pay for. A lot of these people live in mobile parks and mobile trailers. There is nothing wrong with living in those nice mini-homes. Unfortunately, if you or I lose our house, with our income we can afford to buy a mobile home which is traditionally of a lower value than a three bedroom duplex. The people in Canso, in Bonavista, Newfoundland and up in Arichat, Nova Scotia are losing their mobile homes. That is a crisis. Where do they go?

Mr. Speaker, you are an honourable gentleman, as everybody in the House is honourable, but what are we doing in the House of Commons as legislators if we cannot protect the most vulnerable of our society?

• (1545)

It is not that much to ask for 1% of the budget over the next few years totalling \$2 billion to put back into social housing. We ignore the plight of some of the most vulnerable people in our society: our aboriginal first nations people, our seniors, our children, and those with mental and physical deficiencies. The province of Ontario and its Tory government and the federal Liberal government together concentrate on tax cuts for the rich and how we can make them richer.

In the recent federal budget announced by the Minister of Finance the average tax cut for the middle income earner was about \$325, whereas the average tax cut for a person making \$3 million to \$4 million totals \$38,000. If the government can put that much effort into looking after its corporate and wealthy friends, I ask it to put at least half that effort into looking after the most vulnerable in society.

Unfortunately the bill does not do that. It does not even come close. The New Democratic Party is asking the government to go

Government Orders

over the bill again. If government members want to know how to do it, they should come to Vancouver East and sit down with the member of the New Democratic Party who represents that area. She will tell them exactly what they should do to prevent the unnatural disaster of homelessness.

That is all they have to do. They do not need more studies. They do not have to throw more money after reports. All they have to do for one hour is sit down with the member for Vancouver East and she will tell them exactly how to do it. With wonderful advice from her they will be able to solve the problem of homelessness from coast to coast to coast.

It is a shame that in 1999 we are standing in the House of Commons to discuss this very serious issue. In 1989 the leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Ed Broadbent, moved an all party resolution to end child poverty in the country. Now, 10 years later, child poverty has increased four times. It is absolutely unbelievable that the Tories and Liberals of that period ignored the very serious motion and recommendation brought forward by Mr. Ed Broadbent.

Now we are discussing the homelessness issue, an issue that is not discussed often enough in the House. If members of parliament want to know what it is like to be homeless, they should leave their credit cards and wallets at home and live on the streets of Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver or Halifax in January. They should do it for a month if they have the guts to do it. That is what thousands of people go through every day.

I plead with the government, I beg the government, I deplore the government to pay serious attention to the plight of those people. It should look after social housing from coast to coast to coast. It should not download its responsibility on to the provinces again, which is exactly what it plans to do.

I beg the government to put 1% of future budgets totalling \$2 billion back into social housing. That will also create jobs in communities which badly need them. As the member for Dartmouth said, it needs to be community based and non-profit. If these people are given the tools to work with, they will be able to look after themselves.

I hope my comments today have resonance with the Liberals, and I hope they make the right decision when final decisions are being made.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed certain bills, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-66, an act to amend the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee; and of Group No. 3.

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

Some hon. members: Question.

The Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Tuesday, May 4, 1999, the questions on the motions in Group No. 3 are deemed put and the recorded divisions deemed requested and deemed deferred.

The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred divisions at report stage of the bill.

Call in the members.

• (1550)

And the bells having rung:

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. At the request of the deputy government whip the divisions are deferred until the conclusion of Government Orders later this day.

* * *

YOUTH CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT

The House resumed from April 21 consideration of the motion that Bill C-68, an act in respect of criminal justice for young persons and to amend and repeal other acts, be read the second time and referred to a committee; and of the amendment.

Mr. Greg Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest, PC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to take part in the debate on Bill C-68. We have waited a long time for this bill. The minister has delayed 18 months in bringing it in. I do not think there are many in the House who appreciate that delay. It is nothing more than a makeover of the originally flawed act and is more or less tinkering around the edges.

After testing public opinion on this controversial legislation through continued leaks to the media, the justice minister finally introduced Bill C-68. It is ironic that the bill carries with it the namesake of a previous piece of disappointing Liberal legislation which failed to address the needs of Canadians. I am speaking about the infamous false hope Firearms Registration Act.

As with the firearms act, the youth criminal justice act was done without appropriate consultation. Canadians want to know what surveys or consultations were done with parents of young offenders

before the tabling of Bill C-68 occurred. What surveys and consultations were done with officers and judges who deal with young offenders? What surveys were done with social workers who deal with young offenders and with guards at the facilities where young offenders are incarcerated? The public would like to know because this bill, which was supposed to take into account the opinions of Canadians, seems to have left the vast majority of Canadians wanting more.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, Canadians from across the country are concerned that the new youth criminal justice act is not a bill that will move forward societal attempts at dealing with youth justice in Canada. Some would argue that it is a regressive piece of legislation hearkening back to the days of the defunct juvenile delinquent act.

It took the Liberals over a year of analysis, 18 months to be exact, to come up with the very old idea that a repeat youth offender involved in less serious offences would be tried as an adult and then sentenced as a child.

The broader issues of poverty and homelessness are the root of much of the criminal activity at any level. The PC Party is facing this issue head on with the PC poverty task force. The member behind me is involved in co-chairing that process.

The government has drafted a bill which does not go far enough to protect Canadians from increasingly violent youth crime. We are being told that the Liberals have toughened up the bill by placing more violent youth offenders in jail and that youth will be diverted away from the justice system and into community based initiatives such as social services, which are already overloaded and in shambles. This initiative also encourages the police to find alternatives to jail when dealing with youth offenders involved in relatively minor criminal activity.

• (1555)

The legislation encourages formal cautioning by police for young people who have been in less serious trouble. This is all well and good, but how does the government expect the fine members of our Canadian police forces to take on this extra responsibility? The government has already cut Canada's police forces to the point that the police are barely able to function with existing workloads.

Coupled with their already overburdened jobs, they no longer have the time to play the role of parent, psychologist or babysitter. They are expected to come up with a well prepared meaningful statement of warning to the youth offender and his or her parents. Through the implementation of this act the government is stretching police officers beyond their realistic limits and thus the increased workload will not be possible.

The type of crime being perpetrated by youth is increasingly sophisticated as are the problems faced by youth. The challenges on both sides of the divide are immense. Cuts to other sectors like

Government Orders

the elimination of ports police and constant budget restraints have a staggering impact.

The sad result for the Canadian public is to see police forces like the RCMP trying to fight problems such as youth crime with last year's \$74.1 million or 13% cut to the RCMP's federal policing services. This gouging of the RCMP leaves the force incapable of dealing with youth crime in a meaningful way. Do more with less, we have heard in the House before. It is a common theme presented by the Liberal government to nurses and public servants in all ranks.

What is missing from the legislation is a long term plan or strategy for funding. It is cynical on the part of the federal government to be downloading its implementation costs on to the provinces, but it is a familiar theme. The Liberals are forcing the provinces to abandon their youth justice proposals and to follow the federal model upon pain of further cuts. They do this by dangling the 30% funding in their faces and threatening to take it back if they choose to opt out, again a familiar plan.

It is a perverse irony that the government appears to be tougher on the far end and more proactive and progressive on the front end. Yet all this costs money; longer sentences and programming cost money.

If the government had allowed for proper consultation in the first place and actually listened, it could have come up with a deal that all provinces could have supported. Instead the bill resembles the sum total of many regionalized concessions that will make national enforcement of the youth act virtually impossible. A recent article in the Ottawa *Citizen* commented on the regionalized concession theme:

The bill provides considerable discretion on punishment, recognizing that provinces such as Alberta and Ontario want tougher penalties while others including Quebec traditionally rely less heavily on jail sentences.

We are supposed to be one united country with a national criminal justice policy, yet if a youth commits a crime in New Brunswick the youth may not serve the same sentence if he or she had committed the same crime in Alberta. In justice as in health care regional disparity should be of real concern to the government.

I am seeking unanimous consent to finish my speech because I do not think there is a long list of speakers.

The Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member asking for a specified time, or is he saying that he needs unlimited time to finish his speech?

An hon. member: Unlimited.

The Deputy Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to finish his speech?

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Mr. Speaker, before I give consent I would pose to the member exactly the same question. What amount

Government Orders

of time does the member want? I am prepared to agree to a defined amount of time but not to an open ended request.

• (1600)

Mr. Greg Thompson: Five extra minutes.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: I will give consent to an extra five minutes.

The Deputy Speaker: It will be a 15 minute speech. Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Greg Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I thank the members of the House and the deputy government whip.

The government has once again tried to be all things to all people, but has accomplished very little. It appears to be the parochial fence-sitter on this one. The new youth criminal justice bill tried to please everyone. However, by offering only piecemeal, halfway solutions, it in fact pleases no one.

It did not go far enough in lowering to 14 the age at which an offender could face adult sentences for murder, attempted murder, manslaughter and aggravated sexual assault. The 14 year old age limit will also be a barrier for the justice system as it tries to seek justice against young repeat offenders who commit other violent crimes.

These much overblown changes to the bill were an obvious response to overwhelming public pressure to toughen up on youth offenders. The government has given the appearance that it has toughened up the act, but I question whether these cosmetic alterations will have their desired effect.

The obvious question is: Why did the minister refuse to listen to the recommendations of her departmental experts and lower the age of accountability to 10 years of age? Contrary to the attempts by the Liberals to distract the public, no one is suggesting that society take 10 year old offenders, lock them up in prison and throw away the key forever. No one suggests that.

The government says we should try to rely on the social services to meet the needs of offenders under the age of 12. Nevertheless, the Liberals have poked so many holes into the social safety net that current young offender programs are not doing enough for the criminal acts of a 10 year old. On the other hand, if we can hold 10 year olds accountable for their actions and get them involved in the judicial process, there will be more programs available that could lead toward their rehabilitation. It is a mechanism too often necessary to trigger community response.

I wonder why the minister loaded the bill down with such bureaucratic nonsense that certain sections of the act will be difficult to enforce or even interpret. For example, the act proposes

prison sentences for up to two years for parents of youth offenders who wilfully refuse to supervise their children after being released to their custody. The misconception is that there is no real accountability for parents in the first instance. It does not take a rocket scientist to realize that virtually every defence lawyer could poke holes in the court's interpretation of the word wilfully. Thus, an opportunity to gain further accountability for young offenders will be lost, leaving the public to only shake their heads. The crown bar or lawyers will be the biggest beneficiaries of these changes. It will take a legion of lawyers and many, many months, if not years, to sort out this bill.

The bill has been described in many of the provinces as being woefully soft on violent offenders.

Our justice critic received correspondence from the Ontario ministry stating the obvious. Sixteen and seventeen year olds who commit adult crimes are not automatically tried as adults. Even for murder, aggravated sexual assault, manslaughter and attempted murder there is no guarantee that youths will be sentenced as an adult. Even on the third rape charge there is no guarantee of an adult sentence.

Most violent offences still require the prosecutor to prove an adult sentence is necessary. Jail sentences will be reduced in some cases as a result of these changes. The key word is reduced. Youth sentenced as adults for murder are still subject to more lenient periods of parole and eligibility than adults sentenced for murder. Mandatory jail time is not required for youths convicted of an offence involving a weapon. I do not think we would call that progress.

The Ontario solicitor general had this say:

What the people of Ontario have been asking for is legislation that will better protect our children and our communities, that will send a message to young people that they will be held accountable for their actions and would deter youth crime. Instead, the federal Liberal government has released a bill that has little regard for public safety and even less regard for providing meaningful consequences for criminal behaviour such as sexual assault, drug trafficking and use of a weapon.

• (1605)

This commentary is not limited merely to politicians. York Regional Police Chief Julian Vantino stated:

Many police officers and citizens right across Ontario, are frustrated with the Young Offenders Act because it seems primarily concerned with the rights of offenders. . . It's disappointing that the federal government won't take the opportunity to right this wrong and introduce a much tougher law to serve as an effective deterrent to youth crime.

The youth criminal justice act's definition of serious violent offence is so vague that it is almost useless. Thus, we will soon have a youth law where, in no case is an adult sentence automatic. Even in the case of first degree murder, a young person can avoid an adult sentence.

The following offences are not presumed serious enough to warrant adult sentences: armed robbery, sexual assault and drug

Government Orders

trafficking. This is a shocking omission given the prevalence of youth in these serious criminal activities.

A young person can commit three serious violent offences with no guarantee of an adult sentence. Repeat offenders of non-violent crimes are not assumed to receive adult sentences. So much is left to judicial and prosecutorial discretion or interpretation that it will take years to fully understand the effects.

Let us consider that a 17 year old who robs a bank, kills a customer and is found guilty of murder can still receive a lenient youth sentence. Most serious violent offenders still require the prosecutor to prove an adult sentence is necessary.

Just to conclude, I think the bill is flawed.

Mr. Jim Gouk (Kootenay—Boundary—Okanagan, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, it is only appropriate that I start off my presentation today on Bill C-68 by reflecting on the irony of talking to a bill with the number C-68.

We, on this side of the house, feel that the association with that number is so bad that even if this had been a good piece of legislation we probably would have had some problem with it. Bill C-68 is probably the worst piece of legislation that has ever come forward in the House. I refer, of course, to the bill from the previous parliament dealing with the forced registration of firearms owned by law-abiding citizens while criminals get to carry on their activities untouched.

One of the problems we always have in opposition is what to do when we call on the government to bring in some meaningful legislation and it finally comes up with something that goes part way. Do we applaud them for the little bit of progress that we have made or do we lament all the good things that could have been in that bill that are not?

I hear the deputy whip on the other side saying that we should applaud them for the little bit of good they do. I can understand her feeling that way because when a government only does a little bit of good it wants as much recognition as possible.

With this particular bill dealing with youth justice, this should have been done in the last parliament but it was not. A lot of promises were made but it never happened.

What happened? We had an election in 1997. We got the perky justice minister from the west. The west is a good place, but there are not many Liberals from there. The justice minister, right off the bat, said that this was a priority for her. I will never forget waking up every night with the phrase "in a timely fashion" ringing in my ears, because that was the minister's answer every time we asked her when the bill would be coming forward.

I guess either the minister does not know what is timely or she does not know what is in fashion. We waited and waited. Finally,

after much pomp and ceremony at a big press conference last year talking about what she was almost ready to do, it took her another six months to do it. It is no wonder she had so much trouble finally coming out with it, it was mostly fluff.

• (1610)

Why do we not accept what we have achieved thus far? Considering how long it has taken to get what little Bill C-68 has to offer, we might never get anything more. We therefore have to lament what is missing from the bill.

It would be one thing if we thought this was the first instalment, but it has taken us five years to get this little dribble out of the minister. Of course we have to lament all the things that should be in the bill. Members may rest assured that the Reform Party will try to amend the bill both in committee and, if necessary, at report stage.

If the government wants to know whether it should adopt the amendments we will be suggesting, it will have to do two things that are very uncharacteristic: It will have to listen to Canadians and it will have to listen to what they are asking for. It claims it does that from time to time. Maybe it does, but then it has to do the second part, which is something it has a tremendous amount of difficulty with, and that is actually implementing what Canadians want.

One of the things the government has come out with lately is statistics. Statistics are wonderful. Statistics say youth crime is down. Youth crime is not down at all. Convictions on youth crime and prosecution of youth crime is down, but in terms of actual problems out there we still have a lot of problems.

I have heard people say, "Oh, that Reform Party is so hard on the young people. Isn't it terrible. Why are you picking on young people"? The fact is that the number one victim of young offenders is young people themselves. We are not doing this to pick on young people. We are doing it to protect them.

The courts have taken a lenient sort of approach in dealing with youth crime because that is obviously the message and signal coming from government, the appointer of judges. The RCMP are having a harder problem because it is dealing with severe cutbacks in budgets. Cuts have to be made somewhere, but we are basically turning our backs on minor youth crime which may then become major crimes.

We have always promoted and agreed with a three-fold approach. The first approach is early intervention. Our number one priority under the criminal justice system, be it with our youth or adults, is to prevent crime.

The second approach would be when a first time offender is apprehended for committing a non-violent crime and timely action

Government Orders

to prevent the crime was not taken, every effort should be made to ensure that person does not offend again. The best way to do that is to try to find some way to keep them out of the criminal justice system through a diversion program.

The government talks about that in the bill, but diversion programs have been going on for quite awhile. I have one in my own riding in Trail, B.C. It is run by a lot of very conscientious and dedicated volunteers, citizens from the community. The success of that program is absolutely astounding. They have dealt with a lot of young offenders through that program and, from the last figures I have heard, they have had one single case of a repeat crime. That is a pretty astonishing record and one the government would do well to emulate. It tried to emulate it in its own fashion in this bill by promoting a diversion program.

However, even when the government copies us it just cannot get it right. It includes repeat and even violent offenders in that. Under the Trail program, those types of people are specifically banned. This is a single opportunity for those who have made a mistake to turn themselves around. It applies to non-violent and first-time offenders. They get one opportunity. They get one second chance. The government wants to give people three, four, five and six chances because it just does not want to deal with the problem.

That has to be one of the great flaws in the bill. At the same time, there is no question that diversion costs money upfront. It saves a tremendous amount of money in the criminal justice system but the government has to be willing to put some money upfront. It certainly has not identified that it is prepared to put up the kind of money to make this diversion program truly work.

There is also a need at the far end of the scale for those few young offenders, the small percentage, who are repeat violent offenders. That is the small element the government must get tough with. Every time we mention this the government says "Oh yes, these radical Reformers want to crack down on everybody". We want to the best of our ability to ensure we can prevent crime. When we cannot get someone early enough to prevent it, then we want to make sure that it does not occur again.

• (1615)

As I said, it does not matter if we are talking about young offenders or adults. Where we fail, where people simply will not respond to that earlier intervention and the kinder treatment for a first offender, we need to send out a message. The message is that we intend to protect law-abiding citizens and their property. That is our priority. If people will not follow the rules even after they have been given a chance, we have to be prepared to deal with that.

The government fails miserably on that part. The government has said that it will crack down on certain areas of violent crime, but it left a whole lot out. What does that suggest? That it is picking and choosing at random? Violent crime is violent crime. The government should recognize it and treat it as such.

The government still wants to place us in a position where a young offender, particularly someone 16 or 17 years old who has perhaps committed a violent crime, has a trial to see where the trial will take place. It sounds like bureaucracy to me.

The government also says that the public will have access to information in certain areas, but it bans it in a lot of other areas. The government is not clear on this. There is also a lack of standardization.

Mr. Speaker, I got your signal. I trust it was the right finger. I know how some Liberals feel, but I am sure not you.

Where we have a problem is with the standardization. We have a problem right now with certain criminals judge shopping because they are known to be limited in other areas.

Ms. Marlene Catterall: Keep it on.

Mr. Jim Gouk: Mr. Speaker, we woke up the deputy whip again. I am so glad that my speech has finally got through to her.

We need to have some standardization. We do not want the same thing happening in youth crime where we say "If you are going to commit crimes, there are some provinces that are soft on crime".

The government has a lot of work to do. As weak as this bill is, it has some possibilities only if it listens to Canadians, if it listens to the voice of Canadians through us, if it looks seriously at amendments and puts partisanship behind it, if it can do that. Let us work together to make this the kind of bill Canadians have waited for.

[*Translation*]

Ms. H  l  ne Alarie (Louis-H  bert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-68 was introduced at first reading by the Minister of Justice in March 1999. It is a product of the strategy to renew the justice system for young people, which was introduced in May 1998.

The Bloc Quebecois and all the stakeholders in Quebec are opposed to that reform, because it is useless and dangerous in terms of its anticipated impact on crime reduction in the long run.

The current legislation has allowed Quebec to enjoy the lowest youth crime rate in Canada. In the rest of the country, it has decreased youth crime by 23% between 1991 and 1997.

Given these results, one wonders why the act should be changed. Did the minister make this reform strictly for political reasons, or did she yield to the pressure of the right in Canada?

Why did the minister not see fit to refer to the Quebec model for youth justice in the principles and the preamble of the bill? Since she alludes to Quebec in her comments, she should have made

explicit reference to our province, as was pointed out by the Quebec coalition opposing this bill, which feels that:

The alleged flexibility given to the provinces to implement the act is in fact just a series of limited powers that rest on the shoulders of crown prosecutors. Nowhere in the bill do we find confirmation of the right of the provinces to apply their own model.

Some extremely repressive measures are found in Bill C-68, which includes 14 and 15-year old children among those offenders who could be sentenced as adults. I emphasize the fact that these are 14 and 15 year olds. Anyone who has been active in education with teenagers or, better still, who has raised a good family that included teenagers, knows that at age 14 and 15 they are not yet adults. They are still children in some respects.

• (1620)

Bill C-68 establishes a sentence of custody for young people at higher risk and repeat offenders in cases of violent offences.

In addition, it is worth noting that the publication of the names of adolescents would be authorized if the adolescent receives an adult sentence or a youth sentence for violent crimes, if the adolescent is at liberty in the community but has committed a crime or been charged with a criminal act or if the adolescent authorizes release on reaching adulthood and is not under custodial sentence.

Here again, you have to know something about adolescents. The Bloc Quebecois contends that this publicity will give importance to certain young offenders, especially in the case of young people who are members of street gangs or groups. It might be an idea to look at what is going on in the schools across the country. The phenomenon of gangs is everywhere.

We therefore support the current restrictions intended to protect the reputation of innocent families. Publicizing the identity of adolescents could also have the unfortunate effect of creating a false sense of security among the members of the public. We might think that, once we know the identity of the offender, we are safe and there is no more problem.

We must also look at the cost of applying the law. In Quebec alone, the new Young Offenders Act should cost an additional \$69 million in implementation costs over a three year period. How much of the money set aside in the finance minister's last budget will be left for crime prevention? Because it is through prevention that crime is reduced, not through punishment. There are costs associated with prevention, but the long term results are much more promising.

We therefore call on the federal government to transfer full jurisdiction for youth justice, along with the associated funding, to Quebec. Unfortunately the Minister of Justice has failed to con-

Government Orders

vince the rest of Canada of the effectiveness of Quebec's approach. In fact, the proof is in the crime rates.

The Bloc Quebecois is concerned about the future impact on Quebec's crime rate of the tougher approach other provinces will be allowed to take. We also wonder about the latitude judges will have in handing down sentences intended to be proportionate to the seriousness of the offence and standardized throughout Canada.

Judges cannot ignore sentences given elsewhere. Case law, by its very nature, requires that judgments handed down elsewhere be considered and similar sentences given for similar offences.

Finally, various experts from Quebec spoke out against this bill. I am thinking of the association of organizations interested in the new young offenders legislation, criminologists André Normandeau and Cécile Toutant, lawyer Jean Trépanier, and André Payette, the spokesperson for the Association des centres jeunesse du Québec, who has seen many things in his work at the Supreme Court of Canada and as Quebec's president of the bar.

By placing the young person's responsibility foremost in a new statement of principle, the minister is running the risk of destabilizing a system which has, up until now, been able to substantially reduce the juvenile crime rate.

Finally, the government has not explicitly recognized in its bill the possibility for Quebec to maintain, and particularly to expand, its youth justice model. The presumed flexibility in the bill is an illusion, since it is not included in the preamble or the guiding principles of the bill.

In Quebec, as in some other provinces, alternatives to detention have been put in place. Considering that incarceration is not the appropriate solution for most cases that come under the Young Offenders Act, it is the opinion of the Bloc Quebecois that it is essential for such alternative measures to be given more attention.

• (1625)

In her letter of May 3, the Quebec Minister of Justice reminded her federal counterpart:

—that the planned reform is based on false premises. Youth crime has been on a steady decline for a number of years already, everywhere in Canada. This is particularly true in Quebec, which has the lowest crime rate in Canada.

According to the Minister:

The bill—is neither necessary nor justified, and is liable to imperil the rehabilitation model that has been implemented in Quebec. Concretely, if our model is to be maintained, this means that Quebec will have to be excluded from the bill, which is based on a repressive philosophy and which Quebec will have no choice but to apply, like all the rest of Canada.

For all these reasons, we are asking that this bill be withdrawn or, if the minister does not comply with that request, that Bill C-68

Government Orders

be amended by adding after clause 3 a clause 3.1, which would read as follows:

3.1. This act is not applicable to Quebec.

We also wish clause 196 to be replaced by the following:

196. This act replaces the Young Offenders Act, except in Quebec, where it remains in force.

[English]

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (Winnipeg North Centre, NDP):
Mr. Speaker, I am really happy to have the opportunity to speak to Bill C-68.

I along with most members in this House have a clear sense from constituents and Canadians everywhere of their need to feel safe and secure in their neighbourhoods. I do not think anyone here can say that they are not fully aware of the worry and concern citizens of this nation have everywhere about peace and quality of life and security in their communities.

It is a topical consideration today given the shootings that have happened in the schools in Colorado and Taber, Alberta. Those incidents have made us all stop, pause and think about what we can do to work with our young people. We must ensure that embarking upon criminal activities and violence is dealt with in a meaningful and positive way at an age when it can make a difference and we can see a reduction in crime and violence.

Bill C-68 is an important step in addressing the broad range of concerns around youth justice issues, but it is not the whole picture. It is not a comprehensive approach. It does not deal with the range of issues that parliament should be dealing with if we are going to make a real difference.

My own community is an example of where the government needs to be involved and how we can support the kind of spirit of community, the self-help initiative that is springing up everywhere in this country. My community, the north end neighbourhood, is typical of an inner city. Inevitably we will be dealing with difficult situations as long as there is no leadership and as long as there is a policy vacuum in terms of quality of life and economic opportunity.

I am not here to say that we should just eliminate poverty and ensure economic opportunities for everyone and that will put an end to violence and crime. I am not that naive but I do know that quality of life at the community level plays a role.

I looked at my own community of Winnipeg North Centre. In my own neighbourhood we have seen business after business close up shop and move out. Banks have moved their branches from my neighbourhood to a suburban community. The local drugstore has shut down. We have lost the local post office. We have lost the one

meaningful recreational opportunity for young people, the North Y in Winnipeg.

Put all of that together and picture a community of boarded up businesses and homes. They are boarded up because this government and the provincial government have abdicated responsibility for the deteriorating housing stock in our communities and for the lack of economic opportunity. If we put all of that together we have a crisis. We have a critical situation.

• (1630)

How can we begin to address the matters of youth justice and deal with a perceived if not a real increase in violent crime among young people unless we look in our own backyards and realize what the causes are of that kind of behaviour and what is making young people want to join gangs as they are doing in large numbers in Winnipeg and in other inner cities right across the country.

In the face of all of that it is encouraging that communities are deciding to do something about it. In the case of Winnipeg North Centre we have had community after community establishing on a volunteer basis safety patrols. These patrols are made up of volunteers who devote their weekends and their evenings, from 10 o'clock at night until 3 o'clock in the morning, to patrol neighbourhoods. They chase away prostitutes, make it difficult for someone to commit a crime, pick up used syringes and create a sense of security and safety for people who live in those neighbourhoods.

That is incredible devotion and an incredible contribution to the issue we are dealing with today under the auspices of Bill C-68. That is the kind of effort we need to recognize and we need to support in conjunction with those groups. I want to especially single out those volunteers who constitute the Northend Patrol under Community United for Change, the Manitoba Avenue Patrol, the Night Owls, the Flora Place Patrol and the Weston Brooklands Patrol. Those are five groups that have sprung up in a year to start to take control over the situation and to make a real and lasting contribution. They are supported, as much as possible, by community based policing efforts, a program that is doing well in Winnipeg. It needs to be supported and I am sure it has been replicated in other parts of the country.

It is that community based approach, working with volunteers, working with communities, working with organizations which want to ensure that the pride of neighbourhood and spirit of co-operation is alive and well, that we must build on. That is what we need to address when we are talking about Bill C-68.

It makes an attempt to begin to address the broad issues that cause crime and violence among young people. It recognizes the responsibility of communities, parents and families, and it begins to suggest that our youth justice system must look at how effective we are in terms of consequences and punitive measures, but it also

must look at how we actually play a role in terms of rehabilitation and the prevention of youth crime in our communities today.

That is an important effort, but does it go far enough? Does it support what is happening in our communities? Will it make a difference?

The NDP critic for justice has clearly spoken about our concerns with respect to the level of funding committed by the government to back up its legislation and has actually said that \$206 million over three years is not exactly a lot of money if it is applied on a per capita basis. It is not a lot of money if we are seriously looking at a meaningful, comprehensive system of youth justice. There is no question that we have to look at resources and we have to have the political will to make this concept a reality.

I hate to say this, but Manitoba had the highest growth in youth crime between 1990 and 1997. Manitoba has had a 34% increase in violent youth crime in the last seven or eight years. That is an awful record. That is an awful thing for me to have to stand and say, but our job here today is to figure out why that has happened and what we can do to reverse that trend. We have to look at ourselves, we have to look at the federal government and we have to look at the provincial governments.

• (1635)

In the case of Manitoba we are dealing with a situation where the federal government has failed to back up its commitment to deal with this issue in terms of real dollars and real initiative. We are dealing with a provincial government, the Manitoba Conservatives, who continually point fingers. All they do is point fingers at the federal government and say "You are the bad guys. You fix the problem. Give us more money and the whole problem will be solved".

We know that both levels of government are culpable of this inability to deal with a very serious problem. As a result, we have the worst backlog of court cases anywhere in Canada. There are serious concerns about dangerous releases and ineffective controls and standards for release. We know we have problems around weak prosecution. We have not dealt with opportunities for young people. All of those issues, those problems, those concerns, are at the heart of the issue we are dealing with today. The responsibility for dealing with them rests in large measure with the federal government working in tandem with the provincial government of Manitoba.

The community will is there. The efforts are in place. Communities are willing to help themselves, but they need the support of government to back up those efforts and to ensure that wherever we go and whatever we do there are meaningful programs in place so that young people will face up to what they have done and know that the consequences will be immediate and effective.

Government Orders

While this bill goes some distance in recognizing that, I am afraid it does not address the scope of the problem and will fall short unless we can convince members of the government to back up this initiative with meaningful policies and significant dollars.

Mr. Bill Gilmour (Nanaimo—Alberni, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the opportunity to speak at second reading of Bill C-68, an act respecting criminal justice for young persons.

The legislation responds to some recommendations put forward by Reform and the justice committee. However, Bill C-68 falls short in several key areas and will need significant revisions to meet the needs of our youth and the demands of many Canadians.

Over a year ago Reform proposed a three-pronged approach to deal with the complexities of youth crime. This approach included early detection and intervention as an effective means of crime prevention; community based resolutions and sentences for non-violent offenders; and lowering the minimum age to 10, with the maximum age of 15, plus publishing the names of all violent offenders. Reform also proposed that distinctions be made between non-violent and violent offenders, diverting less serious offenders away from formal court proceedings and incarceration, while ensuring that all violent offenders are put into custody.

This side of the House has been very active in fighting for changes to be made to the Young Offenders Act to make it more effective because violent crime by young offenders has more than doubled since 1986. Clearly, the present system is not working.

During the last parliament I saw firsthand how the Young Offenders Act failed a seriously disturbed sexual offender and, more seriously, how it failed a young girl and her family. Seven years ago in Courtenay, B.C., which was part of my riding at that time, six year old Dawn Shaw was brutally raped and murdered. Her killer was 15 year old Jason Gamache, a repeat sexual offender who had been convicted previously of two sexual assaults on four year old children, one girl and one boy. Jason was convicted in Nanaimo in 1991 and moved to Courtenay with his mother to attend court ordered sex offender therapy through the John Howard Society.

His probation order clearly stated that he was to have no contact with children under 12 years of age. Yet Gamache's neighbours, the local authorities and even the Courtenay RCMP were not aware of Gamache's criminal record of sexual assault because of the privacy sections of the Young Offenders Act. The only people who knew of Jason's criminal background were his mother, the John Howard Society and his probation officer.

On October 24, 1992 Jason was playing hide and seek with Dawn and other children. He carried her on his shoulders into the woods, raped her and then stomped her to death. The footprint etched in the

Government Orders

dirt on Dawn's face clearly matched that of Jason's and was one of the clues that identified him as the murderer.

• (1640)

This little girl's murder was a tragedy that should never have been allowed to happen. At the time of the murder Jason Gamache was on probation. He was being supervised by the corrections branch and was receiving sex offender therapy. Yet, despite his probation order, Jason was allowed to live right next door to an elementary school in a low income housing complex filled with children. This should never have been allowed to happen. Clearly, there was no effort to enforce his probation order. Where is the accountability?

Dawn Shaw's parents had the right to know that the boy next door, the boy who was babysitting their children, was a repeat sexual offender. Yet, when Dawn Shaw was reported missing, Gamache aided in the search for her and spent hours babysitting her siblings.

Clearly, the criminal justice system failed Dawn Shaw and her family. It is time that the government put the benefit and welfare of children before the rights of criminals like Jason Gamache.

In the last parliament I tabled over 4,000 signatures on petitions in memory of Dawn, demanding changes to the Young Offenders Act. Yet this bill before the House fails to address this serious concern.

Although Bill C-68 proposes to allow the publication of names of young offenders, this provision is seriously limited. The bill does not allow for the publication of names of youths who are charged. Names can only be published if young criminals are convicted and given an adult sentence, as well as 14 to 17 year olds who receive a youth sentence for murder, attempted murder, manslaughter, aggravated sexual assault or repeat serious violent offences. Repeat sexual offenders like Jason Gamache would still be protected under this new bill and that must be addressed while this bill is before this House.

Dawn Shaw's life could have been saved with the elimination of this section of the act and the establishment of a young offenders registry, including repeat sexual offenders. Such a registry would have provided Dawn Shaw's parents with a warning, at least a chance. Young offenders legislation must include the publication of all repeat sexual offenders' names. The rights of innocent children must be protected ahead of those of the violent offenders. In order to do that the records of young people who commit serious crimes should be treated the same as adults in all respects.

The RCMP in my riding told me that, regardless of age, if there is a dangerous offender in the neighbourhood, people want to know. Parents must know if the person associating with their child is a convicted rapist like Jason Gamache.

Canadians also want a young offenders act that broadens the number of offences where young offenders can be charged as adults. Yet Bill C-68 severely restricts the offences where an adult sentence can be imposed. The list includes murder, attempted murder, manslaughter and aggravated sexual assault. It does not include sexual assault with a weapon, hostage-taking, aggravated assault, kidnapping and a host of other serious violent offences.

Additionally, for these offences the judge must first consider the least restrictive sentence and only impose adult sentencing as a last resort. For youth sentencing purposes maximum sentencing has not changed in this new bill. It is still ten years for murder with six in custody and four under supervision in the community, seven years for second degree murder with four in custody and three under supervision, three years for any offence having an adult sentence of life imprisonment, and two years in custody and one under supervision for all others. That has not changed.

Violent crimes committed by 14 to 17 year olds are no less violent than those committed by adults. 1996 statistics show that youths are charged in 10% of all homicides and 12% of cases of attempted murder. However, just 13% of convicted violent young offenders are put in jail. Clearly, young people who commit adult crimes should do adult time.

Jason Gamache, who killed Dawn Shaw when he was 15, was given a life sentence but would have been eligible for parole this December. If 16 and 17 year olds are old enough to get their driver's licences and old enough to get married, they are also old enough to be held responsible for their actions.

• (1645)

In addition, Bill C-68 has not changed the rules for public access. Proceedings under this act permit the court to exclude any or all members of the public from the courtroom. Reform's blue book policy supports public access to court proceedings in cases involving 14 and 15 year old offenders and in cases where the public's right to know supersedes the need to protect the youth's identity. This is a change Canadians support and want to see in the legislation.

Canadians, the Reform Party and an all party justice committee, with the exception of the Bloc, called for the lowering of the age to cover youths 10 to 15 years old. Yet Bill C-68 fails to change the age of application. The act does not apply to young offenders 10 and 11 years old and continues to treat 16 and 17 year olds as young offenders. Because of this, 10 and 11 year olds will not benefit from the rehabilitative aspects of the act.

Another concern is that the legislation allows the provinces to opt out of its provisions. Youths may escape facing adult sentencing, depending on the policies of each province and each court. Provinces could choose whether to seek adult sentencing, the publication of names and access to records. Canadians do not wish

Government Orders

violent young offenders to receive different treatment, depending on the provinces they come from.

Canadians believe the Young Offenders Act should hold parents of young offenders financially responsible. This is in the act and we welcome it. This is one of the concerns that the RCMP in my riding were hoping to see addressed in the new legislation.

In conclusion, I cannot give my support to the legislation as it stands. There are too many holes. It is my hope the government will listen to Canadians and make the necessary revisions to give Canadians the justice and protection they deserve.

Mr. Randy White (Langley—Abbotsford, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, on reflection it is rewarding for me today to speak in the House to Bill C-68, an act which purportedly amends the Young Offenders Act. Basically what it does is renames the act. I am not sure of the consequence of the change. It is interesting the government changes the name to legislation but the contents of it basically remain the same.

I can remember way back when I was with Alberta energy and the Liberals changed the juvenile delinquents act to the Young Offenders Act. People were asking questions about what it did and how it affected things. It basically took the onus off the parent and off the individual and put it on society in general to accept all problems associated with youth crime. At that time I do not think we had near the level of youth crime that we have today.

Back then, somewhere in the seventies, I do not think we anticipated what is facing us today. There were a lot of complaints. We looked for answers across the nation. We asked questions and more questions. We asked both the Conservative and Liberal governments to look at the legislation that was in place, amend it, toughen it up, because it switched too far to the left, so to speak. Nothing much was done.

In the 1991-92 proceedings prior to the general election when we were all candidates, I can remember talking about it. There was a great cloud over the Young Offenders Act at the time. People across Canada were saying that it had to be changed and that young people and their parents had to be more responsible.

• (1650)

Basically the Liberals promised the Canadian public that after they were elected in 1993 they would make some changes. I was very much involved in the debate in 1995 on very superficial amendments to the Young Offenders Act. After all that time and complaining the new Liberal government made minor changes to the act. There was still no satisfaction from the point of view of the

Canadian electorate and victims of crime throughout Canada, so we said no. We still needed the right changes.

After the election in 1997 it was still a major issue. The government said it was to make changes. Here we are today, and the changes are basically in name only. Some other minor changes are being put forward.

For the life of me I do not understand the hesitancy across the way, for the two of them who are listening over there. I do not understand the hesitancy of the Liberal government. It should look at the issue seriously and put the onus back on young people and their parents. It should try to improve the Young Offenders Act that will be called something else, which does not do justice to the problem.

The government refuses to acknowledge the question about young people being considered adults. As my colleague just said to the House, young people who are 17 and 18 are not automatically considered adults. Yet the age of permissive sex is 14 today. They can drive a car at 16. They can drink alcohol in some provinces under the age of 18. In my province it is 19. They can die for their country, but at 17 and 18 years old they are not adults. They are not considered to be able to make proper decisions when it comes to life and death issues.

When I talk at colleges and high schools across the country one of the questions I usually hear from young people is when politicians will consider them adults. They say that they are considered adults in some cases, but not when it does not suit us in the House of Commons. Sometimes we consider them adults at 18, but we say to drink alcohol they have to be 19.

The government does not have a basic fundamental philosophy. That is one of the problems with most of the legislation that comes before the House of Commons. If they murder someone they might be an adult but it will be fought in the court system. That is entirely wrong. It is the wrong message. When my children were 16 and 17 they said they were adults. If they went out and did something wrong they knew there were consequences.

What is wrong with the bill is that the government does not have a philosophy behind it. It is still in the mode of changing the name, which might appease some people, or having a good promotional exercise and some photo ops. It made some changes involving the family, which are good changes, but by and large when it comes to responsibility it calls them kids. Somehow I doubt whether that will wash.

Not too long ago I was sitting with a young offender who had sold cocaine big time. He was doing some community work. Nobody was allowed to know his name although I thought he was at the age where his name should be given out. He asked me what was my problem. He was doing his penalty, doing community

Government Orders

work. He was actually raking leaves. I told him that he was on the wrong track and asked if I could help out, help him get back in school. Perhaps we could get him into a post-secondary institution later. After that, who knows what? He might get a good job.

• (1655)

And he said to me: "Listen, fellow, nice try. In my world I sell cocaine and heroine. I can make up to \$14,000 tax free a month, and I do on a bad month. I have a lawyer on retainer and I drive a BMW. What are you talking about, go to work, go back to school?"

This young fellow is covered as a child in the Young Offenders Act. He is not a child. He is an adult who deliberately makes decisions much like we would or our children would at that age.

I have great difficulty understanding why the concept of what a young person is today is not over there. Why not make penalties fit crimes? Why not hold young people and their parents accountable today? It works, instead of leaving it open for everybody to assume things might go right.

I could talk on the Young Offenders Act all day, but I only wanted to make that point. I am serious that when it comes to young offenders we would do better to treat young people as responsible citizens, responsible for all their actions rather than assume they have to be 19 years old before they are adults.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: 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 Halifax West, Justice; the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester, Transport; the hon. member for Mercier, Technology Partnerships Canada.

Mr. Pierre de Savoye (Portneuf, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is important to clearly understand what the bill before us, which deals with young offenders, involves. It is important to clearly understand why this bill, if it is passed, would have an effect that is just the opposite of what is intended.

I want to mention a number of things that are obvious to me but which, unfortunately, are not understood by some members of this House, including, it seems, the Minister of Justice.

Teenagers are young people who must receive a proper education to behave properly in society. Threatening them with imprisonment and other repressive measures is not the way to instill in them the values that are necessary for proper behaviour in society.

Some Reform Party members related horror stories about young people committing absolutely horrendous crimes. But, for heaven's sake, when these young people were born, they were normal babies who should have been able to develop and eventually make a contribution to society.

Something went wrong somewhere. These children did not get the education they should have received. They were not made aware of the human, moral and societal values that would have allowed them to be productive members of society.

• (1700)

Looking at this bill before us, one realizes that this is not a bill that will provide young people with a better set of values. It is not a bill that will help them fit better into society.

It is a bill that will have the opposite effect: putting them into the prison setting. It will put them in contact with hardened criminals and expose them to exactly the opposite of the moral values we would like them to adopt. In fact, it will turn them into hardened criminals.

These children, young people, adolescents we refer to are not aliens from another planet. They are our children, the children we have raised and educated, or the children we have not raised, not educated, not trained in how to live properly in society.

Engineers have to be trained. Doctors have to be trained. A person can take courses to learn carpentry or car repair. Unfortunately, good parenting is not something one learns in school. There are no diplomas for parenting.

Most of us manage to do a pretty good job at it, I would venture to say. Proof of that lies in the vast majority of young people who will take over from us and of whom we have every reason to feel proud. Unfortunately, not all parents are as successful.

Perhaps they themselves have physical or mental health problems. Perhaps they have financial difficulties, ones with which this government's policies might have something to do. Maybe they have a work related problem. But these parents who, at a given point, need support to ensure that their children can be, to use the common phraseology, well brought up, are not getting that support, nor are their children, unfortunately, in many cases. And then we wonder why some of these young people go wrong.

I repeat that a young person's first real crime is not the horrendous offence too often described by Reform members. Often, it is something simple, elementary, a sort of alarm that goes off, meaning "Take care of me, I have a problem". However, if the parents are unable to deal with that sign, the young person will get involved in more and more serious situations, that could end in a most deplorable offence.

In Quebec, under the existing legislation on young offenders, we have taken a preventive approach. For more than 20 years now, when a child is in difficulty, and the school system or the neighbours or even the parents notice, resources are available for intervention and prevention. This approach works.

Government Orders

Let us look at the statistics. Quebec has the lowest rate of juvenile crime. It is very low, a lot lower than a number of years ago, and the rate of repeats is also very low. In short, we have a formula that works.

Even in the rest of Canada, the level of juvenile crime is on the decline. Canada too has a formula that works, not as well as that of Quebec, because it has not invested the same money as Quebec in prevention, but things are moving in the right direction.

• (1705)

English has the expression “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”. Right now, with the Reform Party, members are doing exactly the opposite. They are taking something that is working and scrapping it, so to speak, for something more repressive.

Obviously, any young person who is disturbed or in distress will not hesitate to commit a heinous crime just because it might carry a tougher sentence or he might be tried in adult court.

In fact, there are two or three possible scenarios. He could care less. He is upset and will commit the crime without checking the Criminal Code or the Young Offenders Act for the severity of the penalties and whether or not he will be tried in adult court. Unfortunately, he has lost his head and it is too late now.

The other possible scenario is that the young person will see the prospect of being treated like an adult as reflecting glory on him. And so, in order to be treated like an adult, he does something that makes no sense at all.

Quebec’s approach is to prevent the young person from committing a crime by helping him to be a full member of society when he is experiencing difficulty or psychological distress. The Reform Party’s approach is to let him commit the crime, but then punish him with extraordinary brutality, just to show others how spiteful people can be.

Parents are not spiteful; they are kind. We in this House represent the parents of Quebec and of Canada. We must show our children kindness, not spite.

The minister should withdraw this bill. But if she is bent on imposing it on the rest of Canada—heaven help them, their children deserve better—then she should at least respect Quebec’s experience, which is conclusive. She should simply spell out in the bill that the legislation does not apply to Quebec.

It is obvious that Quebec cannot let Canada force it to mistreat its children. We will not stand for it.

[*English*]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few

words on this important piece of legislation, Bill C-68. There are many aspects of this bill that are a major step forward in dealing with people who run afoul of the law.

I listened with interest to my friend from the Reform Party. I must say I agree with him on one point. Actually, I agree with him on many points. He said that young people age 16 and 17 are very mature people.

I have visited possibly hundreds of schools over the last number of years and have talked to young people age 16 and 17. I am convinced that in most cases they are as mature and knowledgeable about issues as most of their parents. Let us face it. There are some goofy young people, but there are also some goofy older people; people who do not think too much about things, or who are a little emotional or a little bit off the wall or whatever. We could find them in a classroom as well. On balance, when it comes to making mature decisions, when it comes to taking life seriously, the world seriously, their studies seriously, their arts, sports or whatever seriously, 16 and 17 year old young people are adult minded.

It brings to mind a discussion we have had many times about what is the appropriate age for voting. It is fair to say that at the moment somebody somewhere decided people have to be 18 to cast an intelligent ballot in Canada. I see my friend from Toronto and I know he would agree that most of us in the House believe that most young people who are age 16 and 17, given an opportunity to take federal or provincial politics seriously and vote in an election, would in fact do that.

• (1710)

As a matter of fact the record shows in those countries where people are able to vote at age 16 or 17 the participation rate is higher than that of their parents. The evidence is clear that when we expect young people to act as adults, they inevitably do; when we expect children to act like children, they do.

My wife and I raised to boys. I remember when they were at that age of 16 or 17. At times we expected them probably not to behave very maturely and they never let us down. They never did. They always behaved immaturely. But at those times when we expected them to do what was expected of young men, when we asked them to act responsibly and behave responsibly, I can say they never ever let us down.

What do we say to young people today when we say, “Yes, you can get married and raise a family. You can drive a vehicle. You can drive trucks, muscle cars or whatever on our highways. You can join our armed forces and serve overseas. You can work in the workplace and be recognized to receive employment insurance”. In other words, all sorts of things trigger off at age 16. But there is one thing they cannot do in our country and that is they cannot vote. What kind of a signal does that send to young people? Obviously

Government Orders

the signal it sends is we do not have faith in their wisdom to cast an intelligent ballot.

A person who is incarcerated in jail can vote. A person who is mentally challenged and over the age of 18 can vote. But young people who are interested in politics, who are well versed in government issues, who have watched the issues and are concerned about their country and are age 16 or 17, we say to them, "Sorry. You can participate in political parties. You can decide who the leader of your party should be. You can work in campaigns. But you cannot vote".

There seems to be a real problem here. As we look over Bill C-68 and ask ourselves whether or not young people who are 16 or 17 years old should be considered adults when it comes to accepting responsibility for their misdeeds, we ought to also consider whether these young people age 16 and 17 should be participating in the electoral process to decide on what the future of their country should be.

I realize this is a bit of a stretch in the discussion in terms of Bill C-68 but there is some connection. We are talking about the role of 16 year olds and 17 year olds in terms of accepting responsibility.

My friend in the Reform Party made a very eloquent case. He said that in his judgment young people age 16 and 17 who are in the workplace, and in that case the workplace was the selling of cocaine, certainly know the implications of their behaviour, and so it is part of the critical discussion. Let us face it. I agree with most of the provisions of this legislation. It is a major step forward in dealing with young people in a thoughtful and professional way. It is a more appropriate way than we have seen in the past.

There is one major fault which I should speak about before I go on any further. This debate gets us around the real causes of youth crime. If there is a fundamental cause of youth crime, it is poverty and the fact that people are not able to get the things they think are appropriate. They cannot afford them.

If we talked to most people incarcerated in Canadian jails, who are youthful, not necessarily 16 or 17 years old, but youthful, and we trace back their origins as young people, I would be surprised if most did not come from a life of poverty, but not all. That does not mean that poverty results in crime. I just say there is a correlation that we ought not to ignore.

What are the fundamental causes of crime? What are the fundamental causes of young people misbehaving? That is what this legislation fails to address.

I must say I support most clauses. The bill opens up the discussion in terms of what is appropriate for young people age 16 and 17. If we are saying that people age 16 and 17 ought to be held responsible for their behaviour, surely in legislation coming next we should say that young people age 16 and 17 should have the opportunity to vote in future Canadian elections.

• (1715)

Mrs. Elsie Wayne (Saint John, PC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Bill C-68 today.

It frightens me when I see what is happening these days. I think all my colleagues in the House have been shocked over what happened in Taber, Alberta, and in Colorado. We ask ourselves what has gone wrong. This did not happen when I was growing up as a child or when I was in high school.

Some time down the road whatever party is in government will have to address the charter of rights and freedoms because responsibilities were left out when it was drafted. Today everybody has their rights and their freedoms but for some reason we do not feel we have responsibilities, and we do.

To be fair to our young people, they have to know that they are accountable for what they do and that they have responsibilities. Someone said to me that no one would have the courage to even mention that. I have the courage to mention it. I pray that some day we will have a government that will address it.

I worked as an assistant to a pastor in a church back in Saint John, New Brunswick. Every night I would go home with a headache and so would he. One day I said to him "Reverend Dan, do you go home with a headache every evening?" He said "Yes, I do". I said "Do you know what is wrong with us", and he said "No".

I told him I would take him out in the alleyway the next day at noon hour and he would see a man who was giving drugs to high school children. I said: "There must be about 35 of them. This has to stop". He said "Elsie", and I said "I have been watching". It was marijuana.

I hear on the Hill about the possibility of decriminalizing smaller amounts of marijuana. I did a lot of research on it out of California and New York City. We do not want to decriminalize marijuana. We want to get children away from it as much as we can, because the minute they start to smoke up it goes into the cells of their brains.

I said to the pastor "Please, Dan, let me bring them in. I will buy the hot dogs. I will buy the pop. The church will not have to pay for it. Let's get them out of that alleyway".

The first day I went out they all ran but five of them who were pretty cocky little men. They stood there and I said "I will not call the police, but tomorrow before he gives you those drugs, come on in and eat with me and just talk".

They did come in. Before we were through we had about 30 young people who came in every day. Later they thanked me for

taking them out of the alleyway. They said "He gave it to us. We did not know it would hurt us".

We asked those young people how they got along with their moms and dads. They did not get along with mom and dad because they were fighting with them to make okay what they were doing. They had guilty consciences.

A few years ago on Christmas eve my doorbell rang at home. A young man was standing there who said "Hi, Mrs. Wayne. How are you?" I said "I am fine. Who are you?" He said "Don't you remember me?" He looked familiar. He said "My name is Terry. Thanks, Mrs. Wayne, for taking me out of the alleyway". I said "What are you doing today, Terry?" He said "I am a draftsman in Toronto, but if I had not gone out of the alleyway I probably would have been on cocaine or heroin".

Each and every one of us have a lot to do. Everyone has their rights. Today's family has a difficult time. For some reason when we are here we forget about the traditional family and how mom, dad, nanny and grampy want some help with their children. They want us to adopt laws that are better for the children and will show them the right way.

• (1720)

Over 1.3 million children are living in poverty. I never thought I would ever live to see the day that I would have to stand in the House of Commons and talk about 1.3 million children living in poverty. We have to look at what has happened to society.

I have a little granddaughter and a little grandson. I often call my son and daughter-in-law when I am home and ask what they are watching on TV. My husband and I are in the TV repair business and of course they have TVs in their bedrooms, each one of them. They make sure grampy gets them there. I worry that they see violence and sex on TV which they should not be seeing at their age.

We talk about freedom. Everybody has freedom, but what about those children? Why do we not allow them to be children for a while like we were while growing up?

My party and I are worried about Bill C-68. My colleague from Charlottetown mentioned about when the government took out the port police. I was mayor at the time. I fought it hard because I told them that the minute the port police were gone they would see cocaine and heroin like never before. Members should it in my community. I cannot believe what has happened, I truly cannot.

My party is calling for lowering the minimum age at which young offenders may enter into the youth justice system. If they break the law they should have to take responsibility for it and we should know who they are. They should not be allowed to live next door without their neighbours knowing they are there. Definitely we should go public.

Government Orders

We need some form of rehabilitation. The new youth justice strategy will be administered by child welfare agencies and/or mental health providers. I also worked for many years with the mental health group in Saint John. They are not the ones to help these children. We need to take these children right from the time they are in our arms and build a better foundation for their future.

I do not want the people in mental health to deal with these children. I do not want them to go down that road. I want us to correct the situation right now. Over \$6 billion were slashed from transfer payments for health care and social service programs. All of that is gone. My party believes that our focus should be on rehabilitation programs for young offenders which put the emphasis on basic education, social skills, personal responsibility and community. We must develop the programs.

The funding cuts have also affected the programs in place for early prevention of youth crime, but I say and will always say that if we help make the family unit stronger and protect it up here there will not be the youth crime we see today. Youth crime needs to be a major focus for our communities. Something needs to be done about the young people who have no regard for the laws of this great country. We need to help them that see there is another way to achieve goals.

I was at our airport in Ottawa at 6.40 Tuesday morning going home. I saw the police pulling up. I wondered what had happened. There was a mother at the airport. She was as high as a kite and she had her child with her. Members should have seen that little child's face. He was saying "Please, mother, please". They took her out and put her in the police car, and the child was crying. That child does not have any hope for the future. There is no hope for the future because the mother has gone in the wrong direction.

All of us in the House know that our children are our future. We need to make sure they are secure and successful and become proud, productive members of society. It is our duty, each and everyone of us here, to help them stay on the right road. When they do not, we must take responsibility for not having helped, for not having adopted the right policies for them, and have a plan for dealing with them that is fair and makes them responsible for their actions.

• (1725)

Bill C-68 does not do that. I am sorry to say that and I ask my colleagues to take a second look at it.

Mr. Eric Lowther (Calgary Centre, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I understand there are not too many minutes left in the debate, but I would like to make a few comments on the topic.

The youth justice bill we are talking about today and the whole initiative of the minister are interesting. I tend to suggest we have to think about the bill as dealing with the problem at the end of the

Supply

process, at the end of the issue. When we have a young person that has been incarcerated or is in serious trouble, something has gone on prior to that. The whole legislation deals with the end of the process.

It is interesting with some of the tragic events that have occurred in Taber and south of the border that there is a cry for increased parental responsibility. There are some elements of that in the legislation, in particular with regard to the accountability of parents for failing to supervise their child once charged and then put in their care. If they fail to properly supervise that child they can be held accountable. We think that is good legislation that came largely out of an initiative of one of the members of our party.

I submit to the House and to all Canadians that responsibility is important, but it comes along with something else we have undermined in society. The government has in fact been instrumental in undermining it, and that is respect for the role of parents, respect for the authority that parents should have in their own homes. Parents must be able to establish limits on their children at an early age. They must be free to do that without fear of some sort of social child advocacy agency coming down on them.

That is in no way to condone neglect or abuse, certainly not. Not every parent is a bad parent. Many parents are doing a great job. If we are to hold parents responsible, we must also respect the authority and the role of parents. That speaks to what the hon. member from the Conservative Party just spoke about, the role of the family. Parents are the heads of the family.

I am concerned right now that in Canada there are those who are undermining the authority of parents. There is a court challenge ongoing in Canada today funded by the Liberal Party court challenges program. That court challenge is to strike down section 43 of the Criminal Code. Section 43 of the Criminal Code allows parents to apply reasonable force in the disciplining of their children.

Some of the child advocates do not think parents should have that right. They have gone to court to try to strike down that law, using the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child largely as their undermining moral legitimization of the court challenge. This undermining, this taking away of the freedoms and the authority of parents in their own homes to limit what their children view, to limit the people they associate with, to apply appropriate discipline, as necessary, as the parents see fit, is a key part of undermining the care that Canadian children are given.

Parents know best what their children need. There are those in the House and in some child advocacy groups that feel they know best and parents are there to help the state or the academic expert decide what is best for children.

We should start to respect the role of parents and allow parents to structure and discipline in their own homes, free from the fear of some child advocate or some child police agency coming down on

them and charging them for disciplining their children. Otherwise that is where the breakdown begins.

Mr. Speaker, when you and I were in school some stern discipline was applied. I know at times I was a recipient of that discipline. It did not hurt me any and I am sure it did not hurt you any.

The Deputy Speaker: I did not get it.

Mr. Eric Lowther: Oh, you did not get it. We have to respect the role that teachers and all those who care for children play. When parents delegate the care of their children to others, they also decide on the type of discipline which will be applied. That is the kind of authority that needs to be passed on if we are going to pass on responsibility because those two go hand in hand.

* * *

● (1730)

SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—SHIPBUILDING

The House resumed from May 3 consideration of the motion; and of the amendment.

The Deputy Speaker: It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the amendment relating to the Business of Supply.

Call in the members.

● (1800)

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

(Division No. 391)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brison	Canuel
Cardin	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	

Gilmour
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Gouk
 Guimond
 Hart
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Jaffer
 Jones
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Konrad
 Lalonde
 Lebel
 Loubier
 Lunn
 Mancini
 Marchand
 Matthews
 McNally
 Mercier
 Morrison
 Nystrom
 Penon
 Picard (Drummond)
 Power
 Proctor
 Reynolds
 Robinson
 Schmidt
 St-Hilaire
 St-Jacques
 Strahl
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Venne
 Wayne
 Williams —115

Girard-Bujold
 Goldring
 Guay
 Hanger
 Harvey
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Johnston
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kerpan
 Laliberte
 Laurin
 Lill
 Lowther
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Marceau
 Mark
 McDonough
 Ménard
 Meredith
 Muise
 Obhrai
 Perron
 Plamondon
 Price
 Ramsay
 Riis
 Rocheleau
 Solberg
 Stinson
 Stoffer
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Turp
 Wasylcia-Leis
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Leung
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Malhi
 Manley
 Marleau
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Mifflin
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Myers
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Proud
 Redman
 Richardson
 Rock
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Julien
 Telegdi
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Whelan
 Wood—147

Supply

Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
 Longfield
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marchi
 Massé
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McWhinney
 Milliken
 Minna
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Pratt
 Provenzano
 Reed
 Robillard
 Saada
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

NAYS

Members

Alcock
 Assad
 Augustine
 Bakopoulos
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bevilacqua
 Bonin
 Boudria
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Caplan
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Collenette
 Copps
 De Villers
 Dion
 Dromisky
 Duhamel
 Eggleton
 Finlay
 Fry
 Galloway
 Goodale
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Guarmier
 Harvard
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lavigne

Anderson
 Assadourian
 Baker
 Barnes
 Bélair
 Bellemare
 Bertrand
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Bradshaw
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Calder
 Carroll
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Drouin
 Easter
 Finestone
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Godfrey
 Graham
 Grose
 Harb
 Hubbard
 Ifody
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lee

Adams
 Cannis
 Fournier
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
 Folco
 Sauvageau
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare the amendment defeated.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

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

Some hon. members: Yea.

The Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

• (1810)

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

*Supply**(Division No. 392)*

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brison	Canuel
Cardin	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (MacLeod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Loubier
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Matthews
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Penon
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Price	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Strahl
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams —115

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélanger	Bellemare

Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepolo
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
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
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Sheckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—146

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Government Orders

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

* * *

BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1999

The House resumed from May 4 consideration of Bill C-71, an act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on February 16, 1999, as reported (with amendments) from the committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at the report stage of Bill C-71. The question is on Motion No. 1.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you would find unanimous consent for the members who voted on the previous motion, with the exception of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands who will be taken out and the hon. member for LaSalle—Émard who will be added, to be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with Liberal members voting nay.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present also vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that Bloc Québécois members support this excellent motion.

[*English*]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote no to this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 393*)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Brien
Cardin
Crête
de Savoye
Desrochers
Duceppe

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas

Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Lalonde
Lebel
Marceau
Ménard
Perron
Plamondon
St-Hilaire
Venne —40

Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Laurin
Loubier
Marchand
Mercier
Picard (Drummond)
Rocheleau
Turp

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Davies
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Easter
Epp
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brisson
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenet
Copps
Cummins
Desjarlais
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Laliberte

Government Orders

Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Lill
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lincoln
Longfield	Lowther
Lunn	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marchi	Mark
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McNally
McTeague	McWhinney
Meredith	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Morrison
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	Obhrai
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Penson
Peric	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Power	Pratt
Price	Proctor
Proud	Provenzano
Ramsay	Redman
Reynolds	Richardson
Riis	Robillard
Robinson	Rock
Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	Stinson
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Strahl
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylycia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—221

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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 agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Quebecois members are opposed to this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting no on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote no to this motion.

• (1815)

[English]

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

(Division No. 394)

YEAS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague

McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Proud
Redman
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Szabo
Thibeault
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wilfert

Mifflin
Minna
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pratt
Provenzano
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Whelan
Wood—146

St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Venne
Wayne
Williams —115

Stinson
Stoffer
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Wasylcia-Leis
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-66, an act to amend the National Housing Act and the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act, as reported (without amendment) from the committee.

The Speaker: The House will now proceed to the taking of several deferred recorded divisions at the report stage of Bill C-66. The question is on Motion No. 1.

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 agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote no to this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present will be voting no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote no to this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 1, which was negated on the following division:)

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Borotsik
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Cardin
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Dumas
Earle
Forsyth
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Guay
Hanger
Harvey
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lowther
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Marceau
Mark
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Muisse
Obhrai
Perron
Plamondon
Price
Ramsay
Riis
Rocheleau
Solberg

Alarie
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Canuel
Casey
Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Hart
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Jones
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Mancini
Marchand
Matthews
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Nystrom
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Power
Proctor
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt

*Government Orders**(Division No. 395)***YEAS****Members**

Abbott
Benoit
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Chatters
Duncan
Forseth
Goldring
Hanger
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Kerpan
Lowther
Mark
Meredith
Obhrai
Ramsay
Schmidt
Stinson
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Williams—41

Bailey
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Casson
Cummins
Epp
Gilmour
Gouk
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lunn
McNally
Morrison
Penson
Reynolds
Solberg
Strahl
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS**Members**

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Bertrand
Bigras
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brien
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
Cullen
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Earle
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Godfrey
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)

Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blaikie
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
DeVillers
Dion
Dockrill
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Galloway
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Graham
Grose

Guarnieri
Guimond
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Marchand
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mercier
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Petry
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Power
Price
Proud
Redman
Riis
Robinson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Whelan
Wood—220

Guay
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Laliberte
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
Loubier
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marceau
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Ménard
Mifflin
Minna
Muisé
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Pratt
Proctor
Provenzano
Richardson
Robillard
Rocheleau
Sada
Sekora
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Turp
Valeri
Venne
Wappel
Wayne
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 1 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 2.

Government Orders

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 2, 4, 6 and 24.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 2, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 396)***YEAS**

Members

Abbott	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Hanger	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Mark	McNally
Meredith	Morrison
Obhrai	Penson
Ramsay	Reynolds
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—41	

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dockrill
Doyle	

Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—220

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

(The House divided on Motion No. 4, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 397)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forsyth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Hanger	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Mark	McNally
Meredith	Morrison
Obhrai	Penson
Ramsay	Reynolds
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—41	

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	De Villiers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	

Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—220

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

(The House divided on Motion No. 6, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 399)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forsyth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Hanger	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Mark	McNally
Meredith	Morrison
Obhrai	Penson
Ramsay	Reynolds
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—41	

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	De Villers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	

Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—220

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

(The House divided on Motion No. 24, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 408)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forsyth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Hanger	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Mark	McNally
Meredith	Morrison
Obhrai	Penson
Ramsay	Reynolds
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—41	

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Béclair
Bélangier	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Crête
Cullen	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	De Villiers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Dockrill
Doyle	

Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godfrey
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Guay	Guimond
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keys
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Laliberte	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
Loubier	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Mancini	Manley
Marceau	Marchand
Marchi	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Ménard	Mercier
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
Nystrom	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Peric	Perron
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Picard (Drummond)
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)	Pillitteri
Plamondon	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rocheleau	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—220

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motions Nos. 2, 4, 6 and 24 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 5.

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 agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote yes to this motion.

[*English*]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Progressive Conservative members vote no to this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 5, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 398)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Bigras	Brien
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Cardin
Canuel	Chatters
Casson	Crête
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Dalphond-Guiral
Cummins	Debien
de Savoye	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Desrochers	Dumas
Duceppe	Epp
Duncan	Gagnon
Forsyth	Gilmour
Gauthier	Godin (Châteauguay)
Girard-Bujold	Gouk
Goldring	Guimond
Guay	Hart
Hanger	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hill (MacLeod)	Jaffer
Hilstrom	

Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Loubier
Lowther	Lunn
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Morrison
Obhrai	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Ramsay
Reynolds	Rocheleau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Stinson
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp	Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Williams—81

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brisson	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Casey
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Earle	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jennings	Jones
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Keddy (South Shore)
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi

Government Orders

Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McDonough
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Redman
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques	St-Julien
Stoffer	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—180

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting yes to this motion.

• (1820)

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative members vote no to this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 7, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 400)

YEAS

Members

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 5 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 7. A vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 9, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 23.

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 agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in favour of this motion.

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Blaikie
Bigras	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Canuel
Brien	Casson
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chatters	Cummins
Crête	Davies
Dalphond-Guiral	Debien
de Savoye	Desrochers
Desjarlais	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dockrill	Dumas
Duceppe	Earle
Duncan	Forseth
Epp	Gauthier
Gagnon	Girard-Bujold
Gilmour	Goldring
Godin (Châteauguay)	Guay
Gouk	Hanger
Guimond	Hill (MacLeod)
Hart	Hilstrom
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Johnston
Jaffer	Kerpan
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Laliberte
Konrad	Laurin
Lalonde	Lill
Lebel	Lowther
Loubier	Mancini
Lunn	Marchand
Marceau	McDonough
Mark	Ménard
McNally	Meredith
Mercier	Nystrom
Morrison	Penson
Obhrai	Picard (Drummond)
Perron	Proctor
Plamondon	Reynolds
Ramsay	Robinson
Riis	Schmidt
Rocheleau	St-Hilaire
Solberg	Stoffer
Stinson	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Strahl	Venne
Turp	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Wasylcia-Leis	
Williams—96	

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélaire
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Redman
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—165

Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
DeVilliers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Jacques
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 7 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 9, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21 and 23 defeated.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 11, 12, 33 and 36.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 11, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 410)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cardin
Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Marceau
Mark
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Obhrai
Perron
Plamondon
Ramsay
Riis
Rocheleau
Solberg
Stinson
Strahl
Turp
Wasylcia-Leis
Williams—96

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forseth
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Guay
Hanger
Hill (MacLeod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lowther
Mancini
Marchand
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Nystrom
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Redman
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—165

Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Galloway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Jacques
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

(The House divided on Motion No. 12, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 411)

YEAS

Members

Abbott
Asselin
Bailey
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bigras
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Cardin
Chatters
Crête
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Duceppe
Duncan
Epp
Gagnon
Gilmour
Godin (Châteauguay)
Gouk
Guimond
Hart
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Jaffer
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Lunn
Marceau
Mark
McNally
Mercier
Morrison
Obhrai
Perron
Plamondon
Ramsay
Riis
Rocheleau
Solberg
Stinson
Strahl
Turp
Wasylcia-Leis
Williams—96

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bellehumeur
Bergeron
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Canuel
Casson
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Cummins
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Earle
Forseath
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Goldring
Guay
Hanger
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Johnston
Kerpan
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Lowther
Mancini
Marchand
McDonough
Ménard
Meredith
Nystrom
Penson
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Reynolds
Robinson
Schmidt
St-Hilaire
Stoffer
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Venne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)

NAYS

Members

Alcock
Assadourian
Augustine
Baker

Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bakopanos

Government Orders

(The House divided on Motion No. 33, which was negatived on the following division:)

(Division No. 416)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Bigras	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Canuel
Cardin	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphon-D-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Epp	Forsyth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Gouk	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Morrison	Nystrom
Obhrai	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—96	

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker	Bakopanos

Barnes
 Béclair
 Bellemare
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Bonin
 Borotsik
 Bradshaw
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Caplan
 Casey
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Easter
 Finestone
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Godfrey
 Graham
 Grose
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hubbard
 Iftody
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Lastewka
 Lee
 Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
 Longfield
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Manley
 Marleau
 Massé
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Pratt
 Proud
 Redman
 Robillard
 Saada
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Julien
 Telegdi
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wood—165

Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bertrand
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Boudria
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Calder
 Carroll
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Clouthier
 Collette
 Copps
 DeVillers
 Dion
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Eggleton
 Finlay
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Goodale
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Guarnieri
 Harvard
 Herron
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lavigne
 Leung
 Lincoln
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marchi
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McWhinney
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Power
 Price
 Provenzano
 Richardson
 Rock
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Jacques
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Wayne
 Wilfert

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Government Orders

Barnes	Beaumier
Bélaïr	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brisson
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepola	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale
Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Grose	Guarnieri
Harb	Harvard
Harvey	Herron
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jennings
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lincoln
Longfield	MacAulay
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	Matthews
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague	McWhinney
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Muise	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Sada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Jacques
St-Julien	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Wayne
Whelan	Wilfert
Wood—165	

(The House divided on Motion No. 36, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 418)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bailey	Bellehumeur
Benoit	Bergeron
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	
Bigras	Blaikie
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brien	Canuel
Cardin	Casson
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Cummins
Dalphon-D-Guiral	Davies
de Savoye	Debien
Desjarlais	Desrochers
Dockrill	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Dumas
Duncan	Earle
Epp	Forsyth
Gagnon	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring
Gouk	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Hart	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Morrison	Nystrom
Obhrai	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Solberg	St-Hilaire
Stinson	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp	Venne
Wasylcia-Leis	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—96	

NAYS

Members

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)	Alcock	Anderson
Cannis	Folco	Assad	Assadourian
Fournier	Sauvageau	Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)	Baker	Bakopanos

PAIRED MEMBERS

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellemare
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Cauchon
Chan
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Easter
Finestone
Fontana
Gagliano
Godfrey
Graham
Grose
Harb
Harvey
Hubbard
Iftody
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McTeague
Mifflin
Minna
Muisse
Myers
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Redman
Robillard
Saada
Sekora
Shepherd
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Julien
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wood—165

Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Eggleton
Finlay
Fry
Gallaway
Goodale
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harvard
Herron
Ianno
Jennings
Jordan
Karygiannis
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McWhinney
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Richardson
Rock
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Jacques
Szabo
Thibeault
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
Willfert

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motions Nos. 11, 12, 33 and 36 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 8.

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 the Liberal members voting nay.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present also vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members support this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present will be voting yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Conservative members vote no to this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 8, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 401)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Blaikie
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Duceppe
Earle
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Marceau
McDonough
Mercier
Perron

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Brien
Cardin
Crête
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Mancini
Marchand
Ménard
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)

Government Orders

Plamondon
Riis
Rocheleau
Stoffer
Venne

Proctor
Robinson
St-Hilaire
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis—55

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélaire
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Eggleton
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
Lowther
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna

Mitchell
Muisé
Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Ramsay
Reynolds
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—206

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 8 defeated.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motions Nos. 10, 14, 22 and 32.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 10, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 402)

YEAS

Members

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie
Canuel
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Duceppe
Earle
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Brien
Cardin
Crête
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold

Government Orders

Guay
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Mancini
Marchand
Ménard
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Robinson
St-Hilaire
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis—55

Guimond
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Marceau
McDonough
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Riis
Rocheleau
Stoffer
Venne

Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Muisse
Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Ramsay
Reynolds
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

Lincoln
Lowther
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—206

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Copps
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Eggleton
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

(The House divided on Motion No. 14, which was negated on the following division:)

*(Division No. 403)***YEAS**

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Blaikie	Brien
Canuel	

Government Orders

Cardin
Crête
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Mancini
Marchand
Ménard
Nyström
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Robinson
St-Hilaire
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis—55

Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Duceppe
Earle
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Marceau
McDonough
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Riis
Rocheleau
Stoffer
Venne

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Muisse
Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Ramsay
Reynolds
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

Knudson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
Lowther
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—206

NAYS**Members**

Abbott
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Eggleton
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Ifody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

(The House divided on Motion No. 22, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 407)

YEAS**Members**

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok
Blaikie
Canuel

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras
Brien

Government Orders

Cardin
Crête
Davies
Debien
Desrochers
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dumas
Gagnon
Girard-Bujold
Guay
Laliberte
Laurin
Lill
Mancini
Marchand
Ménard
Nystrom
Picard (Drummond)
Proctor
Robinson
St-Hilaire
Turp
Wasylycia-Leis—55

Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye
Desjarlais
Dockrill
Duceppe
Earle
Gauthier
Godin (Châteauguay)
Guimond
Lalonde
Lebel
Loubier
Marceau
McDonough
Mercier
Perron
Plamondon
Riis
Rocheleau
Stoffer
Venne

Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lavigne
Leung
Lincoln
Lowther
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—206

Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lastewka
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Muisse
Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proud
Ramsay
Reynolds
Robillard
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

NAYS**Members**

Abbott
Anderson
Assadourian
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Baker
Barnes
Bélair
Bellemare
Benoit
Bertrand
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Clouthier
Collenette
Copp
Cummins
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duncan
Eggleton
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Galloway
Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes

Alcock
Assad
Augustine
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bennett
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Caplan
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Cullen
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Duhamel
Easter
Epp
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Gilmour
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Ifody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

PAIRED MEMBERS

(The House divided on Motion No. 32, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 415)

YEAS**Members**

Alarie
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Bergeron
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Blaikie

Asselin
Bellehumeur
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Bigras

Government Orders

Brien
 Cardin
 Crête
 Davies
 Debien
 Desrochers
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Dumas
 Gagnon
 Girard-Bujold
 Guay
 Laliberté
 Laurin
 Lill
 Mancini
 Marchand
 Ménard
 Nystrom
 Picard (Drummond)
 Proctor
 Robinson
 St-Hilaire
 Turp
 Wasylcyia-Leis—55

Canuel
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Dalphond-Guiral
 de Savoye
 Desjarlais
 Dockrill
 Duceppe
 Earle
 Gauthier
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Guimond
 Lalonde
 Lebel
 Loubier
 Marceau
 McDonough
 Mercier
 Perron
 Plamondon
 Riis
 Rocheleau
 Stoffer
 Venne

Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
 Longfield
 Lunn
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Manley
 Mark
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Matthews
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McTeague
 Meredith
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Muise
 Myers
 Obhrai
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Penson
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pillitteri
 Pratt
 Proud
 Ramsay
 Reynolds
 Robillard
 Saada
 Scott (Fredericton)
 Serré
 Solberg
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Jacques
 Strahl
 Telegdi
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Torsney
 Valeri
 Volpe
 Wayne
 White (Langley—Abbotsford)
 Williams

Lincoln
 Lowther
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Marchi
 Marleau
 Massé
 McCormick
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McNally
 McWhinney
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Morrison
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Peric
 Pettigrew
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Power
 Price
 Provenzano
 Redman
 Richardson
 Rock
 Schmidt
 Sekora
 Shepherd
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 Stinson
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Thompson (Wild Rose)
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Wappel
 Whelan
 Wilfert
 Wood—206

NAYS

Members

Abbott
 Anderson
 Assadourian
 Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
 Baker
 Barnes
 Béclair
 Bellemare
 Benoit
 Bertrand
 Blondin-Andrew
 Bonwick
 Boudria
 Breitzkreuz (Yellowhead)
 Brison
 Bryden
 Byrne
 Calder
 Carroll
 Casson
 Cauchon
 Chan
 Chatters
 Clouthier
 Collenette
 Copps
 Cummins
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duncan
 Eggleton
 Finestone
 Fontana
 Fry
 Gallaway
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Graham
 Grose
 Hanger
 Hart
 Harvey
 Hill (Macleod)
 Hilstrom
 Ianno
 Jaffer
 Johnston
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Konrad
 Lastewka
 Lee

Alcock
 Assad
 Augustine
 Bailey
 Bakopanos
 Beaumier
 Bélanger
 Bennett
 Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
 Bevilacqua
 Bonin
 Borotsik
 Bradshaw
 Breitzkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
 Brown
 Bulte
 Caccia
 Caplan
 Casey
 Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Cullen
 De Villers
 Dion
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Duhamel
 Easter
 Epp
 Finlay
 Forseth
 Gagliano
 Gilmour
 Goldring
 Gouk
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Guarnieri
 Harb
 Harvard
 Herron
 Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
 Hubbard
 Ifody
 Jennings
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kerpan
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Kraft Sloan
 Lavigne
 Leung

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
 Cannis
 Fournier
 Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
 Folco
 Sauvageau
 Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motions Nos. 10, 14, 22 and 32 defeated. The next question is on Motion No. 16.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find unanimous consent that members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the Houses, with Liberal members voting nay.

Government Orders

[English]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present will vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote no to this motion.

• (1825)

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Conservative members will be voting yes to this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 16, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 404)

YEAS

Members

Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Blaikie	Borotsik
Brisson	Casey
Davies	Desjarlais
Dockrill	Doyle
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Earle
Harvey	Herron
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Laliberte	Lill
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Matthews	McDonough
Muise	Nystrom
Power	Price
Proctor	Riis
Robinson	St-Jacques
Stoffer	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Wasylycia-Leis	Wayne—34

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Asselin	Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellehumeur	Bellemare

Bennett	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—)
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Bigras
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casson	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Crête	Cullen
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debieu
Desrochers	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dromisky
Drouin	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Duhamel
Dumas	Duncan
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Gagnon
Galloway	Gauthier
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold
Godfrey	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Guay
Guimond	Hanger
Harb	Hart
Harvard	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Karygiannis	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Lalonde
Lastewka	Laurin
Lavigne	Lebel
Lee	Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lincoln
Longfield	Loubier
Lowther	Lunn
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marceau
Marchand	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
McCormick	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Murray
Myers	Nault
Obhrai	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Perron	Peterson
Pettigrew	Phinney
Picard (Drummond)	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Plamondon
Pratt	Proulx
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reynolds
Richardson	Robillard
Rocheleau	Rock

Government Orders

Saada	Schmidt
Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
Serré	Shepherd
Solberg	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Hilaire
Stinson	St-Julien
Strahl	Szabo
Telegdi	Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Torsney
Turp	Ur
Valeri	Vanclief
Venne	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Wilfert
Williams	Wood—227

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 16 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 17.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find 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.

[*English*]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present also vote no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members vote yes to this motion.

[*English*]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting no to this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Conservative members will be voting no to this motion.

[*English*]

(The House divided on Motion No. 17, which was negated on the following division:)

(*Division No. 405*)

YEAS

Members

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Canuel
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphond-Guiral
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Guimond
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Loubier
Marceau	Marchand
Ménard	Mercier
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
St-Hilaire	Turp
Venne —40	

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélanger
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Duncan	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway

Government Orders

Gilmour
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lee
Lill
Lincoln
Lowther
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Manley
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Matthews
McDonough
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Peterson
Phinney
Pillitteri
Pratt
Proctor
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
Stinson
St-Julien
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylycia-Leis
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—221

Godfrey
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keyes
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Laliberte
Lavigne
Leung
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Mancini
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Nystrom
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Pettigrew
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Power
Price
Proud
Ramsay
Reynolds
Riis
Robinson
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 17 defeated.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 35.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 35, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 409)

YEAS*Members*

Alarie	Asselin
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bellehumeur
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bigras
Brien	Canuel
Cardin	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Crête	Dalphon-Duval
de Savoye	Debien
Desrochers	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe	Dumas
Gagnon	Gauthier
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Guay	Guimond
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Loubier
Marceau	Marchand
Ménard	Mercier
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Rocheleau
St-Hilaire	Turp
Venne —40	

NAYS*Members*

Abbott	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Augustine
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)	Bailey
Baker	Bakopanos
Barnes	Beaumier
Bélair	Bélangier
Bellemare	Bennett
Benoit	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Blaikie	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Borotsik	Boudria
Bradshaw	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Casey	Casson
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chatters
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

Government Orders

Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Cummins
Davies	Desjarlais
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dockrill	Doyle
Dromisky	Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duhamel
Duncan	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Epp	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Forseth	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Gilmour	Godfrey
Goldring	Goodale
Gouk	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Hanger
Harb	Hart
Harvard	Harvey
Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Hubbard	Ianno
Iftody	Jaffer
Jennings	Johnston
Jones	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Keyes
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottetown)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Knutson	Konrad
Kraft Sloan	Laliberte
Lastewka	Lavigne
Lee	Leung
Lill	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
Lowther	Lunn
MacAulay	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mahoney	Malhi
Maloney	Mancini
Manley	Marchi
Mark	Marleau
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	Massé
Matthews	McCormick
McDonough	McGuire
McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
McNally	McTeague
McWhinney	Meredith
Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Minna	Mitchell
Morrison	Muise
Murray	Myers
Nault	Nystrom
Obhrai	O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)	O'Reilly
Pagtakhan	Paradis
Parrish	Patry
Penson	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Power
Pratt	Price
Proctor	Proud
Provenzano	Ramsay
Redman	Reynolds
Richardson	Riis
Robillard	Robinson
Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	Solberg
St. Denis	Steckle
Stewart (Brant)	

Stewart (Northumberland)
St-Jacques
Stoffer
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Ur
Vanclief
Wappel
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

Stinson
St-Julien
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Valeri
Volpe
Wasylcyia-Leis
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—221

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I therefore declare Motion No. 35 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 20.

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 agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members oppose this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, Conservative members will be voting no to this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 20, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 406)

YEAS

Members

Blaikie
Desjarlais
Earle
Lill
McDonough
Proctor
Robinson
Wasylcyia-Leis —15

Davies
Dockrill
Laliberte
Mancini
Nystrom
Riis
Stoffer

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélanger
Bellemare
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
De Villers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Duncan
Eggleton
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Guay
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Émard)

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Cummins
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepola
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Epp
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Gallaway
Gilmour
Godfrey
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloane
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
Lowther
MacAulay
Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
Marleau
Massé

Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Ménard
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Muisse
Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Power
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Valeri
Venne
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—246

McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mercier
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Parry
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Pratt
Proud
Ramsay
Reynolds
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 20 defeated.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 34.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(The House divided on Motion No. 34, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 417)

YEAS

Members

Blaikie
Desjarlais
Earle
Lill
McDonough
Proctor
Robinson
Wasylcyia-Leis —15

Davies
Dockrill
Laliberte
Mancini
Nystrom
Riis
Stoffer

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott
Alcock
Assad
Asselin
Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bailey
Bakopanos
Beaumier
Bélangier
Bellemare
Benoit
Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)
Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bevilacqua
Blondin-Andrew
Bonwick
Boudria
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Brien
Brown
Bulte
Caccia
Canuel
Cardin
Casey
Catterall
Chamberlain
Charbonneau
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
Clouthier
Collenette
Coppes
Cullen
Dalphond-Guiral
Debien
DeVillers
Dion
Doyle
Drouin
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
Duhamel
Duncan
Eggleton
Finestone
Fontana
Fry
Gagnon
Gauthier
Girard-Bujold
Godin (Châteauguay)
Goodale
Graham
Grose
Guay
Hanger
Hart
Harvey
Hill (Macleod)
Hilstrom
Ianno
Jaffer
Johnston
Jordan
Karygiannis
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Keys
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Konrad
Lalonde
Laurin
Lebel
Leung
Lincoln
Loubier
Lunn

Alarie
Anderson
Assadourian
Augustine
Bachand (Saint-Jean)
Baker
Barnes
Bélaïr
Bellehumeur
Bennett
Bergeron
Bertrand
Bigras
Bonin
Borotsik
Bradshaw
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)
Brison
Bryden
Byrne
Calder
Caplan
Carroll
Casson
Cauchon
Chan
Chatters
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Coderre
Comuzzi
Crête
Cummins
de Savoye
Desrochers
Dhaliwal
Discepolo
Dromisky
Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Duceppe
Dumas
Easter
Epp
Finlay
Forseth
Gagliano
Galloway
Gilmour
Godfrey
Goldring
Gouk
Gray (Windsor West)
Guarnieri
Guimond
Harb
Harvard
Herron
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hubbard
Iftody
Jennings
Jones
Karetak-Lindell
Keddy (South Shore)
Kerpan
Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Knutson
Kraft Sloan
Lastewka
Lavigne
Lee
Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Longfield
Lowther
MacAulay

MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Malhi
Manley
Marchand
Mark
Martin (LaSalle—Énard)
Matthews
McGuire
McLellan (Edmonton West)
McTeague
Ménard
Meredith
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Mitchell
Muise
Myers
Obhrai
O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Pagtakhan
Parrish
Penson
Perron
Pettigrew
Picard (Drummond)
Pillitteri
Power
Price
Provenzano
Redman
Richardson
Rocheleau
Saada
Scott (Fredericton)
Serré
Solberg
Steckle
Stewart (Northumberland)
Stinson
St-Julien
Szabo
Thibeault
Thompson (Wild Rose)
Turp
Valeri
Venne
Wappel
Whelan
Wilfert
Wood—246

Mahoney
Maloney
Marceau
Marchi
Marleau
Massé
McCormick
McKay (Scarborough East)
McNally
McWhinney
Mercier
Mifflin
Minna
Morrison
Murray
Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)
O'Reilly
Paradis
Patry
Peric
Peterson
Phinney
Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Plamondon
Pratt
Proud
Ramsay
Reynolds
Robillard
Rock
Schmidt
Sekora
Shepherd
St. Denis
Stewart (Brant)
St-Hilaire
St-Jacques
Strahl
Telegdi
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Torsney
Ur
Vanclief
Volpe
Wayne
White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams
Cannis
Fournier
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)

Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Folco
Sauvageau
Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 34 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 25 and a vote on this motion also applies to Motions Nos. 27 to 29.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you will find 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.

*Government Orders**[English]*

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes to this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, Bloc Québécois members are in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats present will be voting yes on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey (Chicoutimi, PC): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative members are in favour of this motion.

• (1830)

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 25, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 412)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brison	Canuel
Cardin	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hart
Harvey	

Herron	Hill (Macleod)
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom
Jaffer	Johnston
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)
Kenny (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan
Konrad	Laliberte
Lalonde	Laurin
Lebel	Lill
Loubier	Lowther
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
Mancini	Marceau
Marchand	Mark
Matthews	McDonough
McNally	Ménard
Mercier	Meredith
Morrison	Muise
Nystrom	Obhrai
Penson	Perron
Picard (Drummond)	Plamondon
Power	Price
Proctor	Ramsay
Reynolds	Riis
Robinson	Rochelleau
Schmidt	Solberg
St-Hilaire	Stinson
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Turp
Venne	Wasylcyia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams —115	

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Belanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keyes	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)

Government Orders

Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague
McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—146

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois oppose this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting no on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Progressive Conservative Party will be voting no to this motion.

[English]

(The House divided on Motion No. 30, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 413)

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 25 defeated. I therefore declare Motions Nos. 27, 28 and 29 defeated.

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I believe you would find consent to apply the results of the vote just taken to Motion No. 31.

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 30.

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 agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Bailey
Benoit	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Casson
Chatters	Cummins
Duncan	Epp
Forseth	Gilmour
Goldring	Gouk
Hanger	Hart
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Lowther	Lunn
Mark	McNally
Meredith	Morrison
Obhrai	Penson
Ramsay	Reynolds
Schmidt	Solberg
Stinson	Strahl
Thompson (Wild Rose)	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams—41	

NAYS

Members

Alarie	Alcock
Anderson	Assad
Assadourian	Asselin
Augustine	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumur	Bélar
Bélanger	Bellehumeur
Bellemare	Bennett
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bertrand	Bevilacqua
Bigras	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Borotsik
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brien	Brison
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Canuel	Caplan
Cardin	Carroll
Casey	

Catterall
 Chamberlain
 Charbonneau
 Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
 Coderre
 Comuzzi
 Crête
 Dalphond-Guiral
 de Savoye
 Desjarlais
 De Villiers
 Dion
 Dockrill
 Dromisky
 Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
 Duceppe
 Dumas
 Easter
 Finestone
 Fontana
 Gagliano
 Gallaway
 Girard-Bujold
 Godin (Châteauguay)
 Graham
 Grose
 Guay
 Harb
 Harvey
 Hubbard
 Ifody
 Jones
 Karetak-Lindell
 Keddy (South Shore)
 Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
 Knutson
 Laliberte
 Lastewka
 Lavigne
 Lee
 Lill
 Lincoln
 Loubier
 MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)
 Malhi
 Mancini
 Marceau
 Marchi
 Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
 Matthews
 McDonough
 McKay (Scarborough East)
 McTeague
 Ménard
 Mifflin
 Minna
 Muise
 Myers
 Nystrom
 O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
 Pagtakhan
 Parrish
 Peric
 Peterson
 Phinney
 Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
 Plamondon
 Pratt
 Proctor
 Provenzano
 Richardson
 Robillard
 Rocheleau
 Saada
 Sekora

Cauchon
 Chan
 Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)
 Clouthier
 Collenette
 Copps
 Cullen
 Davies
 Debien
 Desrochers
 Dhaliwal
 Discepola
 Doyle
 Drouin
 Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)
 Duhamel
 Earle
 Eggleton
 Finlay
 Fry
 Gagnon
 Gauthier
 Godfrey
 Goodale
 Gray (Windsor West)
 Guarnieri
 Guimond
 Harvard
 Herron
 Ianno
 Jennings
 Jordan
 Karygiannis
 Keyes
 Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
 Kraft Sloan
 Lalonde
 Laurin
 Lebel
 Leung
 Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
 Longfield
 MacAulay
 Mahoney
 Maloney
 Manley
 Marchand
 Marleau
 Massé
 McCormick
 McGuire
 McLellan (Edmonton West)
 McWhinney
 Mercier
 Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
 Mitchell
 Murray
 Nault
 O'Brien (Labrador)
 O'Reilly
 Paradis
 Patry
 Perron
 Pettigrew
 Picard (Drummond)
 Pillitteri
 Power
 Price
 Proud
 Redman
 Riis
 Robinson
 Rock
 Scott (Fredericton)

Serré
 St. Denis
 Stewart (Brant)
 St-Hilaire
 St-Julien
 Szabo
 Thibeault
 Torsney
 Ur
 Vanclief
 Volpe
 Wasylcia-Leis
 Whelan
 Wood—220

Shepherd
 Steckle
 Stewart (Northumberland)
 St-Jacques
 Stoffer
 Telegdi
 Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
 Turp
 Valeri
 Venne
 Wappel
 Wayne
 Wilfert

Government Orders

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Speaker: I declare Motion No. 30 defeated.

The next question is on Motion No. 31.

[Translation]

Mr. Bob Kilger: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent that those members who voted on the previous motion be recorded as having voted on the motion now before the House, with the Liberal members voting no.

[English]

The Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in such a fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote yes on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this motion.

[English]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, New Democrats will be voting no on this motion.

[Translation]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members vote yes to this motion.

(The House divided on Motion No. 31, which was negated on the following division:)

(Division No. 414)

YEAS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)

Government Orders

Bigras	Borotsik	Graham	Gray (Windsor West)
Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)	Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Grose	Guarnieri
Brien	Brison	Harb	Harvard
Canuel	Cardin	Hubbard	Ianno
Casey	Casson	Iftody	Jennings
Chatters	Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Jordan	Karetak-Lindell
Crête	Cummins	Karygiannis	Keys
Dalphond-Guiral	de Savoye	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)	Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)
Debien	Desrochers	Knutson	Kraft Sloan
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	Laliberte	Lastewka
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe	Lavigne	Lee
Dumas	Duncan	Leung	Lill
Epp	Forseth	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)	Lincoln
Gagnon	Gauthier	Longfield	MacAulay
Gilmour	Girard-Bujold	Mahoney	Malhi
Godin (Châteauguay)	Goldring	Maloney	Mancini
Gouk	Guay	Manley	Marchi
Guimond	Hangar	Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Hart	Harvey	Massé	McCormick
Herron	Hill (Macleod)	McDonough	McGuire
Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	Hilstrom	McKay (Scarborough East)	McLellan (Edmonton West)
Jaffer	Johnston	McTeague	McWhinney
Jones	Keddy (South Shore)	Mifflin	Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)
Kenney (Calgary Southeast)	Kerpan	Minna	Mitchell
Konrad	Lalonde	Murray	Myers
Laurin	Lebel	Nault	Nystrom
Loubier	Lowther	O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
Lunn	MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Marceau	Marchand	Paradis	Parrish
Mark	Matthews	Patry	Peric
McNally	Ménard	Peterson	Pettigrew
Mercier	Meredith	Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Morrison	Muise	Pillitteri	Pratt
Obhrai	Penson	Proctor	Proud
Perron	Picard (Drummond)	Provenzano	Redman
Plamondon	Power	Richardson	Riis
Price	Ramsay	Robillard	Robinson
Reynolds	Rocheleau	Rock	Saada
Schmidt	Solberg	Scott (Fredericton)	Sekora
St-Hilaire	Stinson	Serré	Shepherd
St-Jacques	Strahl	St. Denis	Steckle
Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	Thompson (Wild Rose)	Stewart (Brant)	Stewart (Northumberland)
Turp	Venne	St-Julien	Stoffer
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)	Szabo	Telegdi
Williams—100		Thibeault	Torsney
		Ur	Valeri
		Vanclief	Volpe
		Wappel	Wasylcyia-Leis
		Whelan	Wilfert
		Wood—161	

NAYS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélaïr
Bélangier	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blaikie
Blondin-Andrew	Bonin
Bonwick	Boudria
Bradshaw	Brown
Bryden	Bulte
Byrne	Caccia
Calder	Caplan
Carroll	Catterall
Cauchon	Chamberlain
Chan	Charbonneau
Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	Clouthier
Coderre	Collenette
Comuzzi	Copps
Cullen	Davies
Desjarlais	DeVillers
Dhaliwal	Dion
Discepolo	Dockrill
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Earle
Easter	Eggleton
Finestone	Finlay
Fontana	Fry
Gagliano	Galloway
Godfrey	Goodale

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare Motion No. 31 defeated.

[English]

Hon. Alfonso Gagliano (Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Lib.) moved that the bill be concurred in.

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 Deputy Speaker: Is there agreement to proceed in this fashion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Chuck Strahl: Mr. Speaker, Reform Party members present vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Speaker, the members of the Bloc Québécois will vote against this motion.

[*English*]

Mrs. Michelle Dockrill: Mr. Speaker, the New Democrats present will vote no on this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Harvey: Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative members oppose this motion.

• (1835)

[*English*]

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

(*Division No. 419*)

YEAS

Members

Alcock	Anderson
Assad	Assadourian
Augustine	Baker
Bakopanos	Barnes
Beaumier	Bélair
Bélanger	Bellemare
Bennett	Bertrand
Bevilacqua	Blondin-Andrew
Bonin	Bonwick
Boudria	Bradshaw
Brown	Bryden
Bulte	Byrne
Caccia	Calder
Caplan	Carroll
Catterall	Cauchon
Chamberlain	Chan
Charbonneau	Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)
Clouthier	Coderre
Collenette	Comuzzi
Copps	Cullen
DeVillers	Dhaliwal
Dion	Discepola
Dromisky	Drouin
Duhamel	Easter
Eggleton	Finestone
Finlay	Fontana
Fry	Gagliano
Galloway	Godfrey
Goodale	Graham
Gray (Windsor West)	Grose
Guarnieri	Harb
Harvard	Hubbard
Ianno	Iftody
Jennings	Jordan
Karetak-Lindell	Karygiannis
Keys	Kilger (Stormont—Dundas—Charlottenburgh)
Kilgour (Edmonton Southeast)	Knutson
Kraft Sloan	Lastewka
Lavigne	Lee
Leung	Limoges (Windsor—St. Clair)
Lincoln	Longfield
MacAulay	Mahoney
Malhi	Maloney
Manley	Marchi
Marleau	Martin (LaSalle—Émard)
Massé	McCormick
McGuire	McKay (Scarborough East)
McLellan (Edmonton West)	McTeague

McWhinney	Mifflin
Mills (Broadview—Greenwood)	Minna
Mitchell	Murray
Myers	Nault
O'Brien (Labrador)	O'Brien (London—Fanshawe)
O'Reilly	Pagtakhan
Paradis	Parrish
Patry	Peric
Peterson	Pettigrew
Phinney	Pickard (Chatham—Kent Essex)
Pillitteri	Pratt
Proud	Provenzano
Redman	Richardson
Robillard	Rock
Saada	Scott (Fredericton)
Sekora	Serré
Shepherd	St. Denis
Steckle	Stewart (Brant)
Stewart (Northumberland)	St-Julien
Szabo	Telegdi
Thibeault	Torsney
Ur	Valeri
Vanclief	Volpe
Wappel	Whelan
Wilfert	Wood—146

Government Orders

NAYS

Members

Abbott	Alarie
Asselin	Bachand (Richmond—Arthabaska)
Bachand (Saint-Jean)	Bailey
Bellehumeur	Benoit
Bergeron	Bernier (Bonaventure—Gaspé—
Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Pabok)	Bernier (Tobique—Mactaquac)
Bigras	Blaikie
Borotsik	Breitkreuz (Yellowhead)
Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville)	Brien
Brison	Canuel
Cardin	Casey
Casson	Chatters
Chrétien (Frontenac—Mégantic)	Crête
Cummins	Dalphond-Guiral
Davies	de Savoye
Debien	Desjarlais
Desrochers	Dockrill
Doyle	Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)
Dubé (Madawaska—Restigouche)	Duceppe
Dumas	Duncan
Earle	Epp
Forseth	Gagnon
Gauthier	Gilmour
Girard-Bujold	Godin (Châteauguay)
Goldring	Gouk
Guay	Guimond
Hanger	Hart
Harvey	Herron
Hill (Macleod)	Hill (Prince George—Peace River)
Hilstrom	Jaffer
Johnston	Jones
Keddy (South Shore)	Kenney (Calgary Southeast)
Kerpan	Konrad
Laliberte	Lalonde
Laurin	Lebel
Lill	Loubier
Lowther	Lunn
MacKay (Pictou—Antigonish—Guysborough)	Mancini
Marceau	Marchand
Mark	Matthews
McDonough	McNally
Ménard	Mercier
Meredith	Morrison
Muise	Nystrom
Obhrai	Penson
Perron	Picard (Drummond)
Plamondon	Power
Price	Proctor
Ramsay	Reynolds
Riis	Robinson
Rocheleau	Schmidt
Solberg	

Private Members' Business

St-Hilaire	Stinson
St-Jacques	Stoffer
Strahl	Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)
Thompson (Wild Rose)	Turp
Venne	Wasylcia-Leis
Wayne	White (Langley—Abbotsford)
Williams —115	

PAIRED MEMBERS

Adams	Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre)
Cannis	Folco
Fournier	Sauvageau
Tremblay (Lac-Saint-Jean)	Tremblay (Rimouski—Mitis)

The Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[Translation]

The House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's order paper.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

NATIONAL HORSE OF CANADA ACT

Mr. Murray Calder (Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, Lib.) moved that Bill C-454, an act to provide for the recognition of the Canadian horse as the national horse of Canada, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured today to have my private member's bill, Bill C-454, debated on the floor of the House of Commons.

I wish first to acknowledge the hard work of the hon. member for Lanark—Carleton who introduced a similar bill in the last parliament. He has worked hard to win recognition for an important part of our history, and for this he deserves our thanks.

Today I will explain why I introduced this bill and why I believe the Canadian horse should be recognized as the official horse of Canada.

The Canadian horse has been an integral part of our history and our heritage. Scientists now believe that horses originated in North America 50 million years ago. When the first humans arrived in North America they migrated from Asia across a strip of land that is now gone. At the same time the horses were migrating to Asia by the same route. Our first nations were the first humans to have contact with horses. Eventually these horses disappeared from North America. They moved to China, then the Middle East and finally northern Europe.

The circle was completed by the mid-1600s. The ancestors of the current Canadian horse came from France with the early French settlers. They were introduced to Canada between 1647 and 1670

by Louis XIV who sent roughly 30 horses from his own stables in Normandy and Brittany. There was no standard Norman or Breton breeds in the 17th century. As a result, the Canadian Horse can trace its ancestry back to several breeds, including the Andalusian, the Arabian and the Percheron horses.

The Canadian horse became distinctive over time as it adapted to Canadian conditions. The shortage of food meant that the breed became smaller than its French ancestors. Today the Canadian horse could be classified as a medium size horse.

The cold climate and the shortage of barns meant that only the strongest survived. The breed became exceptionally strong and able to thrive in difficult Canadian conditions. The horse has a thick winter coat, a thick mane and tail, and short ears, all of which help to protect it from the harsh Canadian winters. The Canadian horse is the best horse suited to the Canadian climate. Indeed, it is the hardiest breed in the world and often is called the little iron horse.

• (1840)

Canadian horses were indispensable to the settlers in New France. They helped clear, plough and cultivate the soil. They made roads. They transported people and goods. They carried children to school and doctors to the sick and dying. They provided entertainment in the form of horse racing. Indeed they were the foundation of the economic well-being of New France.

It is no surprise to discover that the inhabitants of New France had a great admiration for their horse. When in 1757 the inhabitants found themselves desperately short of food, the administrators of the colony directed the people to butcher some of their horses for meat. The inhabitants were horrified. They would not eat their horses, they said, because it would be like eating one of their family.

The Canadian horse later played an important role in Manitoba, Ontario and the maritime provinces. They cleared the wood from the farms in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. They hauled the timber that built the famous wooden ships constructed in the maritimes. After the conquest, many residents of New France headed west to the Red River Valley taking their sturdy horses with them.

The United Empire Loyalists, driven from their homes during the American revolution, often passed through present day Quebec on their way to their new homes. Many bought Canadian horses to help them with farm work and to use for transportation. The Canadian horse was common in Upper Canada in the 1800s.

In fact, in my area, Grey county, those horses were used by the surveyors who were bringing supplies from Owen Sound down to the Guelph area. From Hamilton up they had to transport everything by backpack on these horses to be able to do the surveys to open up that area.

I have experienced walking behind a walking plough and seeing those horses in action. They are the most efficient and hard working animal and have helped Canadians in many achievements. They were involved in building roads in our area as well. Gravel had to be hauled by wagon and not by the huge dump trucks that we have today. They set up the rudimentary transportation routes back in the early 1700s and 1800s which are the highways we drive on today.

The Canadian horse is still bred in my area by Brenda and Geoff Pantling of Orton, Patricia Cooper of Palgrave, Kathleen MacRobbie of Mount Forest, and Barbara Kidd of Arthur.

In the 1800s many Canadian horses were shipped to the United States. They were bred with other horses to create both the Morgan and Standardbred breeds. The Tennessee Walking Horse and the Saddlebred breeds can also claim Canadian ancestry.

The Canadian horse was used as cavalry mounts and pack horses particularly during the American civil war. Its toughness made it a well suited horse for war. War and interbreeding have threatened the very existence of the Canadian horse. By the end of the 1800s the Canadian horse was in danger of extinction.

Breeders responded by creating a stud book in 1886 and forming the Canadian Horse Breeders Association in 1895. Then the federal government recognized the importance of this horse and took vigorous steps to protect this symbol of Canadian heritage. Export of the horses was stopped. A new and more selective stud book was established in 1907. In 1913 a breeding centre was opened at Cap Rouge, Quebec. Through combined efforts of the federal government and private breeders, the Canadian horse was saved. There are now more than 1,000 Canadian horses in Canada.

The Canadian horse is a perfect symbol for Canada. It has those traits that we, as Canadians, value. I am talking about all Canadians. The Canadian horse is strong for its size. It is both persistent and resilient. It is an intelligent and well-tempered Horse. The Canadian horse has a long life. Like this country itself, Canadian horses are very peaceful. From the time of ancient Greece, the horse has been an emblem signifying strength and courage. The Canadian Horse is one of the world's strongest and most courageous breeds. For this reason, it is the perfect emblem for Canada.

● (1845)

The Hon. Sydney Fisher who was minister of agriculture for an incredible 15 years from 1896 to 1911, had the following to say on the Canadian horse:

—as a rule, is the most kindly, gentle, and docile animal I have ever had the opportunity of handling, and he is also one of the truest to his work. He never gives out, it does not matter what he is at. If he is on the road he travels along forever, and if

Private Members' Business

he has a load behind him he will tug at it until he moves it. He never balks, and children can handle him with the greatest safety. In every way he is docile and kindly.

The 1914 *Breeders Gazette* of Chicago tells an interesting story about a Canadian horse. A wood merchant from Pennsylvania purchased a Canadian horse which he harnessed on the same pole beside another horse 200 pounds heavier. I have a colleague here who is involved in the forestry trade who will probably tell members a story similar to this. The Canadian horse always kept up his end and never seemed to get tired. After two years, the heavier horse died. When asked what happened, the driver said "the Canadian horse worked him to death". Another heavy horse was also teamed with the same Canadian, but it died the following year while the Canadian worked on.

No wonder the author of the *International Encyclopedia of Horse Breeds* calls the Canadian horse the best kept secret of the 20th century.

Symbols are important to any country, not for the country's economic health, but for its identity, for its sense of self. Previous governments and previous parliaments have recognized the importance of symbols. In 1964 parliament had a six month debate over a distinctive Canadian flag. In 1975 a private member's bill declared the beaver as the official symbol of our sovereignty. Recently parliament recognized hockey and lacrosse as national sports.

Other countries also recognize the importance of symbols. The eagle is the national bird of the United States. The wax palm is the national tree of Columbia. The carib wood is the national flower of Dominica. The Azteca is the national horse of Mexico.

Symbols are one way that we communicate our heritage, our history, our values, our identity. Countries have always identified themselves with flags, coats of arms and other emblems.

Canadians are no different. We have a deep respect for our symbols. We treat our flag with reverence and enthusiasm. We respect the beaver and the coat of arms of the country. As Charles Frederick Hamilton of the RCMP said in 1921:

—a nation needs emblems and symbols to preserve traditions and inspire love of country.

Just 10 days ago something happened which demonstrated the importance of symbols and their ability to stir strong sentiments. The Parti Quebecois unanimously adopted a resolution saying that the Canadian horse should be recognized as the official horse of Quebec. In the course of the discussion, delegates were told about the bill that we are now discussing. They were encouraged to adopt the resolution so that Quebec would beat Ottawa to the punch, so that Quebec could recognize the Canadian horse before the federal government had a chance to do so.

Private Members' Business

• (1850)

Of course, the province of Quebec is perfectly within its rights to declare an official horse for Quebec. However, it strikes me as a cheap political ploy to do so only to steal the federal government's thunder.

I have this to say to the Parti Quebecois and to the Government of Quebec: Recognize the Canadian horse if you like, but do so because you appreciate its importance to our history, not because you want to score cheap political points. To recognize this horse for the wrong reasons is to cheapen its worth as a symbol of the history and values of both Quebec and Canada.

Certainly the Canadian Horse has played a key role in the history of Quebec. However, it has also played a crucial role in the development of Canada as a whole. It is a symbol of our development as a country and of our diversity. It is a symbol that we are strong, independent and equal to the task. It is a symbol not just of the heritage of Quebec but of the history of this entire country.

Today, more than ever in our history, we need faith and confidence in ourselves as Canadians. We need to recognize the symbols of our past, our heritage and our values. This bill will recognize one of those symbols and I ask all members for their support.

Mr. Inky Mark (Dauphin—Swan River, Ref.): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in being involved in the debate on private member's Bill C-454. The official opposition certainly supports the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey in his private member's Bill C-454 to have the Canadian Horse recognized and declared to be the national horse of Canada.

The unstated intent of the bill is to protect this animal from extinction. Recently, the Canadian Equestrian Federation wanted the animal placed on a stamp for very similar reasons. Similarly, the Equine Research Centre at the University of Guelph, Canada's leading veterinary school located beside the riding of the hon. member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, is working to ensure a future for Canada's own unique breed.

In our research, we contacted a number of people and organizations with an interest in horses. None were opposed to this bill. Comments ranged from "it is a good idea" to "why not, it won't do any harm".

The Canadian horse was not seen as a mainline breed as were the quarter horse and the painted thoroughbred but rather as an obscure and diminishing breed which poses no threat to established breeds or commercial operations.

The Canadian horse is a unique breed in Canada. The Canadian horse celebrates its 350th anniversary in Canada this year. Nick-named the Little Iron Horse, the Canadian is a result of natural selection and breeding to fit the uniquely Canadian climate. With

only approximately 2,200 Canadian horses in existence, the breed is registered as an endangered species and is classified as vulnerable.

The first horse to gallop on Canadian soil was unloaded in Quebec on June 25, 1647. The original horse stocks were Arabs, Bretons and Anglo-Norman horses brought to Quebec from France. Over time, these horses adapted to the cold Canadian climate, becoming smaller in size and extremely hardy.

Generally the Canadian Horse is black but colours also range from bay to light chestnut. A stallion can weigh 1,050 to 1,350 pounds and the mare, 1,000 to 1,250 pounds. They are 14 to 16 hands in height. The Canadian has a well-proportioned body with especially well muscled legs. The mane and tail are thick, long and wavy. The Canadian is generally very easy to handle. The Canadian is long lived and still useful at an advanced age. The mares are extremely fertile and reproduce regularly until the age of 20 or older.

• (1855)

The Canadians were much loved and utilized by the early settlers because of their strength, willingness, and small food requirements. Their numbers rose quickly so that by 1850 there were approximately 150,000 Canadians. However, the importing of other breeds and exporting to the United States for use in various wars meant the horse was in danger of disappearing as a distinct breed. The number of Canadian horses had declined to under 400 in 1976.

As early as 1886 efforts had been made to increase the numbers of the Canadian breed. Efforts have continued throughout this century with the result that there are presently over 2,000 Canadians. However, with only eight bloodlines in existence today, Canadian horse breeders remain concerned about the future of this little iron horse. The Equine Research Centre is one of a number of groups working on different approaches to ensure a future for the Canadian horse for Canada.

One of the concerns of the Reform Party is that this bill might reflect unfavourably on the Newfoundland pony. Some can argue that this is a pony and not a horse and therefore this would minimize the impact.

Our other concern is that this bill can impact on the prestige of the RCMP's magnificent horses, one of which was given to the Queen this past year. We have tried to make contact with the RCMP but at this point in time we have not received a response.

We have contacted numerous people. I do not know much about horses and had to do some research to speak intelligently about the Canadian horse. We have talked to organizations and individuals like Greg Barrington, a horse trainer in Burnt River, Ontario; Alison Neill, communications co-ordinator for the Canadian Equestrian Federation; Nancy Kavanagh of the Canadian Morgan Horse Association; Pam Schroeder of *Canadian Horsetrader Mag-*

azine; Linda Santa, vice-chairman of marketing for the Manitoba Horse Council; Laurel Smith, the executive director of the Horse Council of British Columbia; the Equine Research Centre in Guelph; and Kit Wallace, the equine studies program manager at Kwantlan College in Vancouver. We have certainly done some homework.

Agriculture is certainly the backbone of my riding of Dauphin—Swan River. Horses are very numerous in my riding. They have become very popular both on the farm and recreationally over the last dozen years. The horse has contributed and continues to contribute to the economic climate of Dauphin—Swan River and continues to play a large part in the culture.

I would like to applaud the hon. member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey for his work on this private member's bill, Bill C-454, an act to provide for the recognition of the Canadian Horse as the national horse of Canada. I close by saying that the official opposition supports this bill.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Hélène Alarie (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I must say from the outset that I certainly agree with all the praise about the Canadian horse, because it is true and because the Canadian horse is part of Quebecers' collective memory.

However, unlike my colleague, I cannot name all the breeders of the Canadian horse in my riding, because there are simply too many of them. Having worked with them, I know for a fact that there is a long list of them, because Quebec remains the province most interested in that breed.

• (1900)

I cannot name them all like the hon. member did, but I was flattered that he would mention Cap-Rouge, which is located in my riding and is a place where horses have always been kept. I will mention other locations later on.

I rise to address Bill C-454, introduced by the hon. member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey. Its short title is the National Horse of Canada Act. I should point out that the bill does not include a summary explaining its purpose and the reasons for its tabling.

However, the full title of the bill, an act to provide for the recognition of the Canadian Horse as the national horse of Canada, sheds more light. The objective is not to legislate on a national breed of horse that is already famous, but to declare the Canadian horse a symbol of Canada.

In fact, the Liberal member for Lanark—Carleton, who tabled a similar bill—I even recognized some of the wording used in 1995—made his objective clear when he said “We need more symbols to add to the rich tapestry which is Canada's history—If

Private Members' Business

we embrace the goal of the bill it would make some small contribution to national unity”.

It is telling that the bill before us today makes no mention of New France or Quebec and only refers to the North American colony. Actually the first horse that came to this land in 1665 as a gift from the King of France, Louis XIV, arrived in Quebec City. It is in New France that this breed, which became known as the Canadian horse, thrived and increased in number, reaching 12,000 in 1760.

In fact, when we talk about the Canadian horse, the word Canadian, according to the *Glossaire du parler français au Canada*, refers to a colony of French origin established in New France or to an inhabitant of French Canada, as opposed to the word English, which refers to those inhabitants of English origin.

It is probably not a coincidence that the member for Lanark—Carleton introduced this bill only a few weeks after the Front commun interraces du patrimoine québécois submitted a request to the Quebec minister of agriculture, fisheries and food for the recognition of the Canadian horse.

At a time when serious events are unfolding on the international scene and when we should be working for peace, it is sad to see this House using some of its precious time in another flag flap, especially considering the fact that, if I am not mistaken, the Canadian horse was recognized by the federal cabinet in 1909. Why rekindle the debate on this issue?

It must be noted also that this bill is only symbolic. It does not propose any concrete measures to protect the breed it purports to promote. I take this opportunity to mention that this government has a tendency to favour verbal commitments that do not lead to any concrete measures.

For example, at the same time the government signed the Rio convention on biodiversity, it abolished dozens of researcher positions at the Canadian Museum of Nature. These researchers were working on an inventory of endangered species. How are people to protect biodiversity if they have no idea which species are threatened?

Another example is the legislation the government wanted to pass to protect endangered species, but which contained no protection measures as if it were enough to name the species, as with the Canadian horse, to save it from extinction.

Quebeckers, however, have taken the necessary action to protect the Canadian horse. In 1880, for example, François Pilote—the founder of the École d'agriculture de La Pocatière, which became the faculty of agriculture where I studied, the oldest French language agricultural institution in North America—along with Édouard Barnard and Dr. Couture, a veterinarian, did something

Private Members' Business

about the survival of this race by selecting and breeding the best specimens of the time and establishing a stud book.

More recently, when the Canadian horse went through a difficult period in the late sixties and early seventies, the Government of Quebec stepped in with special programs at the Deschambault farm. The number of horses again began to grow following the dispersal and breeding of the Deschambault herd in 1981, and with the help of the program to develop the Canadian horse.

• (1905)

From a total population of barely 700 in 1984, the number of horses increased from 975 to 1,360 between 1986 and 1996, and now stands at 2,000.

I think that the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, who introduced this bill, is well aware of the problems faced by farmers for, in addition to sitting on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food, he runs a farm himself. I therefore urge both him and his colleagues to use their talents to talk about the real needs of our farmers and to develop policies and programs to help them.

The committee works in a spirit of co-operation and we should be concerned with several urgent issues, namely genetically modified foods or Bill C-80 revising and consolidating certain acts respecting food and agricultural commodities.

I seize this opportunity to remind the hon. member that I introduced, last Monday, Motion M-619 calling on the federal government to respond to the decreasing number of farms and their increasing size by adopting, in co-operation with the provincial governments, a policy to recognize and support small farms.

I believe that all members in all parties will recognize that this proposal on small farms deserves to be examined and that, if adopted, it will have a real impact on farmers' living conditions.

The agri-food industry's fantastic development is very promising in terms of job creation and exports. However, this should not lead us to neglect small farms, often family farms, which are the basis of the social fabric of rural areas where Canadian horses can often be found.

I must oppose Bill C-454. In no way will it contribute to the preservation and development of the Canadian horse. This bill is simply an attempt to use the name of this breed and serve the purposes of the Minister of Canadian Heritage, who wants to suppress historical facts and create a unique Canadian identity by multiplying symbols.

In view of the fact that the so-called Canadian horse was introduced and developed in Quebec, that those who trained this breed were inhabitants of what became Quebec and that those same people managed to prevent its extinction, it would be more

appropriate for the National Assembly of Quebec to recognize this particular breed of horse.

[English]

Mr. Nelson Riis (Kamloops, Thompson and Highland Valleys, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see there are many others who want to speak to this important piece of legislation.

I want to congratulate my friend from Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey for introducing Bill C-454, an act to provide for the recognition of the Canadian horse as the national horse of Canada.

I need to say thank you to constituents Yvonne and Jim Hillsden of Cherry Creek who brought this issue to my attention some time ago. They are proud to be one of the three major British Columbia breeders of the Canadian horse. They brought this issue to national attention. They have urged me to support this bill and I will do so with a great deal of enthusiasm. I would like to see that this very important national symbol is recognized.

As others have said, this whole issue began back in 1647 when a horse was brought over from France as a gift for the governor of the day. It was considered unfitting for a knight to be without a horse and to have to walk through the mud or ride in an ox cart like the other people had to do. This horse was the first modern horse to gallop along on Canadian soil.

Not long after that there were imports of other horses from France. It is fair to say that the breed itself is recognized as coming from King Louis XIV and is a combination of Spanish Barb horses, Andalusian horses, French Norman horses and horses with Breton blood in them. It is a very interesting breed.

Many of us have seen this horse perhaps for the first time in the artwork of Cornelius Krieghoff which depicts scenes from the province of Quebec. For many years we saw through his work these small horses working the land, carrying children to school, sick people to doctors, pulling cutters and carriages. Off and on they provided entertainment in the form of racing on lakes at night after the gruelling work was completed. It was such gruelling work that there was an attempt to ban the racing because of the danger to the horses but the spirit continued and the racing went on.

• (1910)

These little horses had a number of nicknames. One was the little iron horse. It had that name because it was a relatively small horse but it was a tough horse. It existed in that time in new Canada on very poor quality food, out in the cold with minimal shelter and did very hard work.

The long and the short of it was that only the very strongest of these animals survived. A very hardy breed resulted here in Canada. It went on to be one of the founding breeds of a number of the horses that are very familiar to us today in various parts of the

United States and other parts of the world. I am speaking of the Tennessee Walking Horse, the Saddlebred horse and of course the Morgan horse. To this day when viewing the Morgan one can see that little iron horse from Canada standing there in a slightly different form.

It also went on to have other nicknames. The most recent one is that it is called Canada's best kept secret because until fairly recently it was focused only in one part of Canada. Only in recent years have vast numbers of Canadians become aware of this wonderful horse and to appreciate what its contribution to the modern world of horses could be.

We are fortunate because it almost became extinct. It was very popular in Canada particularly during the American civil war. Its hardiness, sturdiness and ability to work hard was appreciated. Thousands were sent to the United States to take part in that dastardly civil war. We came very close to losing this breed. At one point there were only a few hundred left. I am pleased to say that as a result of breeders taking on this challenge right across Canada, particularly in the province of Quebec, today we are talking of at least a few thousand horses of this Canadian breed.

I could speak a great deal about this horse. It is an incredibly friendly animal. Its primary purpose today would be to pull carriages and that sort of thing. It is also a great working horse. I have seen the horse in action. Any horse owner would be very proud to have one. I hope one day to own one of these horses myself on my own farm. I look forward to that day. It is not there yet but it is the kind of horse I would like to see as part of my operation.

The New Democrats will support this bill. We support it with a great deal of enthusiasm. This is an excellent initiative being brought forward by my colleague.

The United States does not have a national horse. I do not think Britain has a national horse. Obviously Peru has one. We see more and more Peruvian horses in Canada. Mexico has its own national horse. I think it is time that Canada too had its national horse and it should be the Canadian horse.

Mr. Mark Muise (West Nova, PC): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to stand. I feel somewhat—

An hon. member: Honoured.

Mr. Mark Muise: That is not what I was thinking. I was thinking more along the lines of after all these great debates on the horse that I am still very pleased to address this bill.

I congratulate the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey for recognizing the importance of the Canadian horse and the

Private Members' Business

role it has played throughout our history. I must admit, like my colleague from the Reform Party, I found myself somewhat beleaguered with my limited knowledge of the Canadian horse, but after a bit of research I felt more comfortable to talk on the topic.

I also thank my caucus colleague from South Shore for putting me in touch with Mr. Hiltz who helps run the Ross Farm Museum. Not only was Mr. Hiltz extremely helpful in providing me with a historical background of the Canadian horse, but he also described the nature of this kind and gentle animal.

● (1915)

The Ross Farm Museum has 11 registered Canadian horses in its stables. Although most Canadian horse breeders reside in the province of Quebec as was discussed by a few of my colleagues this evening, the Canadian horse is nevertheless making its way across Canada and into the northern United States. There are approximately 3,000 registered Canadian horses in the country.

[*Translation*]

This is the oldest horse breed in Canada. The first specimen arrived in Canada from France in 1647 as a present for the governor, Chevalier de Montmagny.

King Louis XIV understood how hard life was for the colonists who had no horses and had to cope with a very harsh environment. He therefore decided to send over some horses.

Eighteen years after the first Canadian horse arrived in Canada, the King of France sent over 20 mares, 8 of which died during the voyage, as well as 2 stallions. Over the next century, the Canadian horse population increased to about 12,000.

[*English*]

The Canadian horse played a key role in the development of the country. As I read through some of the material that was provided to me, it became apparent that this breed was no ordinary horse. Its legend is still talked about in certain circles within the horse breeding industry.

Stories of doctors galloping through Canada's primitive roads on the backs of their trusted Canadian horses to tend to the sick and dying are well known in the 18th and 19th centuries. Legend has it that one Quebec City butcher and his Canadian horse outraced an overnight steamer to Montreal to collect on a bad debt.

The Canadian horse is somewhat smaller in stature compared to some of the other heavier horses. However, what distinguished the Canadian horse from others is its big heart. The legend of the Canadian horse grew immensely during the 1760s when the British brought over their own workhorses, the Percherons, the Clydesdales and the Belgians, to Quebec following its capture. Initially

Private Members' Business

mocking the Canadian horse, the British quickly realized that this breed was far better than those presently in their stables.

The Canadian horse is generally a very quiet animal, excellent for a carriage horse. The Canadian horse was capable of accomplishing dual responsibilities without difficulty, either for transportation or for heavy labour.

[*Translation*]

It is very hard for someone of my generation to understand how important a role the horse played in the lives of our ancestors. For most of us, a horse is nothing more than a very beautiful animal we sometimes see on a farm. But a horse is far more than that. It is a symbol of what helped us develop this great country called Canada.

[*English*]

The Canadian horse is a symbol of what was accomplished through much hard work as our ancestors struggled to survive under very difficult conditions in the new world.

Canada could certainly use more identifiable symbols of things that have helped make this country the greatest country in the world. Unlike our southern neighbours who take great pride in promoting their unique history, Canadians unfortunately do not seem to have that same enthusiasm.

It is important that we take stock of our own history. Canada has a number of highly identifiable symbols including the Canadian flag, our provincial coats of arms and the maple leaf, just to name a few. The Canadian beaver is an instant reminder of the fur trade. The loon has been adopted as a symbol of serenity.

I quote a passage in the "Symbols of Canada" booklet published by the Department of Canadian Heritage:

Symbols of Canada can be used to heighten not only our awareness of our country but also our sense of celebration in being Canadian.

The Canadian horse is a symbol of what we have accomplished together through hard work and great hearts. This horse epitomizes the drive and perseverance it will take from each and every one of us to continue to make our country grow and prosper.

• (1920)

I once again congratulate the member from across the floor for focusing our attention on the fine exploits of the great Canadian horse. I encourage all members of the House to support the bill and recognize the Canadian horse as the national horse of Canada.

Mr. Hec Clouthier (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak in favour of Bill C-454. If the little Canadian horse was not in Canada, as my dad

would say, perhaps I would not be here. That might please some, if not all, members of the House.

Let me explain. My father, at the age of 13, had finished his third book, could not afford to take the train from Petawawa to Pembroke to further his education, and had to work in the project camps, at which point his father consigned to him a team of Canadian horses. Their names were Pete and Prince. They were not very big, but at the project camp they worked for the princely sum of \$5 a month. Those were big wages back in 1929.

This pair of little Canadian horses had to pull the same load as the big Belgians, the Percherons and the Clydesdales that were driven by other people and moving rocks. To put it in perspective, it would be the same as hooking up the hon. member for Wild Rose and the hon. member for Winnipeg South. Those two behemoths competed against me and the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie. It would be the little horses against the big horses.

Because my dad loved those little Canadian horses and they were not very big, once the load of rock was on the wagon he would conveniently forget to close the back end. Thus when he was going up the grade some of the stones would fall off and naturally the load would become a little lighter.

When the foreman of the job rationed the feed, because it was during the depression era, he said to my dad "Listen, you only need half the feed for your horses because they are only half the size". However he expected those little Canadian horses to do the same job. Therefore in the middle of the night my dad would awaken and borrow some more hay and oats for his horses, because they were so darned good to him.

At the end of summer my dad took a job for the Pembroke Lumber Company for which he was paid 5 cents a log. This same team of horses, Prince and Pete, went with him back into the bush operation. They were without a doubt, according to my dad, the sturdiest animals he ever had. He is still alive at 83 years of age.

At one time we had a team of 55 work horses and a team of over 20 little Canadian horses. Their bellies used to touch the snow and they broke the trail to skid the logs out. These were the hardest little animals. The other horses would get bogs and splints. They would get scratches from the ice between the hoof and fetlock. The scratches would open up and the horses would not be able to work because they were bleeding. The little Canadian horses were hardy little fellows and they would keep going. There was no denying the fact that they were the best workers.

My dad at 14 years of age used to cut logs with a crosscut all day. He would be so tired at the end of the day that he would get on one of the horse's back and fall asleep, and the horse would bring him back to the camp.

We must bear in mind that at that time people like my dad would get up at 5 o'clock in the morning. It would be dark when they

Private Members' Business

would leave camp and they would not get back until 7 o'clock at night when it would be dark again. The only time they saw the light of day at the camp was on Sunday, and even then they would on occasion take Pete and Prince to church with them.

We have heard another speaker tonight talk about how courageous and fast these horses were. Let me tell a story about the crazy wheel. The crazy wheel is a mechanism that hooks on to the back of a sleigh. When going down a steep hill with a team of horses a cable would be hooked on to the back of the sleigh and the sleigh would be let down. Back in the thirties and forties the roads would be iced so it would be easier for the horses to pull the sleigh. Halfway down one of these steep hills, when my uncle Dave was driving the team, the cable broke. Members know what happened. The cable broke. The load started pushing the horses and the little Canadian horses were running down the hill. My dad shouted to my Uncle Dave "jump Dave, jump" because there was a sharp corner at the bottom of the hill before they got on to the lake.

• (1925)

My Uncle Dave, being a rather stubborn fellow, decided not to jump. They went around the corner and they broke the bunks of the sleigh. The bunks of the sleigh are what keeps those logs in line. My Uncle Dave went into the bush with some of the logs but the little team kept on going around the corner and out on to the ice. They were not hurt but they were terribly fast.

Other speakers have said that they used to actually race these horses at night. Many do not know that the little Canadian horse is one of the genesis of the standardbred horse. I happen to have my standardbred horse licence and race horses. There was one particular standardbred horse called Cam Fella which reminded my dad and I of these little Canadian horses. He was only a little horse but everybody who touched that horse made money. Doug Arthur bought him for \$19,000, made \$150,000 with him, and sold him for \$2 million to a breeder. That breeder made \$5 million with him and he sired 16 million dollar winners.

I know some of my other colleagues want to speak to this bill, but I will tell one little story about my father at the end of hunting season when he polished up his brass harness and took the horse on parade in Pembroke, Ontario, back in 1942. Some of the people started cawing at the horse, saying the horse was crow bait. My dad was so incensed and actually chased the people away. The little Canadian horses used to grow a lot of hair, something like my colleague from Ottawa Centre or my colleague from Bourassa. Their long hair kept them from getting sores on their bodies.

I congratulate the member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey. I was trying to figure out what he had in common with horses. We know he is a chicken farmer of fame. I have noticed that chickens have wings, but there was a legendary horse called Pegasus that had wings. When I raced my horse last Sunday night at Rideau Carleton, I wished that my horse had the wings of Pegasus and the heart, determination and charisma of the little Canadian horse because I might have won the race. To be honest,

my trainer said that it was probably more the driver's fault than the horse's fault.

My father and Prince and Pete, those two little Canadian horses of 1929, would be honoured if somehow we could see fit to name the Canadian horse Canada's national horse. I thoroughly endorse the hon. member.

I will sit down because two members are giving me the evil eye. I think they are ready to give me a horse kick if I do not wrap up now and give them the opportunity to say a few words. Bravo, little Canadian horse.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will not take long. I could not let the rubbish spouted by my friends in the Bloc pass once again. Most importantly, I wanted to support, with vigour I hope, my colleague from Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey and his important bill.

A bill can be said to be not important, but when the Bloc talks on and on about recognition and symbols and tries to claim for themselves as a Quebec horse the French Canadian horse that has been proven historically to be the Canadian horse, we have problems.

I do not know what the interpreters will do with this one, but let me put it this way: the Bloc is blathering again. They said that all my colleague wanted to talk about was national unity and that, in the end, he had started another flag flap.

A lot of things go on in Rimouski. They still do not know whether Céline Dion is a Quebecer or a Canadian, and the same goes for a breed of horse.

• (1930)

And the PQ, the Bloc's head office, finally decided during the last general council, that it was absolutely necessary to have a resolution recognizing the French Canadian horse as the only breed in the world that is part of Quebec heritage. The avowed objective was to act before the federal government. Bill C-454 seeks, how shocking—to quote an article written in *Le Soleil* by my friend Michel David on Thursday, April 22, 1999—recognition for the national horse of Canada. One can see the reason for this sense of urgency.

If there is one inane debate within Bloc Québécois, it is the one on identity. It never fails. They always try to find some issue and turn it into a flag flap. We should be proud that a French Canadian horse is a symbol of Canada.

Adjournment Debate

Canada includes Quebec and the rest of the country. There are French Canadians everywhere in Quebec. Again, they are trying to cut themselves off from symbols and say that it is only in Quebec that worthwhile things are happening.

As a Quebecer, a French Canadian and a Canadian, period, I fully support my colleague, because I think it is important. We need symbols, and we need to recognize them as such.

It is through recognition that we begin to solve problems. Once again, they are making a big fuss and saying “No, no, it is a Quebec symbol”.

We should unanimously support the hon. member in saying that the French Canadian horse is the national horse of Canada.

[*English*]

The Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member for Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey wishes to exercise his right of reply, he may do so now. I advise the House if he speaks now, he will close the debate.

Mr. Murray Calder (Dufferin—Peel—Wellington—Grey, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members who have stood here tonight and supported my private member’s bill, Bill C-454.

I am a little disappointed that the Bloc would try to cheapen what the Canadian horse is, a symbol of Canada, a symbol of our heritage, the symbol of the integrity of Canada. I am a little upset about that.

I want to thank the other parties that have definitely shown their support. The Progressive Conservative Party has shown its support. The Reform Party has shown its support. The NDP has shown its support. So has my own party. I express a heartfelt thanks to the members who have stood here tonight.

I would like to seek unanimous consent for the following motion. Given that clearly there is considerable interest in this issue and given that the opposition, particularly the Reform Party says that it wants more free votes in the House, I would move that Bill C-454, an act to provide for the recognition of the Canadian horse as the national horse of Canada, be deemed to have been chosen as a votable item.

The Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the bill be made votable?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. members: No.

The Deputy Speaker: The period for the consideration of Private Members’ Business has now expired and the order is dropped from the order paper.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

JUSTICE

Mr. Gordon Earle (Halifax West, NDP): Mr. Speaker, this Liberal government has committed an injustice to black Nova Scotians and all Canadians.

This government has also done a grave injustice to justice itself. “If justice is fairness to all, then justice has not prevailed in Nova Scotia”. These words wrap up the Donald Marshall commission. These words have unfortunately never been more true than today.

The commission recognized that black people in Nova Scotia have been systematically excluded from the legal profession. The commission recommended that “governments consider the needs of visible minorities by appointing qualified visible minority judges and administrative board members whenever possible”.

One scant month after spouting nice words and lovely sentiments during Black History Month, the Liberal government turned back the clock on racial equality.

• (1935)

The Liberal government did a grave injustice to all when it overlooked Nova Scotia’s most senior female judge and the only black family court judge when making appointments to the province’s new unified family court.

Judge Corrine Sparks was passed over and ignored in a conscious decision by the government to appoint judges who have sat on the bench in Nova Scotia for less time. Judge Sparks was appointed in 1987. The government overlooked her in favour of judges appointed in 1995, 1993 and 1991 among others. As Lincoln Alexander, chairperson of the Canada Race Relations Foundation stated, this is a “major slap in the face to the black community” and suggests this government’s actions “smack of racism”.

I first raised this issue in the House of Commons on April 14. The government buried its head in the sand and hoped the problem would go away, as governments in this country have so often hoped when it comes to issues of fairness for blacks and other Canadians of colour.

Then on April 26 I listened with incredulity to the justice minister’s answer to my question on this issue. She responded by telling me that the government had appointed a black judge in Alberta. Well stop the presses. The government has appointed a black judge. Clearly, enough is enough for the government and one black judge must somehow ease the Liberal government’s con-

science. I suppose the government is now quite comfortable and pleased with itself that it has done all it can in the fight against the oppression of visible minorities.

The minister seems to be suggesting on behalf of the Liberal government that one black judge is more than enough to appease blacks and Canadians of colour in this country from coast to coast and to keep us quiet and thankful. The appointment she refers to is over 3,000 kilometres from the blacks in my riding.

The issue is that Judge Sparks seems more than qualified to have received one of these appointments. The fact that a black judge was appointed elsewhere has no relevance whatsoever to Judge Sparks' situation. The minister seems to suggest that Judge Sparks is not qualified enough to receive this appointment. Is it the fact that she is the most senior woman judge in the province that does not qualify her? Is it the fact that she is the only black family court judge in the province that does not qualify her? Or does she not qualify because she has many more years experience than others who were appointed?

The government went from ashamed to shameful when it went so far to avoid appointing a black judge that it ignored Judge Sparks in favour of appointing someone who is not even a judge. In my riding alone there are the predominantly black communities of Beechville, Lucasville and Upper Hammonds Plains. Also in Nova Scotia are North Preston, East Preston, Sackville, Cherrybrook, Lake Loon, Westphal, Dartmouth, Halifax, and several other areas all with large black populations.

When sitting as a supreme court judge, Bertha Wilson remarked in a lecture at Osgoode: "If women lawyers and women judges through differing perspectives on life can bring new humanity to bear on the decision making process, perhaps they will make a difference. Perhaps they will succeed in infusing the law with an understanding of what it means to be fully human".

I join with the Black Lawyers Association of Nova Scotia, the African United Baptist Association of Nova Scotia, the Canada Race Relations Foundation and the Nova Scotia Federation of Labour in telling the government to correct this grievous wrong now. Canadians, and especially black Canadians, are watching and waiting for the government's response.

The Quebec government recently appointed Juanita Westmoreland-Traore to the Quebec provincial court.

Let the Liberal government show some courage and a sincere effort to fight racism.

Ms. Eleni Bakopanos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying on my behalf and as someone who has worked for equality in this country for a long, long time, over 25 years, and on behalf of the Minister of Justice and the government that I take very strong exception to the remarks made by the hon. member.

Adjournment Debate

This government rejects any suggestion that the decision taken was discriminatory and racist. We are confident that Canadians looking at the government's record on appointments will see concrete evidence of the personal commitment of the Minister of Justice to improving the quality and diversity of the judiciary and in particular, to increasing minority representation and women's participation on the bench. A fair reading of our recent efforts will prove this.

In Nova Scotia in the past year alone the Minister of Justice and this government have appointed two outstanding jurists from minority communities, Judge Heather Robertson and Justice Linda Oland. Furthermore, real efforts are being made through judicial appointments committees across this country to achieve the objective of greater diversity on our benches. These efforts are bearing fruit.

More could be done. I agree with the hon. member on that. As the minister herself said last week in answer to these questions from the hon. member, critics of these recent unified family court appointments should know that we are a government that takes considerable pride in the fact that we appointed the first black judge in the province of Alberta to a superior court.

These decisions are not made in isolation, something the opposition often forgets. As with all appointments, the Nova Scotia unified family court appointments were made following extensive consultations with the provincial attorney general, senior members of the bench and the bar. They are excellent appointments and reflect our continuing commitment to a strong family court.

• (1940)

This is the real story of what has happened in Nova Scotia recently. Through a shared vision and the provision of resources, the unified family court, the province of Nova Scotia and the federal government have laid the groundwork for reducing the costs and the pain of family disputes and want to find lasting solutions to benefit families and children.

TRANSPORT

Mr. Bill Casey (Cumberland—Colchester, PC): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the very distinguished Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport.

Just a few weeks ago the Government of Nova Scotia and Transport Canada arranged a meeting in Truro, Nova Scotia in my riding to discuss the emergency measure aspects of hazardous material transportation. The plan was to move radioactive material which originated in Russia.

The plan agenda said: "The sample of radioactive material which comes from Russia by ship will enter Canada in Halifax and

Adjournment Debate

be moved by road to Chalk River, Ontario early this summer". This was an unequivocal statement. It was not a conjecture or a proposal. It was stated as a fact. This material would be transferred through Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Quebec by road, presenting a significant hazard.

It obviously begs the question as to why we are bringing radioactive material to Canada in any case. We already have a waste disposal problem with radioactive material. Why did the government not respect the unanimous vote in the foreign affairs committee to not bring the material to Canada?

Another obvious question is if the Department of Natural Resources says there has been no request made for this transfer, and there are no plans to bring the material to Canada, why did they plan this meeting in the first place? Again, it was the Department of Transport in conjunction with the province of Nova Scotia.

For the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, there was no public consultation. Even more disturbing, the emergency measures organizations involved stated this week that they do not have adequate training and do not have equipment for this project.

We now know the meeting has been cancelled and the minister has stated that there is no plan right now to proceed. Obviously there was a plan. Obviously there is some intent here. Obviously there is some intention because the province of Nova Scotia and the Government of Canada let the cat out of the bag by releasing this agenda.

Before any radioactive material is transported through Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario, will there be public consultations and will the people affected along the route have the opportunity to register their objections and concerns? Will the federal government provide adequate training, equipment and protection for all the emergency measures organizations involved along the route of the transfer of radioactive material if it does happen?

Mr. Stan Dromisky (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the matters raised by the hon. member for Cumberland—Colchester on April 22, 1999 regarding the transportation of test quantities of mixed oxide fuel, otherwise known as MOX fuel.

Transport Canada's role is to ensure that if dangerous goods are transported in Canada, they are transported safely.

Before the transport of MOX fuel for testing in Chalk River can take place in Canada, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited is required to develop an emergency response assistance plan and obtain approval of the plan from Transport Canada. The emergency response assistance plan must set out how Atomic Energy of Canada Limited would respond in the event of an emergency. As well, it would contain the proposed routing options. Atomic Energy of Canada Limited has not yet proposed a plan to Transport Canada.

Given the fact that every year in Canada there are over 800,000 shipments of radioactive materials, department officials routinely offer technical sessions for fire chiefs and other respondents as a measure of safety. The offer from Transport Canada to begin the technical sessions in Nova Scotia erroneously contained the statement that the Russian federation MOX would arrive in Halifax.

As I mentioned earlier, we do not yet have a proposal from Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. Therefore, we do not know if Halifax will be proposed or not. However I can assure the House that if an application is received Transport Canada will carry out its role of ensuring that if this material is transported in Canada it will be transported safely.

The Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 7.45 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Wednesday, May 5, 1999

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

National Fitness Month	
Ms. Augustine	14709
Penticton Airport	
Mr. Hart	14709
Bridgeview Public School	
Mr. Gallaway	14709
Canadian Armed Forces	
Mr. Clouthier	14709
Job Creation Programs	
Mr. St-Julien	14710
Taxation	
Mr. Casson	14710
Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Leung	14710
Bernard Voyer	
Mr. Lebel	14710
Intercede Diversion Program	
Mrs. Longfield	14711
Ontario Budget	
Mr. Kenney	14711
Member for Québec East	
Mr. Coderre	14711
The Late Terry Riordon	
Ms. Lill	14711
Maryse Coziol-Lavoie	
Ms. St-Hilaire	14712
Huntington's Disease	
Mr. Muise	14712
Multiple Sclerosis Society	
Mrs. Redman	14712
National Youth Week	
Mr. Harb	14712

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Manning	14713
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14713
Mr. Manning	14713
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14713
Mr. Manning	14713
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14713
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	14713
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14713
Mr. Scott (Skeena)	14713
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14714
Economic Missions	
Mr. Duceppe	14714
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14714

Mr. Duceppe	14714
Mr. Duceppe	14714
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14714
Mr. Turp	14714
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14714
Mr. Turp	14714
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14714
Kosovo	
Ms. McDonough	14715
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14715
Ms. McDonough	14715
Ms. McDonough	14715
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14715
Taxation	
Mr. Brison	14715
Mr. Marchi	14715
Mr. Brison	14715
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14716
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14716
Aboriginal Affairs	
Ms. Meredith	14716
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14716
Ms. Meredith	14716
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14716
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14716
Economic Missions	
Mr. Duceppe	14716
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14716
Mr. Duceppe	14716
Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice)	14716
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Strahl	14717
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14717
Mr. Strahl	14717
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14717
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14717
Bill C-68	
Mr. Bellehumeur	14717
Ms. McLellan	14717
Mr. Bellehumeur	14718
Ms. McLellan	14718
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. Manning	14718
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14718
Mr. Manning	14718
Mrs. Stewart (Brant)	14718
Lévis Shipyard	
Mr. Dubé (Lévis-et-Chutes-de-la-Chaudière)	14718
Mr. Manley	14718
Student Loan System	
Ms. Carroll	14719
Mr. Pettigrew	14719
Dangerous Offenders	
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	14719

Mr. MacAulay	14719
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	14719
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	14719
Mr. MacAulay	14719
The Environment	
Mr. Mancini	14719
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland)	14719
Mr. Mancini	14719
Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland)	14720
Province of Ontario	
Mr. Jones	14720
Aboriginal Affairs	
Mr. O'Reilly	14720
Ms. Blondin—Andrew	14720
Ports	
Mr. Morrison	14720
Mr. Collenette	14720
Francophones Outside Quebec	
Mr. Plamondon	14720
Mr. Chrétien (Saint—Maurice)	14720
Ethics Counsellor	
Mr. Nystrom	14721
Mr. Boudria	14721
Taxation	
Mr. Harvey	14721
Mr. Massé	14721
Presence in the Gallery	
The Speaker	14721

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Mr. Knutson	14721
Committees of the House	
Public Accounts	
Mr. Williams	14721
Income Tax Act	
Bill C-507. Introduction and first reading	14722
Mr. Guimond	14722
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	14722
Hepatitis Awareness Month Act	
Bill C-508. Introduction and first reading	14722
Mr. Stoffer	14722
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	14722
Members of Parliament Superannuation Act	
Bill C-509. Introduction and first reading	14722
Mr. Gouk	14722
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	14722
The Deaf and Heard of Hearing	
Ms. St-Hilaire	14722
Motion	14722
(Motion agreed to)	14722

Petitions	
Human Rights	
Mr. Szabo	14723
Penticton Regional Airport	
Mr. Hart	14723
Yugoslavia	
Ms. Bakopanos	14723
Medicare	
Ms. Wasylcyia—Leis	14723
Child Pornography	
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	14723
Gasoline Additives	
Mrs. Ur	14723
The Senate	
Mr. Gallaway	14723
Taxation	
Mr. Epp	14723
Questions on the Order Paper	
Mr. Knutson	14723
Motions for Papers	
Mr. Knutson	14723

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

National Housing Act	
Bill C-66. Report stage	14724
Ms. Wasylcyia—Leis	14724
Mr. Bailey	14725
Ms. Lill	14725
Mr. Stoffer	14727
Message from the Senate	
The Deputy Speaker	14728
National Housing Act	
Bill C-66. Report stage	14728
The Deputy Speaker	14728
Divisions deemed demanded and deferred	14728
Divisions deferred	14728
Youth Criminal Justice Act	
Bill C-68. Second reading	14728
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	14728
Ms. Catterall	14729
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	14730
Ms. Catterall	14730
Mr. Thompson (New Brunswick Southwest)	14730
Mr. Gouk	14731
Ms. Catterall	14732
Mr. Gouk	14732
Ms. Alarie	14732
Ms. Wasylcyia—Leis	14734
Mr. Gilmour	14735
Mr. White (Langley—Abbotsford)	14737
Mr. de Savoye	14738
Mr. Riis	14739
Mrs. Wayne	14740
Mr. Lowther	14741
Mr. Lowther	14742
Supply	
Allotted Day—Shipbuilding	
Motion	14742
The Deputy Speaker	14742
Amendment negated	14743

Motion negatived	14745
Budget Implementation Act, 1999	
Bill C-71. Report stage	14745
Mr. Kilger	14745
Mr. Strahl	14745
Mr. Bergeron	14745
Mrs. Dockrill	14745
Mr. Harvey	14745
Motion No. 1 negatived	14746
Motion for concurrence	14746
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	14746
Mr. Kilger	14746
Mr. Strahl	14746
Mr. Bergeron	14746
Mrs. Dockrill	14746
Mr. Harvey	14746
Motion agreed to	14747
(Motion agreed to)	14747
National Housing Act	
Bill C-66. Report stage	14747
Mr. Kilger	14747
Mr. Strahl	14747
Mr. Bergeron	14747
Mrs. Dockrill	14747
Mr. Harvey	14747
Motion No. 1 negatived	14748
Mr. Kilger	14749
Motion No. 2 negatived	14753
Motion No. 4 defeated	14753
Motion No. 6 defeated	14753
Motion No. 24 defeated	14753
Mr. Kilger	14753
Mr. Strahl	14753
Mr. Bergeron	14753
Mrs. Dockrill	14753
Mr. Harvey	14753
Motion No. 5 negatived	14754
Mr. Kilger	14754
Mr. Strahl	14754
Mr. Bergeron	14754
Mrs. Dockrill	14754
Mr. Harvey	14754
Motion No. 7 negatived	14755
Mr. Kilger	14755
Motion No. 11 negatived	14759
Motion No. 12 negatived	14759
Motion No. 33 negatived	14759
Motion No. 36 negatived	14759
Mr. Kilger	14759
Mr. Strahl	14759
Mr. Bergeron	14759
Mrs. Dockrill	14759
Mr. Harvey	14759
Motion No. 8 negatived	14760
Mr. Kilger	14760
Motion No. 10 negatived	14764
Motion No. 14 negatived	14764
Motion No. 22 negatived	14764
Motion No. 32 negatived	14764
Mr. Kilger	14764
Mr. Strahl	14765
Mr. Bergeron	14765

Mrs. Dockrill	14765
Mr. Harvey	14765
Motion No. 16 negatived	14766
Mr. Kilger	14766
Mr. Strahl	14766
Mr. Bergeron	14766
Mrs. Dockrill	14766
Mr. Harvey	14766
Motion No. 17 negatived	14767
Mr. Kilger	14767
Motion No. 35 negatived	14768
Mr. Kilger	14768
Mr. Strahl	14768
Mr. Bergeron	14768
Mrs. Dockrill	14768
Mr. Harvey	14768
Motion No. 20 negatived	14769
Mr. Kilger	14769
Motion No. 34 negatived	14770
Mr. Kilger	14770
Mr. Strahl	14771
Mr. Bergeron	14771
Mrs. Dockrill	14771
Mr. Harvey	14771
Motion No. 25 negatived	14772
Mr. Kilger	14772
Mr. Strahl	14772
Mr. Bergeron	14772
Mrs. Dockrill	14772
Mr. Harvey	14772
Motion No. 30 negatived	14773
Mr. Kilger	14773
Mr. Strahl	14773
Mr. Bergeron	14773
Mrs. Dockrill	14773
Mr. Harvey	14773
Motion No. 31 negatived	14774
Motion for concurrence	14774
Mr. Gagliano	14774
Mr. Kilger	14774
Mr. Strahl	14775
Mr. Bergeron	14775
Mrs. Dockrill	14775
Mr. Harvey	14775
Motion agreed to	14776

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Horse of Canada Act

Bill C-454. Second reading	14776
Mr. Calder	14776
Mr. Mark	14778
Ms. Alarie	14779
Mr. Riis	14780
Mr. Muise	14781
Mr. Clouthier	14782
Mr. Coderre	14783
Mr. Calder	14784

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Justice	
Mr. Earle	14784
Ms. Bakopanos	14785
Transport	
Mr. Casey	14785
Mr. Dromisky	14786

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://wwwparl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Additional copies may be obtained from 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 des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9

On peut obtenir la version française de cette publication en écrivant à : Les Éditions du gouvernement du Canada, Ottawa, Canada K1A 0S9